

Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
October 31, 2023 | 1:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Tower Ballroom – IUPUI

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Allen-Brown, Kayla; Buckman, Christopher; Butters, Rebecca; Cycholl, Garin; Dam, Gregory; DeSawal, Danielle; Eskew, Kelly; Goff, Philip; Kini, Ranjan; Kravitz, Ben; Maxcy, Brendan; McCoy, Chase; Medina, Monica; Morgan, Gin; Murdoch-Kinch, Carol Ann; Need, Andrea; Palmer, Megan; Perez, Rodrigo; Popham, Susan; Ramos, Bill; Reck, Cate; Rivas, Jaynne; Schult, Carolyn; Sciame-Gesecke, Susan; Shrivastav, Rahul; Slayback-Barry, Denise; Wert, Joe; Whitten, Pamela

MEMBERS ABSENT: Barthlow, Deanna; Ben Miled, Zina; Carlton, Rebecca; Cohen, Rachael; Eaton, Kristine; Eisenstein, Marie; Elliott, Rob; Evans, Cindy; Froysland, Hayley; Jones, Kevin; King Thorius, Kathleen; Lester, Jessica; Nichols-Boyle, Shawn; Raji, Aaliyah; Stucky, Thomas; Trinidad, Jon; Windsor, Jack

GUESTS: Applegate, Rachel; Andrews, Sabrina; Lee, Karen; Kincaid, Jenny; Zheng, Lin; Pinkney, Dwayne; Mumper, Russell; Calloway, Heather; Mack, Teresa; Roberts, Bethan; Stopher, Brenda; Richardson; Miller, Willie; Woodman, Brian

Agenda

University Faculty Council
Agenda

- 1. Approval of the minutes of April 25, 2023**
- 2. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)**
 - Philip Goff, UFC Co-chair, IUPUI
 - Colin Johnson, UFC Co-chair, IU Bloomington
 - Carolyn Schult, UFC Co-chair, IU South Bend
- 3. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)**
 - Pamela Whitten, President, 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 Goff, Johnson, and Schult by emailing ufcoff@iu.edu. Questions should be submitted no less than two business days before the meeting.
- 5. Updates on the New Budget Model and New Metrics for State Appropriations (15 minutes)**
 - Dwayne Pinkney, Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration
- 6. Questions/Comments on New Budget Model and New Metrics for State Appropriations (10**

minutes)

7. Report on Faculty-activity Reporting Tools (15 minutes)

Susan Sciame-Giesecke, Vice President for Regional Campuses and Online Education

Sabrina Andrews, Associate Vice President of Institutional Analytics

8. Questions/Comments on Faculty-activity Reporting Tools (10 minutes)

9. New Policy on Employee Relationships Involving Students (5 minutes)

Jennifer Kincaid, University Director of Institutional Equity/University Sexual Misconduct and Title IX Coordinator/University ADA Coordinator

Lin Zheng, Chair, UFC Faculty Affairs Committee

[Discussion Item]

U4-2024: New Policy on Employee Relationships Involving Students (Discussion Item)

10. Questions/Comments on New Policy on Employee Relationships Involving Students (20 minutes)

11. Updates on ICR Policy and Recent Changes in Research (15 minutes)

Russell Mumper, Vice President for Research

Ben Kravitz, Co-chair, UFC Research Affairs Committee

Tom Stucky, Co-chair, UFC Research Affairs Committee

12. Questions/Comments on ICR Policy and Recent Changes in Research (10 minutes)

13. Updates on and Charge for University-wide AI Taskforce (10 minutes)

Philip Goff, UFC Co-chair, IUPUI

Colin Johnson, UFC Co-chair, IU Bloomington

Carolyn Schult, UFC Co-chair, IU South Bend

U5-2024: Charge for University-wide AI Taskforce

14. Questions/Comments on University-wide AI Taskforce (10 minutes)

15. Updates on Questions for Reviews of Core-school Deans (5 minutes)

Philip Goff, UFC Co-chair, IUPUI

Colin Johnson, UFC Co-chair, IU Bloomington

Carolyn Schult, UFC Co-chair, IU South Bend

U6-2024: Questions for Reviews of Core-school Deans

16. Questions/Comments on Questions for Reviews of Core-school Deans (10 minutes)

Transcript

Whitten (00:04:46):

I think we're at 1:30. I am not someone comfortable with a gavel, so I think I will just declare the meeting started if that is okay with everybody. Good afternoon and welcome. I think the first order of business, which should not surprise anyone, is the approval of the minutes from our last meeting, which feels like five minutes ago, and I guess it was April 25th, which has been a while. So do we have a motion

for approval first? Great. Do I have a second? There you go. Thank you. Thank you. Colin. Is there any discussion on the minutes at all? Okay, hearing none. All those in favor signal by raising your hands. Very good. Any opposed? Okay, the minutes are approved. The next item on the agenda is executive committee business, and so we're going to hear from UFC co-chairs Phil Goff from IUPUI, Colin Johnson from IU Bloomington, and of course Carolyn Schult from IU South Bend who represents all of our regional campuses. So Phil, I believe you're up.

Goff ([00:05:49](#)):

Good afternoon everyone. Welcome to Indianapolis. If you are present or watched the president's state of the university address yesterday I mentioned that this campus is committed to making a good place to do research, teach, learn, and serve an even better place for everybody, for students, faculty and staff. To that end, the past year has been incredibly busy last year faced with both a strategic plan to think through and write and a re-envisioning of our campus as IU Indianapolis. Hundreds of faculty rolled up their sleeves and got to work this year we are implementing those plans. This is not happening without some bumps and bruises because, but in the collaborative and engaged spirit that marked IUPUI for half a century, we're working our way through them. There's plenty to be excited about amid all the unfamiliar changes, including an infusion of funds to jumpstart new research initiatives and the school of science.

([00:06:46](#)):

I'm grateful to Dean John Detusa and his faculty who have been working closely with Vice Chancellor of Research, Phaedra Corso and plotting out a path toward research excellence that will also help our students throughout the campus. Schools are rethinking how to meet their goals in a shifting education market. This is often uncomfortable as we all know around this table, but it's necessary. You probably followed some of the bumpiest bumps we've encountered as some of our colleagues shift to Purdue administratively on July 1st. I spoke up early about this and I've continued to speak about it often over the summer, two national publications covered the story. While I doubt anyone is satisfied with the current situation, I am at least pleased to say that the pressure has had two mitigating effects. First, nearly all of our lecturers transitioning to Purdue were upgraded to teaching faculty rather than staff.

([00:07:43](#)):

I was worried about this because lecturers at Purdue are called staff and are not part of academic affairs. Second, the unsatisfying university tenure Purdue created, which is unconnected from departments, has been further defined and some of the worst aspects have been modified to allow for reviews and promotion as well as affiliations, at least with departments. We will continue our efforts to give our colleagues as soft a landing as possible as they transition to Purdue. Finally, in regard to this change, I'm grateful to the administration and to the Luddy School for taking on many of the IUPUI computer science faculty as the school quickly stands up, a computer science program here, this is a win-win situation for our faculty and for the city.

Whitten ([00:08:35](#)):

Good, thank you Phil. Colin.

Johnson ([00:08:40](#)):

So Phil is always more prepared than I am. I had just made some notes for myself. So first of all, echoing Phil's comments, I can report that the Bloomington campus is a busy place this time of year and it has been for some time. I think the faculty are very excited about some of the things that are going on on

campus right now and very grateful to the leadership of certainly our provost and the president in terms of pushing some exciting new initiatives along. I think people are sometimes exhausted. We've talked about that before, but I do know that people are deeply committed to doing their best for their students, for their colleagues, and really for the institution in the longer term. I will say that one of the things that struck me since the beginning of the year is some of the most exciting initiatives and some of the biggest changes that are happening on campus, though at times disconcerting are also really interesting in the sense that I think pretty much everything we're trying to undertake right now really requires us to reflect very deeply and meaningfully on some of the ethical implications of what we do as teachers, as researchers, and really as citizens of the state of Indiana.

[\(00:09:55\)](#):

That's challenging and sometimes scary, but I think it's a really important part of who we are and if that kind of thinking can't happen in the context of a university community, it's not entirely clear to me where it can happen. One of those issues that we're taking on this year is obviously the advent of the era of artificial intelligence, and we'll be hearing a little bit more about that today in the context of thinking about the task force. This body is going to charter and charge today, but there are a couple of other initiatives that I think are also worthy of comment. One of them is certainly a very significant investment that the university announced that it's making in research, having to do with AI and nanotechnology and nano fabrication, which I know is an enormous opportunity for many of our colleagues currently on campus and will provide a lot of opportunities for people we're trying to attract to join us at the Bloomington campus.

[\(00:10:46\)](#):

So that's very exciting. I will say that initiative though it has been sort of welcomed by many people, has also raised some questions, some very longstanding questions about the academy's relation to certain sorts of research and the kind of potentials of that research to either do good in the world or to potentially do harm in the world. And I think that many of my colleagues want to engage in a kind of robust dialogue about what our relation to that research agenda is and what kind of thinking needs to happen to ensure that we're really doing, serving the state, the nation, and the world in the way that I think ethically we're all kind of feel deeply committed to serving it. The second issue is another issue that I think we'll hear a little bit about today, which is some discussion going on around the reconfiguration of the Kinsey Institute as a research institute on the Bloomington campus.

[\(00:11:32\)](#):

And as many of you will know during the last legislative session, some changes were made, a bill was passed that really made it more complicated to do something we had already been doing, which is not funding the Kinsey Institute with state appropriated dollars historically, but the institution is starting to think about ways to respond that I assume we'll hear a little bit more about that, but I do know that we have colleagues on the Bloomington campus that have a lot of questions about what the implications of that are and will be, and I think that they deserve to have those questions answered and I certainly think they deserve to hear assurances from the administration, that the administration, the university, continues to really recognize the signal importance of the research that was done at that entity and has really defined IU in many ways on multiple fronts for the past 75 years. So I'm looking forward, like I said, to having some of those really engaging, thoughtful and really important ethical discussions about the past, present, and future of Indiana University and the role that it plays in the world. And I fully expect that our colleagues in the administration will be happy to engage in those conversations as well. So I look forward to them.

Whitten [\(00:12:47\)](#):

Thank you, Colin. Carolyn?

Schult ([00:12:53](#)):

Okay, here. Okay. So the regional faculty caucus continues to work together on things that are of interest to the regional campuses. Last year, our big joint project was aligning our campus calendars to a regional common calendar so that we had finals week and all our breaks are aligning. We're seeing how that's still playing out. Some folks that are used to have a week for Thanksgiving and aren't going to have that this year, but we'll see how it goes. But it's best for our students who are taking classes from multiple campuses to have a common calendar. And so we're still tweaking a bit, but we're mostly done with that project. In August, we met to discuss several strategic initiatives and to find out what each campus is working on and what they've been focusing on. And honestly, the goal of these sessions is larceny.

([00:13:39](#)):

If one campus has a good idea that's working, the rest of us should absolutely steal it and try it for ourselves. So we talked about being a student ready campus regional perspectives on DEI leadership certification, plans for growth for online education badges and microcredentials P through 12 IU strategy regional campuses as engines of community impact future IU, which is a grassroots faculty and staff think tank that's trying to get off the ground. And then reimagining campus structures and programs for a more nimble future, which is about the reorganization, academic reorganizations that's going on on the South Bend campus. We have going from five schools and colleges down to two, and so we have a lot of changes going on there, but things are progressing very well on that front. So a lot of different ideas of ways we can collaborate and work together in the future.

([00:14:36](#)):

I also wanted to mention our September 12th meeting just to make sure it gets into the minutes. We had a planning session for the UFC on September 12th to try to get the committees thinking about what they wanted to do with the year early on so that they can have plenty of time to get the work done. And the UFC laid out its three objectives for the year. So one is the ai, which we're going to be hearing about today, AI task force. Also, we wanted to focus on changing financial models and how that might impact the various campuses and also faculty morale. And so those are three areas of focus as we go through this year. Thank you.

Whitten ([00:15:16](#)):

Very good. Thank you. Thanks Carolyn. So the next item on the agenda is the presiding officer's report. So that's me. So I'll spend just a few minutes if I may, providing report as was referenced by Phil just a minute ago yesterday, I delivered the state of the university address for 2023 and had the opportunity at length to share a lot of really the outstanding progress that's occurring across all of our campuses in advancing Indiana University, particularly talking through the three pillars. And so what I thought I'd do today is not repeat that entire 31 minute speech, but maybe just give a few highlights, pull a few highlights from it to reference. And so first of course the first pillar I talked about was student success. And so we are doing a number of things and you all have so many exciting things going on all of your campuses related to really elevating the student experience as well as getting down to the basics to make sure that they can be successful.

([00:16:16](#)):

And one of the things we're doing is we're launching a comprehensive online student success platform. And so beginning next fall, fall of 24, we're actually going to be providing students with a single point of

access to chart their own IU journey where they'll be able to actually track their academic progress and they'll be able to actually access support for themselves. And so we're going to be using this technology to help students make smart academic choices that will keep them on track to graduation through a single mobile friendly tool. It's pretty amazing. We haven't had that for our students, but we will. And it will really facilitate their ability to make not only smart decisions about timely progress to their degree, but also to see all the options that they have across a department of school, a college, or even a campus or across campuses for academic offerings that might fulfill what they need to earn a degree.

[\(00:17:10\):](#)

So it'll be terrific. I know that we have talked a few times and we'll continue. We're just going to keep talking about this until it's made perfect, which means we're going to keep talking about this forever. But those are efforts to really reduce high DFW rates across all of our campuses, which we know are really leading indicators of decreased retention, decreased completion and extended time for people to be able to finish their degrees. Extensive problems with DFW really do impact students' progression and success in universities. And it's particularly important because we know that they have an outstanding impact, particularly on first gen students, on Pell eligible and on historically underrepresented minority students. And so we really are, and I'm glad to say on all our campuses, leaning into solutions to address the DFW problems that are really exacerbated in some of our courses. And so under the strategic plan, all of the campuses are focusing on lowering the DFW rates to enhance student success.

[\(00:18:12\):](#)

And so in the Indy campus, there's a large effort to employ active learning technologies in course design and delivery. And so their goal in part is for the faculty to be well-informed about really the variety or the wide array of active learning approaches that have proven demonstrative effectiveness and that the faculty will know where to go to access resources to make enhancements that will improve student engagement and learning in their own classes as well. So just some examples on the student side. Under our second pillar of the research side, obviously working to foster excellence in research and creative activity, we have a number of exciting initiatives underway. For example, through the ongoing faculty 100 hiring initiative on the Bloomington campus, we're recruiting a hundred accomplished new faculty to join the IUB academic community in the coming years as well. And so I know there's a significant movement.

[\(00:19:08\):](#)

In addition, we've recently announced really some major investments that will bolster the IU research enterprise. And again, these are new targeted investments that don't, it's not meant to supersede or imply that there aren't a broad array, a huge universe of research and creative activity that we're proud of and looking to advance on our campuses as well. In terms of the two big announcements that we just made earlier this month, and I guess I can say earlier this month because it's still October, although we don't have a single person in costume today. Oh, we do. There she is. How did I miss that? Thank you. Thank you so much for saving Halloween for all of us. We appreciate that. So earlier this month, we announced that IU is investing about 111 million over the next several years to advance our national leadership in microelectronics and in nanotechnology.

[\(00:20:06\):](#)

And so our investments are going to boost the growth of the microelectronics industry in Indiana and across the US and accelerate our collaboration with public and private partners. And for those who are not in engineering world, we're talking about chips, we're talking about semiconductors, we're talking about literally the teeny little engines that make everything run in every aspect of our life. And I know all of you following world events know that one of the things that came out of the pandemic was our

country's over-reliance for supply and development from other places. And to assure that we have everything from effective health to entertainment to transportation, we're going to need to really step up and the university be doing that in significant ways. Yesterday I announced that we as a university are going to be investing more than 250 million in a university wide commitment to advance research and biosciences, biomedical engineering and health and wellness.

[\(00:21:03\)](#):

And so this includes establishing two pioneering multidisciplinary research institutes right here in Indianapolis. They are the Institute for Convergent to Bioscience and Technology. That's one. And the second is the Institute for Human Health and Wellbeing really are going to both spearhead research and endeavors that are aimed at improving the health of all Hoosiers, attracting investments from all over the world and fostering innovative startups, and then of course, really having a significant impact on our state's biotech industry as well. So from this includes investing into the life sciences \$60 million that was earmarked from the Indiana General Assembly in the most recent state budget that will be used to expand and rejuvenate biosciences research facilities right here in Indianapolis on the Sci Tech Corridor that we announced last year, as well as hiring that comes through funding in Indianapolis as well as hiring. That's going to happen in Bloomington through the faculty 100 and other initiatives as well, and certainly on our regional campuses too.

[\(00:22:12\)](#):

So this is a wonderful example of an all hands on deck. Every single campus, every space in place throughout the state has a way to contribute, particularly in the research and development realm to the biosciences in different ways. And I cannot think of a better place to do it than Indiana University with all the assets that we have as well. So the new research institutes I mentioned, and the creation of the Sci Tech Corridor of course on this campus are going to be an important part of strengthening the research enterprise as well, particularly in Indianapolis where planning continues for the eventual formal launch on our campus under its new name, which is now, I guess only eight months away as well. So these significant research investments in microelectronics and nanotechnology and the life sciences will bolster the university's research enterprise as a whole, but also of course, lend credence and support our third pillar of IU 2030 as well contributing to the Hoosiers State quality of the quality of life and the state of our economy and really just the lifeblood of Indiana as well. And so the faculty that are hired as part of these initiatives are going to be able to draw the researcher students and collaborators of course, to all of our campuses. And the influx of this talent really can serve to create a dynamic research ecosystem that we think is going to attract local and out-of-state partners and investors as well.

[\(00:23:41\)](#):

While I was talking about the research pillar yesterday, I also took time during my remarks to discuss the coordinated assessment of the space that's used for research at IU. And so we know that the efficient utilization of space directly impacts productivity and the effectiveness of our research enterprises and initiatives on our campuses. And so by assessing and optimizing the allocation of our physical resources, we can create conducive environments that enhance collaboration, innovation, and interdisciplinary research. But to do that, we have to make sure that we use data-driven space utilization analysis, which will really enable us like all universities to plan strategically for future growth and our changing research needs. And so we're conducting a coordinated assessment of the space used for research at IU with a strong commitment to prioritizing necessary renovation and reallocation with a major focus on allocating additional space to enhance research capacity on the Bloomington campus.

[\(00:24:41\)](#):

I think I want to make sure everybody understands that our provost Rahul Shrivastav, our VP of research Russ Mumper, and I hear you loud and clear in Bloomington, that there is very, very dramatic improvements and expansion of research space necessary to enable our faculty to be successful and do the research that we do. So it's here. Okay, and as we move to pillar three, as we're building on our research and teaching missions to advance the third pillar of IU 2030, improving the quality of life for all Hoosiers and enhancing the economic and cultural development of our state, we certainly are going to drive economic growth and creation at IU within the Hoosier State by working to foster a more pervasive culture of innovation and enterprise among both our faculty and our students at IU. And so next week we have an opening of the first location for IU Innovates, which is a platform to support students and faculty in initiating and growing startup ventures.

[\(00:25:44\)](#):

And this will be a major first step in advancing that goal. And we'll be having that kind of soft grand opening across from the Sample Gates where the facility is actually going to be located. And then we're looking for a spot in Indianapolis, of course, to add a new site for IU Innovates here quickly as well. And then of course, across all of IU, a lot of initiatives are being put in place to really improve who's your health. And so we have a new Institute of Health Disparities and Health Equity right here in Indianapolis. The School of Medicine is really leaning in as well to a new campus-wide infrastructure to really help improve outcomes and health and wellness, including mental health and so much in between, both to serve our own IU community as well as to really attempt to have an impact on our state, which as we all know, has pretty depressing metrics for almost every health outcome or health status that there can be.

[\(00:26:37\)](#):

We're pretty much in the bottom in Indiana as well. In yesterday's remarks, I also underscored our commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging. We welcomed our most diverse student body to Indiana University this year where students of color comprise almost 32% of the student body university wide. We are making progress. We are not satisfied. I hope we are all very ambitious in this goal to do much more and certainly to ensure that our students of color succeed at the same rates, graduate at the same rates as all students. Of course, we're also investing to ensure that our faculty reflects the fullness of our society. And in reference to the Presidential Diversity Hiring Initiative, I reminded everyone yesterday that the 30 million that we allocated over seven years hit 43 million after two years. And so we have certainly exceeded that. And I want to say in every public forum that I can, that I want to acknowledge and recognize that really this extraordinary success in this initiative is because of faculty.

[\(00:27:45\)](#):

Faculty in their specific disciplines know wonderful underrepresented potential faculty members that are talented to recruit to Indiana. They persuade them to come take a look at us, bring them on campus, have them undergo rigorous processes themselves because obviously it's very competitive to get jobs here, decide that they want them to join their colleagues and then persuade them that this is a wonderful place to be. So the success of the Presidential Diversity Hiring Initiative to date this extraordinary success is truly on the backs of our faculty, and I'm grateful for them to them for this. And I think it's a great example of the role faculty can play in making transformational difference at a university in a really short amount of time. So please spread my thanks to your colleagues because I know why this particular initiative has been so successful. So in closing, I want to encourage all members of our IU community to be mindful that this is a sensitive time for the Jewish and Muslim members of our community across all of our campuses.

[\(00:28:50\)](#):

We stand at IU as always against all forms of hatred, discrimination, and harassment. They have no place in our university and they simply will not be tolerated. Now more than ever, it's imperative that all of us recommit ourselves to strengthening Indiana University as a place where we take care of each other. We must be forever committed to fostering kindness, respect, and compassion across our university community. And so thank you for allowing me to share those comments with you all. The next item on our agenda is a 10 minute question and comment period. These questions can be for me or certainly for co-chairs, or I guess for anyone that's in the room today as well. We start with questions that we invite from anyone on the campus. We did receive questions from two people outside the UFC regarding the organizational structure of the Kinsey Institute. And so, excuse me, we're happy to address those questions specifically.

[\(00:29:53\)](#):

But before addressing those questions, I want to state very clearly and very publicly, and I want to reaffirm, I use unwavering commitment to the Kinsey Institute and the support for the critical research and scholarship that it conducts both yesterday, today, and we know that it will conduct tomorrow as well as you know, I hope you know the state budget adopted in April included language prohibiting the use of state funding for the Kinsey Institute and the Kinsey Institute and its affiliated faculty will have the university's full and continued support in seeking and securing critical research grants and private philanthropic support, which already provide the vast majority of the Kinsey Institute's funding. And together we will all ensure that IU and the Kinsey Institute remain globally recognized for excellence in both research and in scholarship. And so I'd like to invite our provost of the Bloomington Campus Rahul Shrivastav to respond specifically to the questions that were submitted.

Shrivastav [\(00:30:56\)](#):

Thank you, president Whitten. Yes. We received two sets of questions related to the Kinsey Institute. One asked about why, and the other asked about the status of the collections, and I'd like to respond to both. First of all, I just want to second President Whitten's strong support for Kinsey. It is a legacy institute here, and we are proud to have it as part of IU. For more than 75 years, the Kinsey Institute has promoted and fostered a greater understanding of human sexuality and relationships through research, outreach, education, and historical preservation with the utmost goal of preserving and advancing that critical mission for the future and ensuring the academic freedom of all faculty and researchers. We are proposing to the board of trustees next week that we return the Kinsey Institute to a 501 C3 nonprofit as it had been throughout its existence prior to 2016.

[\(00:31:54\)](#):

As you might know, and as President Whitten just mentioned, the Indiana legislature passed a law in the most recent session, which took effect in July prohibiting state funding for the institute since the law was passed. As promised, we have conducted a thorough legal review to ensure the university follows the law. While we have taken some initial steps to remain compliant with the new law, with the guidance of expert legal counsel, we feel the next step that provides the most assurances and fully continues Kinsey's vital mission as the faculty connected with it in 10. So next week at the board of trustees meeting, we will ask for initial approval of this plan. Please know that this process, if it is approved, will take many months and not every question may be answered. At this stage, we are being exceedingly careful to create the least disruption possible.

[\(00:32:53\)](#):

Please be assured that all Kinsey faculty, staff, and affiliates will continue with no changes to compensation, benefits or responsibilities. Likewise, all collections will remain with IU in their current

location, particularly in Linley Hall. With the current staffing, there are no current concerns about any donor engagements or agreement, and please recognize that IU has no intention to sell or move any collection anywhere. Again, this is simply a return to the previous model for Kinsey, and we will continue to work closely with its executive director, Justin Garcia, faculty, staff, alumni, donors, and all others who have an interest in Kinsey to make this transition as positive and as seamless as possible. Thank you.

Whitten ([00:33:46](#)):

Thank you, Rahul. Now, I'd like to open the floor to questions from UFC members. Yes, ma'am.

Need ([00:33:58](#)):

I just have a comment on the DFW discussion. So I don't teach a quantitative class, so I can't speak to it directly, but I guess in support of our quantitative instructors, I would hope that the focus on, of course, no one wants students to get DFWs, but I hope that the focus doesn't turn into faculty having to curve or reduce the expectations due to a spotlight being on their classes. And the second point I'd like to ask is that for us to consider as a university the impact of attendance on DFW. And if we don't have a culture of attendance and we don't have requirements of attendance, I'm not really sure that that may be, fair isn't the right word, but placing the emphasis on the faculty, what the faculty are doing might be a little misplaced. So those are my comments.

Whitten ([00:34:53](#)):

Thank you. I think there's a robust discussion about the role that many, many people will need to play to impact DFWs all the way from advisors to discussions that we're having with people in the K 12 system as well. So this is a continuum. We recognize that. But thank you.

Rivas ([00:35:16](#)):

I do have a question. Well, I was very glad to hear about all the investment in the research area in microelectronic and biomedical science, science. In this direction, my question is if have, I mean, if the university have any plan for investment in sustainability area for projects or research or improvement in the campus?

Whitten ([00:35:50](#)):

You mean from an academic perspective, from ah

Rivas ([00:35:53](#)):

Both of them, I mean academic in sustainability or for improvement in the campuses?

Whitten ([00:36:02](#)):

So those are two different answers from my perspective, from the perspective of improvement in the campuses, I hope that many of you have seen the climate action plan that was released and approved over this summer. A committee of people worked for over a year and really did some terrific work to put together a plan that is ambitious and pragmatic at the same time, which is really very impressive, which includes some very specific things that we'll be doing over the years and also includes activities that will be driven on the campus level as well. So I don't know, Rahul, how would you describe the Bloomington campus, the way it's taking it on? Yeah,

Shrivastav ([00:36:40](#)):

So Bloomington Campus will create its own climate committee. I've received nominations from BFC and other sources. So we will do that and it'll go in parallel with the Campuswide Climate Action Plan. It'll, in addition to the sustainability goals, it'll also help foster more student experience and service projects. In addition, as part of the IUB 2030 sustainability environment and particularly environmental health are areas that have been identified for further priority investment. And you'll see some of these Faculty 100 hires under the biosciences go in that direction as well. So we will be doing a little bit of both.

Murdoch-Kinch ([00:37:31](#)):

I'd like to respond from the Indianapolis campus, very similar approach in that committee is being convened. I've submitted and approved names and they'll be working together, faculty, staff and students. We'll be part of that committee. And we have our climate action plan that's been designated and they will be moving forward with the initiatives with clear goals and metrics that have been outlined, but very similar process to what Provost has described for Bloomington.

Sciame-Giesecke ([00:38:04](#)):

All I can say is ditto from the regional campuses. Obviously the same work. The part that's most exciting for me, I think on the regional campuses is the applied learning experiences that students will get through all of the work that's in that plan.

Whitten ([00:38:22](#)):

Any other questions?

Ramos ([00:38:23](#)):

Question about the Kinsey situation outside of the situation itself, and it's very tricky with the legislative situation, but do we feel we've done enough lux at Veritas? I mean, are we putting light and truth around it? I think some untruths were told in the process of it, and I know that's politically tricky and maybe poking the bear, but can our role be to at least dispel the mistruths that were told?

Whitten ([00:38:49](#)):

I think we've been, at least in my time here, pretty direct, particularly with the general assembly. I mean, I want to give Michael Huber's team who runs university relations, government relations credit as they were in the capital last year. They were pretty direct about wonderful research and examples and impacts, very positive impacts in Indiana and society. They were pretty direct and clear about it. If you can find a way to manage and control social media, you will be a rich man and we would also love your advice in that area as well. That's a tough one.

Perez ([00:39:37](#)):

So I have two different questions. One is a simple one. I'd like to get more information on how to follow the progress of the space allocation assessment. The other question is related to the situation with DFW ratios, and I like to know if, so the situation is that we have assessments of incoming classes who have been negatively affected by the pandemic. And in many cases this has been described as them arriving with insurmountable gaps in their knowledge in mathematics and science. So the question is if there are rules simply to take into account this discrepancy in the status of these students for the effect that they will have in the DFW ratios in those classes.

Whitten ([00:40:42](#)):

I'd ask my academic leads to weigh in here. But absolutely, I mean these are complicated issue. I think what's interesting about them though is that every campus does, it's not like every campus has the exact same two courses that have the problem or it's a significant problem. There can be variability across campuses and certainly across universities. There might be a course or two in Indianapolis where there's very significant ongoing long-term challenges with DFW that you just don't see at other urban universities, for example. So sometimes there are things that are unique to our campuses and other campuses have the same issues that the whole gamut has to be addressed, but we have to address it. We just have to, for our students' sake, I would invite any of the three of you because as much I talk about how important it is, you all are going to be the ones that solve it. Frankly. It's going to end up being our faculty coming together to solve it.

Sciame-Giesecke ([00:41:40](#)):

I would say that the president is right. We have to continue to study it, right, in the different courses and what might be causing it. And I think you brought up lots of different variables, right? It's the lack of attendance of students not attending. Why aren't they attending? Why aren't they engaged? Those are some of the questions that we have to ask ourselves, not just in that particular class, but what else is going on with them. We all know the pandemic had a tremendous impact, not only on our students and on us and our communities. And so as we mentioned in the regional campus report, hashtag student ready, we have to be ready for these students in different ways. And the only way to be ready is to continue to study them, continue to find what kind of responses we can give to the kinds of issues and concerns that they have. I don't think anybody would suggest that we would ever lower standards for a student, but certainly would want to make sure that we have the right support and that we understand where their challenges are and how if we can, and how we can try to adapt to them. So I would say continue to study.

Murdoch-Kinch ([00:42:47](#)):

I will say on the Indianapolis campus, our dean of the University College and the division of undergraduate education, Christina Downey has provided, has developed a comprehensive approach to look at this. So student success isn't just one thing. We do know that our students in the Indianapolis campus are more likely to have to work, may be older, may have other challenges in addition to the learning laws associated to the pandemic. And there may be specific courses that have specific challenges that may be opportunities for improvement. We also know that there's high impact practices that can make a real difference for students and as well help students transition from high school to college. And so in the last two years on the Indianapolis campus, we have made the bridge program mandatory for all freshmen students. So it's a comprehensive approach and we need to continue to evaluate what we do to understand better what the challenges are and how to really tailor those interventions and those strategies to the specific needs of the students. A comment about standards, we will not be doing our students any service by lowering the expectations for them. As a teacher and a faculty member myself, I think that's really important that we fulfill our promise to our students to really prepare them for the workforce and for anything else in their career and their life. And so when asked, I think those who are working on this would want to avoid even the perception that there's an expectation of changing the stats based on things like curving and lowering the standards that would not be the right. So thank you.

Shrivastav ([00:44:35](#)):

I can just echo that comprehensive approach. In Bloomington, it's being led by the VP for undergraduate education, Vasti Torres. It's a very comprehensive approach. We look at everything from background preparation, economic factors, all the way to pedagogy, classroom, classroom infrastructure. It is not exclusively related to quantitative courses. There is, if you look at the list, there are some quantitative and some more discussion writing courses as well, wherever possible. We benchmark data to peer institutions. So if our calculus class has a much higher DFW rate, but our peers are doing better, even though they have almost identical on average student bodies, we use that as a decision maker. So it is not a one size fit all solution center for teaching and learning is engaged. Last spring, we invested \$750,000 for pedagogical support and course transformation that is being deployed this year, fall, spring, and mostly in the summer to help faculty translate some of those pedagogical changes and curricular changes into their classwork. So a lot of activity, much needed change. And the pandemic has certainly added a layer of complexity because the preparation for the incoming student body is very different, but we have to tackle that head on because the longer you kick the can down the road, the bigger the problem will become. So thank you.

Whitten ([00:46:20](#)):

Thank you for the sake of time. We've run a little past on the agenda, so I'm going to keep us moving so that we make sure we get through all our agenda items today. And so next on the agenda is an update on the new budget model and new metrics for state appropriation. So if our EVP for finance, Dwayne Pinkney, we'll take the floor.

Pinkney ([00:46:39](#)):

Okay. Thank you President Whitten. And thank you all for the invitation to the university faculty council. We earlier today completed the second of three lead sessions focused on the budget redesign. We will complete the third in the series on Friday in Richmond. I didn't bring slides because some of you may have seen those slides, but I will provide an overview of what those slides showed us and what they have shown us. And so we have been focused on really trying to describe why, well, what in the budget redesign, the what is focused on a review. And I would say more than tweak to our current budget model, which is, as most of you know, a fairly traditional responsibility centered management RCM budget model that relies on revenue and expense staying where that revenue and expense, whether revenue is earned and where the expense is made.

([00:47:56](#)):

And those models have served institutions of higher ed of our size, scale, and complexity. Well, for many, many years, those institutions that have more mature RCM models like ours have begun to look at those models a bit more closely to determine whether those are the best models in their current iteration to move institutions forward. We have done that here. And when we look at our model relative to our strategic direction as articulated in IUB 2030, IU 2030 IUB 2030 IUI 2030, in the regional campuses, strategic planning, we have made the, we've reached the conclusion that it is time for us to take a fresh look at our budget model. Some of the strengths of RCM, we will certainly retain in a redesign. The incentives are clear in RCM models and we want to retain incentives. The specifics around the incentives that we establish that you establish in the campus models is the opportunity space for us.

([00:49:20](#)):

Some of the mechanics involved in adjusting the budget to drive out the, I would say some of the non-value add activity associated with the budget moving money around. You've heard us talk about that. It certainly represents a challenge just in terms of its complexity, the cost associated with it, the challenge

that it presents in terms of financial reporting and making sure that we are in compliance with audit observations, but also we have so many years of experience and we know our cost structure not to reflect that in the way that we budget just strains our just strange fidelity. I mean, why would we spend time and effort moving money around when we understand our cost and we could fund ourselves much more simply. And so the first phase of the work with the budget redesign will focus on doing just that funding, those parts of our budget, the central administrative component of the budget.

[\(00:50:38\)](#):

Without all of the complexity associated with funds transfer or assessments and transfer, we would just fund to meet those needs. Not increasing the budget for central administration or decreasing, but simply reflecting those costs where they are today, funding things, providing base funding for those activities that we fund today through a patchwork of mechanisms, getting rid of the patchwork and moving to something that is much more simple, transparent, and predictable. So that is phase one of this effort. The second phase of the effort around the campus allocations, the campus resource allocation model is work that will be led on the campuses with the support of my office and many others. That work will be underway. It is already started, but in earnest that work will ramp up in the next fiscal year. Phase one that I talked about a moment ago, we will implement for fiscal year 25, but the campus allocation work would be implemented in the next fiscal year.

[\(00:52:02\)](#):

So there would essentially be at least a year's worth of activity at the campus level planning, designing the incentives and the structure and the processes to support those campus allocations. And the opportunity is for Indiana University and its campuses to more optimally align its resources to the strategic direction of the institution at the day-to-day level, what you will see and feel should be minimal. Faculty and staff will continue to be paid and paid on time. We'll meet all the regulatory burdens that we have, responsibilities we'll carry on our work in all of the spaces that we do that work today, and we will do that seamlessly. But the real opportunity is around allocating our resources to the best and highest and most strategic direction and purpose of the institution. That is the work of phase two and that work will be led at the campus level. So that is a brief description of the redesign model, and again, this work will be underway for the next year, certainly for the phase two work. And phase one will be implemented in fiscal 25. I'll stop there for any questions or comments on the budget redesign work.

Whitten [\(00:53:45\)](#):

So we have a few minutes allocated for anyone that would like to ask Dwayne a question.

Rivas [\(00:53:57\)](#):

Can you hear me? Yeah. Okay. Yes. You mentioned that in the new budget there will be moving the money around no value add activities, right? You say that you are, I mean the money is moving around or not changing the amount, but moving around the money of not value adds activity.

Pinkney [\(00:54:30\)](#):

That is correct.

Rivas [\(00:54:31\)](#):

What kind of no value add activities. Could you give me an example of that kind of activities please?

Pinkney (00:54:37):

Absolutely. Today we transfer significant sums of money. We assess the campuses, we assess the responsibility centers for the cost of activities that are performed at both central administrative and campus administrative to support those units. At the center. We're talking about functions like human resources, finance activities like payroll and tax and treasury management, all of those things that are necessary for the operation of an institution. And those costs are well established. They don't vary significantly from year to year, but because we assess for them year over year as if they are new cost, we undergo a great deal of activity to move the funds from responsibility centers to the center to support those activities and those functions.

Whitten (00:55:53):

I think Colin has a question.

Johnson (00:55:54):

I do actually. First of all, I want to thank you Dwayne, and everybody who's been involved in this process. I know managing a budget of our size is not an easy task and does require a high degree of skill and thoughtfulness. And I think we'll all be enormously grateful if the product of that work is a budget that is more transparent and more seamless and certainly more cost effective. I first have a request on behalf of this body, which is, and maybe I could put it to you as a form of a question, which is I just wanted to remind that the university faculty council does in fact have a body that exists to sort of facilitate the constitutional mandate of consultative authority with this. And so I would just ask, and everybody involved in this process from an administrative side, I understand it's a huge undertaking to remember that that is from our perspective, from the perspective of this body, the appropriate consultative channel kind of conduit to sit down with the kind of faculty at some point and say, this is the product of the work we've done.

(00:56:53):

Let us explain it to you in detail so that you understand it and to receive kind of feedback for whatever that's worth. So I would just put that on everybody's radar screen. I think when that process works well, as I constantly say to people, it's not just that it's sort of mandated by our governance documents, it actually helps to legitimate change for those kinds of conversations to happen. So I think it's a really important thing. The other thing I would say is an observation that I've made, and we've talked about this a little bit before, is I do think the sort of changes that are being proposed provide a rare opportunity to also speak to concerns that faculty have about the increase of investment in centralized administrative functions and kind of administrative costs that many universities see. Based on your description of this process so far, it does provide an opportunity, I think, for this institution to make a commitment to ensure that those centralized costs do not grow at a greater rate than the growth that happens on the campuses. And I think we have a real opportunity actually to sort of make those kind of rates of growth transparent to people for centralized services to hold themselves accountable and to ensure that the greatest number of resources get channeled to where they really need to be to support the instructional research and service missions of the institution, which happen on the ground in our classrooms, in our laboratories, et cetera, and so forth. So that will become under the model you're proposing a very easy metric to track.

Pinkney (00:58:16):

Absolutely. We are in agreement.

Johnson ([00:58:18](#)):

Excellent.

Need ([00:58:25](#)):

This is more of a comment than a question, not delving into the model, really just a comment about some of the projects that I think we're working on that I think are university wide. I'm not sure, maybe just Bloomington re-imagining the possibility of re-imagining gen ed and then also the first year seminar type thing seem to be wrapped up in budget or how the change in the budget might happen. And so just I'm throwing out there that if I don't know how these things are going to happen all at the same time, but they do seem interconnected, particularly with faculty and units and who wants what. And so yeah, just putting that out there.

Whitten ([00:59:07](#)):

You're really speaking to campus specific activities. And so as Dwayne just said, that's the piece that's in the works now, right? So in Bloomington, for example, the provost and team are leading this rather lengthy process that will determine how the campus allocates its resources as well. So that's coming. Okay, we need to move on to the next item on the agenda, which is a report on faculty activity reporting tools. And so I'm going to turn the floor over to Sue Sciamé, our vice president for regional campuses on online education, and Sabrina Andrews, our AVP of institutional analytics, and they're going to present this report for us.

Sciamé-Giesecke ([00:59:51](#)):

Thank you, president Whitten. And I'm going to start, and then I'm going to hand it off to my colleague Sabrina. The university's current faculty activity reporting system is a watermark based tool that we refer to as DMAI, Digital Measures Academic Insight. For reference, it was implemented in 2016, and the latest three-year contract with watermark was set to expire at the end of October, 2023. As the chair of the executive ALC. With my colleagues Raul Carol-Ann and Mary, we decided that we should initiate some renewal discussions. We began those conversations in the fall of 2022 based on growing concerns that have been expressed to us that the current system was inefficient, technically difficult to use, and did not meet the basic needs such as producing a usable CV or department reporting needs without extensive formatting or data manipulation. In addition, the School of Medicine had decided not to use it as it was a tool that did not work for them at all.

([01:01:00](#)):

The CEO of watermark and her team met with us to hear the concerns about our current tool, knowing that the university would need to make a renewal decision. Before October of 2023 deadline in the spring of this year, we requested that a work group be formed with faculty and faculty council representatives named by the four of us. In addition, university administration representatives were also included in the work group because this discussions were going to take a little bit longer than anticipated. We were successfully able to secure a one year renewable of the watermark product in October, to October of 2024. We gave a two-part charge to the work group, which was first to evaluate the current system configuration to see if there were any enhancements or reconfiguration that could improve it so that we could continue to use it. And then number two, pursue request for information demonstrations from other products and vendors. Before I turn it over to Sabrina to walk through the activity of the work group, I want to remind everyone that we are still working on making sure that all

faculty bodies will have sufficient time to review the vendor proposals that we will get and make their recommendations. So Sabrina, I turn it over to you.

Andrews ([01:02:31](#)):

So the work group that Vice President Sciame-Giesecke spoke about met May through September of this year to discuss and plan for what would be needed to either improve the current faculty activity reporting system or what would be needed in a new reporting system. So on the screen are the members that participated in the summer work group activities. The work group began by first identifying the functional and technical requirements needed for a more usable system. We did this as a way to identify possible fixes to the current system and to order the highest priority requirements to show due diligence to our current vendor and explore possibilities for system improvements. We met in person with the vendor at Watermark, their leadership team in June to review our concerns about the functionality of the current system. We also spoke to another Big 10 institution, university of Minnesota, about their use and experience with the watermark product.

([01:03:40](#)):

After these activities, we turned our attention to researching other vendors that provide a faculty activity reporting system. We worked with purchasing and issued a request for information, which led to demonstrations from four vendors, inter folio, simplistic, power school people, administration, and academic analytics. So after exploring options to improve watermark, and after reviewing the alternative system demonstrations, the worker concluded that pursuing a more modern, robust faculty activity reporting system was the better alternative rather than trying to improve the current system. A recommendation was made to the executive A LC team on September 13th that noted the following. The process should include broad faculty input, including faculty governance bodies. The selected system needs to be easy to utilize, provide the most benefit to faculty, and would be able to support our current processes and workflows as they relate to annual reviews. The executive A LC group accepted the recommendation and efforts move towards putting the RFP together and developing a review process. So as Sue mentioned, the RFP review process is still being finalized, but we anticipate something along these lines.

([01:05:17](#)):

The RFP committee will begin by processing and reviewing all vendor proposals. The vendors will likely be narrowed down to two based on the overall percentage of requirements met. These two vendors will be asked to demonstrate their functionality by individually presenting to these faculty groups, the Bloomington Faculty Council, the Indianapolis Faculty Council, regional Faculty Council, and the IUSM Faculty Steering Committee. The respective faculty councils would then communicate the availability of the materials, the demonstrations, and the RFP responses, and the mechanism by which faculty can submit feedback to their respective council. The executive committees of these faculty governance groups will then share an evaluation of the vendor functionality with the RFP committee. The RFP committee will prepare recommendation to the Executive Academic Leadership Council, and this recommendation will be informed by the feedback that we get. This group, the executive A LC, will then share their decision back to each of the faculty governance groups to affirm the decision. So the request for proposal was issued on October 17th. It is still out there and active with proposals due on November 8th. We expect and anticipate to get the demonstrations organized with the vendors between November 27th and the eighth. So the last week of November, first week of December, they will be recorded. And then recognizing the very busy end of the year activities, feedback from the faculty governance groups will be collected in January.

([01:07:19](#)):

After the committee receives the feedback, they will work on a recommendation to the executive A LC, and then they will share that back with the faculty groups. So what we have right here is the proposed RFP review committee membership, and largely very largely faculty and academic affairs representatives from all the councils that were mentioned. And that concludes my portion.

Whitten ([01:07:54](#)):

Thank you. Does anyone have a question? Yes, sir.

Wert ([01:08:02](#)):

The timing of the faculty comment period kind of concerns me given the fact that it's happening, looks like during, maybe in the latter part of December and the beginning of January, which is a lot of that is our break. I dunno if that could be pushed back a little bit to give faculty more of an opportunity to.

Sciame-Giesecke ([01:08:30](#)):

Well, we have the whole month of January, so when everybody gets back, if we need to extend the time, we can extend the time. That's certainly possible. So the faculty bodies will have to kind of give us a sense of it. We certainly though, only have till October for the year extension of what we have. So we wanted to make sure that we could get a decision made and that we could then get that product, get training and all those other kinds of things. So you guys will just have to let us know how that's going. But we have the whole month of January. We need to push it into February, push it into February.

Wert ([01:09:04](#)):

Thank you.

Whitten ([01:09:12](#)):

Move on to the next item on our agenda,

([01:09:18](#)):

Which is the new policy on employee relationships involving students. This is UA 2024, and this is a discussion item. No vote will be taken today. However, it's critically important that we address the pressing matter of a comprehensive policy and employee relationships involving students. I have to tell you that it's not lost on me in a very, very negative way that IU is the sole institution in the Big 10 without such a policy. It's staggering to me that in 2023, we do not have a policy on this issue. We have got to protect our students. We have got to make that a priority from my perspective. So today we want to engage in an open and thorough discussion about the proposed policy with the aim of voting on this long overdue policy at the next meeting. So to present the proposed policy I will turn the floor over to Jenny Kincaid, university Director of Institutional Equity University sexual misconduct, and the Title IX Coordinator University, A coordinator, and Lynn Zhang, the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Zhang ([01:10:25](#)):

Thank you. As president mentioned, we are the sole institute in Big 10 who is lack this policy. We also have received tremendous support both internally and externally here about having a policy as soon as possible. So that's a purpose here that we are presenting today. So just to give you additional information, background information about this policy, the work has been underway for more than four years. A UFC task force was convened in 2019 and completed and presented a report in 2021. As a result, ACA 33 incorporated language changes to address consensual relationship between faculty and

students. Now last year, a second committee started working on drafting a new separate standalone policy to addressing employee relationship, so that expense to more than the faculty group. So now it includes faculty, staff, and also student academic employees. The initial draft of the policy was discussed in April, 2023 meeting. We received the support and also we revised the draft in the summer incorporating comments and feedback from you all. So the revised draft here was reviewed, discussed by the faculty affairs committee, which I am the chair, and then a second revision was made and which is the copy you have now. So again, I want to continue stressing that we have received the support from both internal and external. So now I'll turn over to Jenny to talk about the revised policy, the draft. Thank you.

Kincaid ([01:12:20](#)):

Thank you Lynn. And thank you to Lynn for being such a good partner this past year and working on this and also to Taylor Struble and the university policy office who's really kept us on track with the drafting and the research. So here's our committee that we had representatives from Indianapolis Bloomington, the regional campuses, and a few of the people that were on the original task force that started in 2019. So again, here is what is the current language in a CA 33 academic appointees responsibilities and conduct, which was updated in March. And so we have the language and the current policy draft tracks this language, so it's not drastically different than the intent, but again, it takes it out and puts it in a separate policy and clarifies procedures and also makes that application to staff. So since we talked to you in April, most of the feedback was that the language should be stronger.

([01:13:32](#)):

So really what we did was just to separate structurally in the policy that we started with what was prohibited and then went down into the disclosure and exception sections of the policy and then a little bit more talk about if a management plan cannot be created to resolve any conflicts, then an exception would not be granted. So in other words, there might be times where there's just no avoiding the conflict between the faculty member or a staff member and a student, and so there would be no exception granted and continuing that relationship would be a violation. Really that prohibited relationship is going to only be considered a violation if it's either not disclosed or continued after being disclosed without an exception. Granted, the other feedback that we got was around the language of foreseeably could have a professional responsibility regarding the student in the future, and so we added a line in there that's an example that says foreseeable professional responsibility could include but is not limited to when the student is pursuing a program of study in the academic appointees school or department. And as you can imagine, given the variation of size and context around the university, that's going to look very different in a school of 10,000 students versus a small department. So we do still need that space around what is foreseeable, but the idea that it would be foreseeable that the student could reasonably be under the supervision of that faculty member in the future.

([01:15:24](#)):

These are some of the same considerations that we brought you last time, but I think it's worth mentioning in that 2021 task force, there was a lot of discussion about the inappropriately intimate relationships and that was their term for it, and the gap between addressing things that are non overtly sexual that do not fall into sexual harassment but are really inappropriate behaviors targeting students in an attempt to set up a relationship. And we do, we've had one or two of those a year and they're very difficult to address in terms of sort of slotting them into some of our other definitions. Our relationships between staff and students are not covered elsewhere, and that's going to be another benefit of this policy. Our graduate students are concerned about a safer academic experience, and there was a portion that quote is taken from a 2021 GPSG resolution that they presented to us.

[\(01:16:26\)](#):

And just last night I was talking to a chair whose graduate students had expressed concerns about a speaker coming from another institution where there had been quite a few marriages between faculty members and students, and this was unrelated to me giving this presentation, but express the view that graduate students do not want to be viewed as a dating pool. I think for faculty, and that may have been a change from many years ago, but I think it's important to realize that this is how our students feel about it. There's concerns about privacy. Obviously all of these matters could be very personal and in the draft policy, if there is an investigation, it would be done by our trained investigators and any report would stay either at Office of Institutional Equity in HR or Academic affairs. The draft policy would also provide consistency and clear expectations for anyone in the process because we would follow the decision sanction appeals track that is in our discrimination harassment and sexual misconduct policy, and sometimes there might be things that are overlapping that would be investigated concurrently. External entities considered a risk not to have this type of policy. I was in a meeting last week where I learned that our insurance underwriter will give us a significant discount if we have this policy that is how much of a risk it is that's funding in the six figures and up. Also, we did a report on an audit for National Science Foundation last week. They want to know what our policies are. IH in a similar fashion, so this is definitely of interest to external entities.

[\(01:18:23\)](#):

As President Whitten said, there's other big tens that have this policy component really in one fashion or another. Most of them in standalone policies, six have an outright prohibition on relationships with undergraduates completely. The task force, when they met between 2019 and 2021, they conducted a survey of about a thousand faculty and students. The majority did not favor that outright ban, but a very rigorous reporting and exception process. And the policy uses multiple factors for consideration in evaluating inappropriate behavior, a consciousness and intent to avoid heteronormative structure as well as recognize the different disciplinary settings and contexts that occur across the university. So we'd be happy to take any questions throughout the discussion.

Whitten [\(01:19:22\)](#):

Thank you. Who has a question?

Schult [\(01:19:28\)](#):

So if there's a relationship that's disclosed and a management plan cannot be granted, you said that the relationship would have to end in order for people to be in compliance or

Kincaid [\(01:19:46\)](#):

No, I don't think we would. It would mean that in the current setup there is not a possibility there would have to be a change either in what the student is taking, what the employee function is or something. I don't think we would ever want to tell someone they needed to end a relationship,

Schult [\(01:20:06\)](#):

But it seems like if someone discloses that they're in a relationship and then the exception is not granted, they're already in violation of the policy. I guess that's what I was asking. You're saying they're not in violation of the policy because they disclosed it?

Kincaid [\(01:20:18\)](#):

No, I think that the idea would be, it'd be sort of an interactive process, I think with the dean and that particular school with the ability to consult with some of these other offices and so to hopefully work out a way again that if both the student and the employee are consenting and willing to sign on that they're going to be a way to eliminate those conflicts between either supervision, evaluation, grading, those type of things.

Schult ([01:20:54](#)):

Okay. So yeah, I don't think it was clear the way the policy is written right now, what happens when a relationship is disclosed and the exception is not granted. I think all the co-chairs when we read it thought that that meant that they were in violation. So what would the incentive be, Susan? There's a strong incentive to hide the relationship if you're going to be found in violation of it if you're not granted the exception.

Kincaid ([01:21:17](#)):

Well, I think that's going to really be up to the particular discipline and the dean whether you can, it is possible if someone is in your class or it's somebody on your dissertation committee. It's hard to imagine that there wouldn't have to be a change so you wouldn't be in conflict. I think that's the point. It's hard to think about all the many ways that this could come up and think about what would have to happen to make that acceptable, but I think we have good examples in our conflict of interests and nepotism plans at this point as to how we can have those work out and whether it's changing, bringing in someone else to do the evaluation and grading for a person perhaps would be one alternative. And again, I think it's really going to depend where someone is in their course of studies. What level are we talking about? A clinical setting. I think it's going to be very different if it's an undergraduate, but also if it's an undergraduate, you may have more options to have the student be with another instructor.

Schult ([01:22:28](#)):

Okay. Yeah, so I think those are all very reasonable approaches, but I just don't know if that's reflected in the policy that that's what would happen. It just seems like it's just kind of left hanging that nope, you're not going to get the exception. And a lot of people might assume then that they're in trouble then because they disclosed it.

Kincaid ([01:22:46](#)):

Yeah, that's something we can certainly look at.

Johnson ([01:22:55](#)):

I know that this is a very, and I have to say I appreciate all the work that you all have put into this. I know it's a very complicated policy. It's a complicated issue. It's a policy we need, but I think it's really important that we get it right. And so I think it's really important that we talk through some of these things. I would like to return to this issue of foreseeability, which I understand is kind of an important consideration, but as you noted, a very complicated thing to try to fully think through and take into account and specify in terms of intent. One of the concerns that I have about this is that the obligation of managing foreseeability may actually fall very differently on differently appointed people relative to this policy. So it is one thing, for example, to talk about foreseeability with regard to a faculty member situated in a particular department who mostly teaches undergraduates in that discipline or graduate students in that discipline, you can look and say, these are people who could foreseeably come within your sway.

[\(01:23:52\)](#):

Really you need to be thinking about this all the time for various reasons, but you definitely need to be avoiding this actively because of the fact that it could lead to an abuse of power. That's one thing. But we have, for example, graduate students who themselves are implicated in this policy not only as students but also as instructors who teach introductory courses that are required of all undergraduates. Many of those graduate students are themselves six months out of their own undergraduate degrees. They're themselves 22 years old. Maybe this isn't an issue in Indianapolis, but Bloomington is a fairly small town in terms of their social circles. Would it, for example, is it possible that a graduate student who is teaching introductory composition who ended up engaging having some kind of relationship with an undergraduate newly arrived on campus the summer before they start, who ends up finding a student in their class because they're required to take composition? Would they be presumptively in violation of this policy by virtue of that fact because they could have foreseeably known by way of the nature of their appointment that any undergraduate could end up in their class as an example?

[\(01:25:11\)](#):

I mean, these are the kinds of things I think we need to think through because students and staff have fewer protections actually than faculty do, and I'm frankly worried about them.

Kincaid [\(01:25:19\)](#):

Yeah, I mean I think that my thought on that would be that in the cases where there's a required class in a discipline and where people are going to be coming through, there's a narrow age gap and not that age is presumptive, but in terms of power differentials, it's a factor to consider. I think that should someone find themselves in that relationship, that's a good example of something that could be disclosed. So if they disclose that it can be managed so that individual undergraduate is not in their class, I think what we want to think in the examples I think about of the cases that we had come through are maybe a school where there's a lot of interaction either in a clinical or say music or theater where you may be the instructor in one class, but you may wind up coordinating orchestra in another so that you're going to have contact with those students throughout.

[\(01:26:30\)](#):

You may be supervising in a variety of settings. So I think that's the foreseeable part, but I do think if you're in the college or Kelley School or something where there's literally 10,000 students and you're in a department of many that it doesn't have to be reasonably foreseeable. We're definitely open to thinking about that. It's, it's one that I think that we wanted to have there as a reflection and of the intent not to have students in your school of disciplines sort of again be in the dating pool or available as potential romantic partners. So how do we put it a little bit wider than the exact class roster that you have in front of you, but not so wide that it's an outright ban on all undergraduates. So it's trying to drive that through.

Johnson [\(01:27:25\)](#):

And if I can just follow up, something similar would apply to a staff member, for example, who works in financial aid who could foreseeably deal with the financial documents of any student at Indiana University.

Kincaid [\(01:27:34\)](#):

And on that one at least there's a financial code of ethics. So there are a few places like that that have sort of a higher list of requirements, but I do think in advising, if you're in advising in a school or department, I think it would be reasonably foreseeable that you would not want to be in a relationship with maybe anybody that could possibly come through your purview. I don't think that's too much to ask. Again, you could seek the disclosure if that came about, but I think we're looking for a policy to be preventative somewhat too. But again, I'm very open to other ways to try to say that if it could be more precise,

Johnson ([01:28:14](#)):

I think it probably should be.

Perez ([01:28:24](#)):

It seems from all the questions I have heard that the not concerned, but what people have in mind is the issue of clarity in the definition of terms so that there is no ambiguities.

Whitten ([01:28:37](#)):

Could you speak more directly into the mic? Thank you. Sorry, it's just a little hard to hear.

Perez ([01:28:43](#)):

Yeah, so my initial comment was that I have impression that other questions spoke to the need for clarity in the definition terms, so there's no ambiguities left for possible discussion after the policy is in place, particularly the issue of feasibility. My concern in the respect is to understand very clearly what is the mechanism and how the body is selected that makes the decisions about exceptions and what are situations where these exceptions are valid and whether or not, because from what little I actually heard about this, it was not clear to me that this was clearly defined.

Kincaid ([01:29:31](#)):

I think that the exception process is designed to happen at the school with the principal administrator being defined as the dean, staff side director. I think it's clear in the policy, but if you have questions otherwise or have suggestions, again, we're open to that. But I think at that level, again, I would say for cases without complications or serious concerns about an abuse of power, those are going to come up. Again, we are a huge place with 40,000 plus employees across the state, and so we aren't going to essentially know how to do that. But at the level, if it can be managed in a fairly routine way and then that plan be forwarded to campus academic affairs or HR to be on file, I think that's going to be most of the ones. I think where it's really going to come into play I think are maybe a couple times a year cases that come up that are very concerning for an abuse of power. And those are the ones I think where we would take it more through a consultation or perhaps investigation. It's going to be very infrequent fortunately, but it does happen. And where we do see the concerns sadly, is when students have left, often they've gotten tenure somewhere else, they've graduated and because they did not feel safe making those concerns known beforehand. And then I think that's a big part of what we're trying to do here.

Whitten ([01:31:22](#)):

No other questions? I'm sorry.

Kini ([01:31:25](#)):

Yeah, let us say there is an infraction and there was a resolution made and that it's documentation somewhere, will it be maintained private and how long, what happens if the person gets out and that university contacts you? Could you disclose? Do you have any infractions about this person? What is the ruling on that? Is there a time timeline?

Kincaid ([01:31:52](#)):

That's a good question. I think that for our sexual misconduct and discrimination harassment investigations and finding, we're actually revising our retention or making sure those are itemized in our retention schedules, but it's based on the Title IX regulations. It's seven years from the separation after the employee would be separated, student expulsions. Those are kept longer indefinitely, but I think that if there was an investigation and a sanction and a finding, I think it would follow that. We could specify that same as other, but it would be the same as other employee records. What is disclosed to a subsequent institution where a person may go is really going to depend. It would be nice if the Big 10 or someone made that uniform of what people come back. Right now we're really seeing a lot of piecemeal including what we're trying to develop approach to what is asked of the prior institution. It might be asked if the person left under an investigation. It might be asked if there was any kind of finding for research misconduct, professional misconduct, something like that. So those are really done case by case and we answer the question sometimes with assistance of counsel sort of exactly as asked by an outside institution,

Whitten ([01:33:32](#)):

The witch.

DeSawal ([01:33:36](#)):

Thanks. So Jenny, can you share a little bit with us why this is for faculty and for staff when typically those are separated and why they're not parallel? Because there are two different distinct processes that are associated with those as well as reporting structures.

Kincaid ([01:33:54](#)):

Yeah, I think that like UA 03, which is discrimination, harassment, sexual misconduct, it's very helpful to have one policy. There are multiple sets of procedures we're there, but there's a great deal including the definitions that apply to all employees. And I think this to me makes the most sense here. There's really the idea of having professional responsibility and supervision or evaluative responsibility for some aspects of a student's academic life at the university is really, there's going to be so much overlap instead of having two separate policies, I think we're really trying to have a single policy. I think it would be a benefit to students to see that any employee that they are working with, whether it's a coach, an advisor or faculty member, has the same prohibitions and guidelines about those relationships.

([01:35:00](#)):

So that would be my take on it. It's not impossible to have different ones, but we need to cover all employees and to me it's the most beneficial to do in a single policy. So then I have a quick follow up. So have the staff been consulted or is this body going to be responsible for making that decision for everyone? Yeah, we had Elizabeth Pear on our policy from HR, so we've been working with them and employee relations all along. So they've been there in terms of staff council or something like that. We don't have really the same structure that we do at the different campuses, but we've had a lot of input

from employee relations and really at different campuses. For example, like Bloomington Athletics already has this prohibition, but it's not sort of written in place at the other campuses. So it's collecting some of the same information that's already out there in different units and just putting it into one policy.

Johnson ([01:36:08](#)):

One more thing from that, I promise.

([01:36:10](#)):

I would just say as this develops, I mean particularly if it continues to sort of name both faculty and staff or anyone with kind of instructional responsibilities, I do think it's crucially important. I assume this would happen, but that Vice Provost Richardson would take this back to our colleagues and staff. It's not clear to me that they follow in every instance what goes on here. I'm sure they would be made aware of this, but I think it would be supremely unfair and arrogant of this body to pass policy that would have those implications for staff members and not make absolutely sure that our staff colleagues are aware of the fact that that's happened.

Kincaid ([01:36:46](#)):

Okay. Again, they have been involved the whole way. Vice President Richardson and the staff, we've talked to them about it, and so we are welcome to get that out there as much as possible, but again, we've really deferred to their thoughts on so many things, even some of the changes in policies of how it would work and who should be sort of in the loop at a campus level and departmental level. So just to assure you, we weren't sort of giving that the brush over that was taken very seriously.

Whitten ([01:37:22](#)):

Well, thank you. And as we transition to our next topic, if I can just add personally, I'm disappointed, I'm saddened if you will, that during this discussion there wasn't a single person that brought up the question from the flip perspective and said, how does this policy, how do we ensure this policy is protecting students the way it needs to? And I would urge us to make sure that that's part of every conversation as well moving forward with this policy. Next on the agenda is an update on the ICR policy and the recent changes in research. So I'm going to ask our VP of research, Russ Mumper and Ben Kravitz, the co-chair of the UFC Research Affairs Committee to present these updates please.

Kravitz ([01:38:07](#)):

Alright, thanks. So I'm Ben Kravitz. I'm the co-chair of the UFC Research Affairs Committee. My co-chair, Tom Stuckey, tested positive for COVID yesterday, so unfortunately he's not able to be here. And so I'd like to hand it over to Russ to talk about the many things that are going on with the new indirect cost return policy and what the changes might look like.

Mumper ([01:38:31](#)):

Thanks, Ben. It's really great to be here and I appreciate the invitation, as Ben said, to really give a very brief update on what IU research has been doing, certainly in my tenure over the last five months. And then to address questions or where we are with respect to the ICR allocation formula and distribution. So as I've said, I've been here five months. I've had the opportunity to recruit about five members of the leadership team. It's about 50% of the leadership team we've, you hopefully are aware, we've placed three senior leaders, the AVP and vice provost for research at Bloomington.

[\(01:39:16\)](#):

That's Brea Perry, the associate vice president for research development. Chris Liu will be starting on Monday. We're really excited about Chris joining and helping to imagine research development and what it can be to help execute IU 2030 strategic plan. Over the next seven years, we've recruited an associate VP for innovation and commercialization. Another really important function that comes out clearly in the IU 2030 strategic plan in terms about innovation, creative work, and translating that for economic and societal development. And as part of that innovation and commercialization, we've realigned some units in IU research, one in particular r and d business engagement and put it under the umbrella of innovation and commercialization to significantly enhance our partnerships with industry, not only for the benefit of our research intensive faculty and staff and students, but also to be able to have partnerships that provide students a great co or extracurricular activity that really builds on their resumes.

[\(01:40:29\)](#):

We have two searches ongoing. One is for an assistant VP for centers and core facilities. I think we have a great opportunity, especially now to imagine how IU research can support the breadth and comprehensive nature of our research enterprise. I think centers and core services and facilities are a really important piece of that. So that person will report and be a member of the leadership team helping us to do that. The last one that's ongoing, there are more, but these are the five kind of senior members is an assistant vice president for arts and humanities research. I think this was a really important move that we made that would best reflect how IU research can support, again, the breadth of research and creative activity that occurs university wide and if not statewide. So those are some big initiatives. We have launched commensurate with those, and I think more will be coming later.

[\(01:41:43\)](#):

I've enjoyed my conversations with various research advisory committees on new initiatives and hope to continue those discussions as the leadership team comes into place of the rest of this calendar year. Two initiatives that we did launch in support of IU 2030 strategic plan was a re-imagining of our major equipment fund and how we would support research on all the campuses. And so somewhere around four or five weeks ago, we announced a revision of the major equipment fund, and that's online. It's posted, and we've already been making awards and including two regional campuses. So we're really excited about that. We think that will be a great way to support the research mission of the university. I think with the recruitment of the senior leadership team, I think it's really important for me because as I have conversations with you and others, and I constantly say that the primary mission of IU research is to facilitate the individual faculty ambitions, staff ambitions as it relates to their research and creative work, the departments, colleges, schools, centers, and institutes.

[\(01:43:13\)](#):

That is our absolute mission, and I call that mission critical. So having the right leaders in place to work across the expansive research enterprise is really important. Another really important thing that we do is support in every way possible the IU 2030 pillar two strategic plan, transformative research and creative activity, as well as all of the campus specific plans. So that is what we do. We support and facilitate research again of individual faculty departments, schools, but also in full support of IU 2030 strategic plan. As Ben introduced the topic of ICR allocation around August 15th, I sent out a communication, my office to all faculty on all campuses to make it clear that we have a new allocation formula for how we distribute ICR and to make it very clear that we intend to use those funds that are retained by research for seven purposes. And that was part of my memo, and I just thought it would be important just to mention, because I think one of the things that I've committed to is that on a very

recurring basis, we would report every dollar received in terms of that new allocation formula and exactly how it was spent.

[\(01:44:50\)](#):

And actually the allocation formula calls for that that I would report to the president, the cabinet to deans and faculty, how we're spending those resources to advance both our mission and pillar two of the strategic plan. So those seven areas are mission critical, research, infrastructure and personnel. If we don't have the personnel to facilitate your work as it relates to pre-award, post awards, innovation, commercialization, compliance, then we're not executing our core mission. So that's one way that we would spend that research and animal space renovations. We are committed to working with all of the campus leaders, the deans, the faculty to make sure that our faculty have the best and most contemporary research and creative space possible. We have a significant opportunity to continue to make progress and we're committed to doing that. The other one is the research infrastructure and equipment. So we are supporting equipment.

[\(01:46:00\)](#):

That motivation led to the re-imagining of our major equipment fund, and I've heard a lot of positive things about that and faculty are participating and we're making awards. University-wide labs, cores and core services are the fourth one. Again, as I mentioned, we think it's critical that our mission is to support the research and creative work across multiple campuses that we must have core services from STEM to arts and humanities, and I think there's some really important work to be done to define what would those be, what would we do, and importantly, what will we not do? And I think that I'm enjoying to begin to have those conversations. Of course, the search that we're doing right now for the assistant VP for centers and core facilities, I hope will be a spearhead for those conversations. Startup and retention packages for faculty. IU research has on a selective basis, has already been working with deans and campus leaders when necessary to retain or recruit key faculty, which is absolutely key to our research mission.

[\(01:47:22\)](#):

The sixth area is anything having to do in supportive pillar two of our IU 2030 strategic plan. And so the great thing about becoming a vice president for research three months after the IU 2030 plan was launched is that from a perspective of execution, it's really clear what our mission is across the university and campus wide. The last thing that we would use the indirect costs retained is for matching, required matching on external grants and contracts. Many of you know, I know that many federal agencies have become very strategic in requiring grantees to commit certain funds in order to either qualify or be competitive for federal agency grants and contracts. And so routinely we will work with campus leaders, deans, faculty center, institute directors to pitch in so that the 4,000 or more grants and contracts that IU submits annually and growing can be as competitive as possible. I guess I'll just end with kind of how I started as it relates to the ICR. I've committed to Ben and others that very frequently, no less than annually, but I intend to do this quarterly, is to be able to produce a very simple page of every dollar that we've received and how we're spending it across those seven areas for full transparency and full discussion. So I will end there.

Whitten [\(01:49:22\)](#):

Terrific. Who's got some questions?

Rivas [\(01:49:38\)](#):

On. Oh, okay. Thank you. My question is, well, I see you talk about the innovations and the changes and I also see that there is a lot of new staff in the office yourself. Is five months new in the position and five more people? My question is about how, I mean, what step has you taken to guarantee the continuity of the research area, if there is any continuity in the research area? That is my question.

Mumper ([01:50:16](#)):

So I think your question is asking about, since we are hiring so many new leaders, senior leadership team, it's a lot. Yeah. Yeah. So we have 11 on my senior leadership team. I think four or five are continuing and have been in their positions for many years and I would say fortunately in really critical positions. So our Office of Research Administration, which facilitates over 4,000 grants and contracts, Steve Martin has been in that position for many, many years. Office of Research Compliance, which facilitates our compliance with state federal board obligations and requirements has been in that position for many years. So I think that I feel confident that there is opportunity to recruit new people. Some of them have already worked, two of them are starting in the next two weeks, but we also have a strong foundation including people that I didn't even mention. So directors, grant specialists, contract specialists, and I think one thing that I've observed that I think has impressed me is that as I have met the research staff that work in the IU research, how many of those employees have been in their position in the long tenure that they've had. So I feel that we're in a pretty good position in terms of continuing to execute our mission with the opportunity to do more.

Rivas ([01:51:59](#)):

Thank you, sir.

Goff ([01:52:04](#)):

Hi Russ. I know a lot of the stuff with the ICR was sort of left over to you in some ways and then it was done before you got here and I direct a center that works in the humanities and social sciences and by most standards it's doing very well. But where we get our money from are foundations that don't give much in the way of ICR 10% at the most 15%, but we have very real local cost. We have to cover with assessment for personnel assessments for space. I mean we buy our own computers, everything. We can't put hardware or anything like that into these grants. I guess I'm encouraged at some point to go back and think about maybe where the grants come from and where the resources are most needed for the real covering of indirect costs and more on the local level. Don't get me wrong, I think assumption kept central. I love working with Jen Lawrence for instance, and we need to help pay people's salary like that, but there is a big difference between a lab that gets 58% from the federal government and a smaller, not really smaller, we're pretty big, but something working in the humanities and social sciences, they get a much lower ICR rate and we really have costs we still have to cover.

Mumper ([01:53:25](#)):

Yeah, I appreciate that and I've had many conversations about that our current allocation formula is silent about the source of the external funding and applies the same allocation formula irrespective of where the award is. Should it be different? I think we should have that conversation. I think this is to an extension of your point, as I look at the opportunities for IU research, IU research has done a fantastic work over many decades in securing large federal grants and contracts, which we largely, but not always, but we largely apply that 58.5%, but we have to really think about a research enterprise and its impact and sustainability over a long time. To your point, I think is we need partnerships with industry, we need partnerships with corporate and foundation relations, and I'm open to any type of

arrangement that will lead to those outcomes that will project our impact and sustainability over a long period of time.

Whitten ([01:54:46](#)):

Okay, thank you. Thanks, Russ. Next up on the agenda are updates and a charge on a university-wide AI task force. All this will be a human discussion today led by our UFC Co-chairs.

Johnson ([01:55:00](#)):

Thank you. So as many of you may recall, well let me go back to, as many of you may recall, at the beginning of the year, we were all having a meltdown about the arrival of chat GET and its apparent like Refiguring of the world in which we lived. So that was sort of the first thing. The second thing was at the beginning of the year, this group, the executive committee of the university faculty council, and then subsequently the entire university faculty council convened to discuss issues that were interest to the members of the council and to try to identify action items or initiatives that we could pursue over the course of the year Chief among the issues that arose in the context of those initial planning discussions was in fact AI and what we were going to do about it in terms of integrating it into the landscape of higher education in terms of contending with the realities and the challenges that it poses for instructional purposes and not least significantly in terms of thinking about the opportunities that it also suggests for us in higher education and research and lots of other areas.

([01:56:07](#)):

Based on that discussion, the executive committee went back and decided that in fact it was an important thing, a reasonable thing for us to try to convene a task force to help guide the institutions thinking about how to respond to the arrival of AI as a kind of everyday dimension of life in higher education for ourselves, for our students. And I was very pleased at that point to have enlisted the assistance in the support of President Whitten who very generously agreed to partner with this group to put together the charge for a task force and also to help us assemble it assuming that charge is accepted. So what I'm doing today is I'm presenting to this body the primary charge points that were developed by the executive committee for the task force, the AI task force, and also to seek this body's support and approval of that charge so that we can proceed after this meeting to begin to put the task force together and get to work.

([01:57:07](#)):

So I will just really quickly move through. The charge itself includes a brief preamble and then the second half of it is a series of questions being posed to the AI task force. And I'll just read through those really quickly. They are first, what general principles should govern the crafting of policy and guidance related to generative AI as the technology continues to evolve? Two, what guidance should faculty, staff, administrators, and students receive regarding the acceptable use of generative AI in the context of IU related activities and work? Three, what formal policies, if any, may need to be altered or newly adopted to ensure that generative AI is used in connection with IU related activities and work in a constructive ethical manner? Four, when and how should artifacts produced using generative AI in connection with IU related activities and work be clearly identified? And how should such AI generated artifacts be cited?

([01:58:09](#)):

Five, to what extent are artifacts produced using generative AI or the fact that generative AI has been used to produce artifacts subject to the terms of the public records act and what policies and practices might be required to ensure that Indiana University remains in compliance with that act along these

lines. And finally, and I think not least importantly, what opportunities exist to use generative AI in constructive and ethical ways to advance the teaching, research and service missions of the institution? How might generative AI be used to improve the conditions of work at Indiana University? So these are six broadly framed questions that the executive committee felt it would be appropriate in consultation with the president, felt it would be appropriate to pose to the task force as a point of departure. The charge itself gives the task force broad range to include any other questions or to address any other issues that it feels are important for the purpose of executing its work.

[\(01:59:05\)](#):

And if I'm not mistaken, I think that if it's not mistaken, the document asks for at least an initial finding from the task force no later than March 1st to give this body the opportunity to begin to formulate concrete actions drawn from that work. So it's a pretty quick turnaround, but we think it's really important that these questions, very broad questions be addressed on the university level. It doesn't really make sense to us to have every campus and every department and every developing its own philosophy of how to respond to sort of the emergency as a point of reference. Presumably whatever questions should be asked should be asked by all of us. And so this was our solution to try to begin to generate that conversation. So what we're seeking is really the support of the council for this charge language and we're happy to entertain. Any questions?

McCoy [\(02:00:02\)](#):

I just want to make a point that I hope you are going to consider involving both graduate and undergraduate students as a part of this task force because students are using these tools in ways that I think many of us do not know in both incredibly positive ways that I've heard, such as students using it who are non-native speakers of English to make sure that what they're writing makes sense and I think that's a really wonderful use of the tool, but also I think they know of ways that they're using it in somewhat nefarious ways that maybe we're unsure of. So I think it would be really useful to involve the students in this process.

Johnson [\(02:00:35\)](#):

And I will say I think that's an excellent point. I will say too, our intention, we wanted to get a charge in place first and then the next step is for us to pretty quickly talk about in consultation with the president who makes sense to sort of put on this thing. And I know you've already been doing some really important work in terms of pulling people together and trying to get them on board. So I think that's an excellent point.

McCoy [\(02:00:57\)](#):

And point two, I'm glad that number six was there because I think we need to be careful not to demonize the tool and make those who use it sort of pariahs for having chosen to use it for very useful ways when it is used as a tool. So I just hope that that spirit continues throughout the building of, and whatever comes out of the task force.

Kini [\(02:01:29\)](#):

Colin, I brought this preliminary discussion to our campus and my FACET member in the FACET group at entered all campuses indicated to me we are already working on it. Is that something that you're aware of? FACET group is working on some such documentation? I don't know.

Johnson ([02:01:52](#)):

I was not aware of that. I would only say I think that's symptomatic partly of the problem, which is there. I mean I think all that information is useful and I think one of the goals of this task force should be probably to survey everybody and figure out who's working on what. UITS this summer already set forth what looked a lot like policy language regarding acceptable use of generative AI on campus. That was articulated solely from the perspective of their concerns about data maintenance, like how IU data touches third party systems, which caused, I mean it was a very important policy caused enormous consternation because it seemed to be propounding the university's position with regard to acceptable use. And when you talk to them, they said, we're just concerned about X thing, we just had to do this. But I would say that's wonderful news. I mean, I can't speak for the task force. I think it's wonderful news, but it's also precisely symptomatic of why we need a coordinated effort. We cannot have 19 different units on campus developing language.

Rivas ([02:02:59](#)):

Sorry, my question is in the same direction. How will be this coordination? Because we also have in the collaborative program, the online collaborative program, we also working in a policy for it. So how will be the mechanism for those for all these initiatives coming together?

Johnson ([02:03:17](#)):

So I think this is one of the things we're going to have to figure out, but I do think that along the same lines, my hope is, and part of the reason we're seeking the imprimature of the entire university faculty council for this is my hope is after this is adopted, after the task force is assembled, that it will actually be a point of reference so that all of the groups that are currently thinking about this, and I'm sure many others that will begin to think about it in different contexts, will be able to say very clearly we should be collaborating with this task force for the purpose of trying to pool our knowledge, kind of share responsibility for doing work and ultimately developing policy. So at a minimum, if we're able to adopt this as a general charge and assemble this task force, every single group on campus will not have to labor in isolation or they can continue to do their work, but they'll have actually, I would hope a point of reference to bring their work back to and say, we would like this work to inform broader thinking about this.

([02:04:18](#)):

No, the first thing we need to do is just figure out what it's supposed to do. But that's a first step, but I think it's a really important thing when it. Yes?

Kravitz ([02:04:30](#)):

Given how rapidly AI evolves, will this task force become a permanent fixture?

Johnson ([02:04:36](#)):

I think an excellent question for the task force. How's that for slipperiness? I wouldn't be surprised.

Whitten ([02:04:50](#)):

Did you want to have a vote or something?

Johnson ([02:04:52](#)):

Yeah, I mean assuming now I'm going to, that's definitely your prerogative.

Whitten ([02:04:58](#)):

If we're done with the questions, I think Colin was hoping that we could have a vote to indicate support for pulling together the task force. Is that fair?

Johnson ([02:05:05](#)):

And the adoption of the charge document. Yeah.

Ramos ([02:05:10](#)):

Motion to support the task force development and document.

Johnson ([02:05:13](#)):

And second.

Whitten ([02:05:14](#)):

All those in favor. Okay. Any opposed? Great. Okay, we'll take that as a duly supporting the charge and the go ahead to get started.

Johnson ([02:05:25](#)):

It's a thing. It's a thing. Okay. Thank you all.

Whitten ([02:05:28](#)):

Very good. Thank you. Thanks, Colin. Next up is to talk about questions reviews of the core school deans, and I'm going to turn the floor back to our co-chairs for that discussion as well.

Goff ([02:05:39](#)):

This one's me. This is pretty straightforward actually. As you know, there are different policies for reviews of different sorts of administrators and we actually have a policy for reviewing our core school deans. However, if you look at the questions, you can see here, this is in UA 11, the second short paragraph independent of these comprehensive reviews, each dean shall be evaluated by a survey distributed to the faculty of the dean's unit at the beginning of the dean's third year in office. The questions we had are really pretty antiquated. I think they're referred to horse drawn carriages and things like that. So the executive committee, as you can see the way it's supposed to happen, a set of approximately 10 questions, the same for all deans drafted by the university faculty council executive committee in consultation with a survey agent and approved by you, the university faculty council.

([02:06:42](#)):

And so that's why we're here right now. We have the executive committee. Thanks especially to Danielle and Cate who worked on these. We have updated and so we're proposing new questions for the core school deans for their review and we need your approval. These will be done on a Likert five point Likert scale, from one, with strongly agree being five, but also each one will have a text box labeled. Please expand if appropriate. So we're going to a quantitative survey rather than just leaving it open-ended. That being said, we can still gather qualitative information as well for those who want to share it.

([02:07:27](#)):

These were circulated already and I'm not sure that it's worth reading. Every single one of them, there are 10, they're all fairly straightforward and they're also covering what you expect of deans generally, but especially making sure that we get at the fact that these are leaders of units that go across campuses. And so we need to make sure that they are appointing quality leaders and there are various colleges and schools in each of the different campuses. The dean has been effective in hiring and retaining faculty, which is very important for all of us right now, all the way through tenure and promotion cases where the dean has consistently and appropriately applied the criteria of governing evaluation and our areas of responsibility. As I say, these were circulated. They've also been on the website. I don't know if there is a lot of discussion, but if anyone has ideas of how to improve them, we'd be happy to hear them.

Ramos ([02:08:33](#)):

I am thinking of other surveys like student applications or promotion and tenure, and I'm wondering why it doesn't culminate with a question of, do you feel that this dean should continue in their role? It's kind of a final summative question. Would you recommend this candidate for promotion and tenure? How highly do you recommend this student for entry into the graduate program? So many of the surveys end with that summative question. Just curious.

Whitten ([02:09:04](#)):

I don't think that's the purpose of the survey. Yeah, I mean I would encourage our other campus leads to weigh in, but it's a review to gather information to see how things are going, make things better, see if there are problems, but it's not intended to be a performance review that would determine hiring status. Is it?

Shrivastav ([02:09:24](#)):

Yeah, I've had this conversation with the BFC leadership and I would second that it is not a, dean reviews are annual and then you have three year and five year reviews by BFC and UFC policy. We combine all of those and along with metrics and then altogether, we or I at least decide whether a dean continues in the role or not. And so this is just one piece. I like the questions that you have here because they're actionable for the dean, they're actionable for the supervisor because it says where is a person strong? Where are areas of weakness that need to be improved? So I think this is a much better improvement than the original version you had.

Sciame-Giesecke ([02:10:15](#)):

I would agree with that. We currently have a review of a chancellor. It is not the campus's decision about whether a chancellor should be retained or not. That isn't the decision. The review is to inform the chancellor about the pros and the strengths and the challenges of what's going on on the campus. The ultimate decision about whether a chancellor would be retained or not would be the president of the university or informed by probably the vice president of regional campuses. So I just think it's an inappropriate question because it isn't housed there in that decision I don't think.

Ramos ([02:10:52](#)):

Thank you.

Johnson ([02:10:57](#)):

I would just add onto that. I think it's an excellent question. I will say if people haven't looked at the full breadth of ACA 11, our policies governing dean reviews both at the university level and the campus level are enormously complex. I think in ways, if we know how to do anything here, it's right policy. But anyway, for better or worse. But I will just say this dimension of the dean review, this is the data collection from the faculty. But then there are also the faculty, the school councils for example, get to add five additional questions to the survey that goes to the faculty. So they would actually have the opportunity if that was an important issue to weigh in on, they would actually have the opportunity to add those questions to a survey. And then on top of that, not necessarily for a third year review, but certainly for the five-year review, there's a very kind of multi-layered, extensive process done of a committee being convened to collect additional data, write a report, which is then forwarded on. So I do think, especially for a third year review, the idea of trying to gather actionable kind of information about things is probably mostly appropriate. But I do think that our policies afford faculty considerable latitude to weigh in the context. Now, whether they choose to do that and what their own calculations are is a different question.

Goff ([02:12:13](#)):

They're on the UFC website for the meeting. This meeting, under circulars.

Rivas ([02:12:29](#)):

I have a question. What is the weight of these answers collected using this questionnaire in the dean's evaluation? I mean, because at the IU East campus, we have something like that, the academic vice chancellor, but it was more for her information like for her self-improvement instead of the evaluation. So I just wanted, my question is what would be the weight it will be for the evaluation of the deans?

Shrivastav ([02:13:02](#)):

Like I said, there's no one point that I use for evaluation. It's ongoing. It's every year it's various metrics. All deans in Bloomington have a set of metrics. It's their progress made on those metrics that become a big factor of it. This is one piece of a holistic review process. So it's hard for me to put a number and say this is X percent,

Whitten ([02:13:28](#)):

But I would add things are a bit different. Now, correct me if I'm, but prior to Rahul coming here, our deans didn't have an annual evaluation done with the provost. So this is a new practice with our provost. I won't call you new anymore, but with our provost. And so there's a series of ways to be gathering data and monitoring that don't extend to a third and a fifth year. Because one of the things I say to all the leaders is, if we have issues both wonderful issues or troubling issues, they can't wait three to five years. We need to be aware of them much sooner than that to be addressing them. And that's part of the process now too. Okay. I think we are to have a vote on accepting these questions. So can we have a motion for that? So moved, seconded? Can we a second. There we go. All those in favor? Any opposed? Great. The motion passes. Thank you. Thank you. And with that, if there are no further questions, we've come to the end of our agenda and so the meeting is officially adjourned. Thank you to everyone for your service on UFC. Happy Halloween.