

Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
February 27, 2024 | 1:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Zoom – IU Broadcast

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Barthlow, Deanna; Ben Miled, Zina; Buckman, Christopher; Butters, Rebecca; Carlton, Rebecca; Cohen, Rachael; Cycholl, Garin; Dam, Gregory; DeSawal, Danielle; Eskew, Kelly; Evans, Cindy; Froysland, Hayley; Goff, Philip; Johnson, Colin; Jones, Kevin; Kini, Ranjan; Kravitz, Ben; Lester, Jessica; Maxcy, Brendan; McCoy, Chase; Medina, Monica; Morgan, Gin; Need, Andrea; Nichols-Boyle, Shawn; Palmer, Megan; Perez, Rodrigo; Popham, Susan; Ramos, Bill; Reck, Cate; Rivas, Jayne; Schult, Carolyn; Slayback-Barry, Denise; Stucky, Thomas; Wert, Joe; Whitten, Pamela; Ramchand, Latha; Shrivastav, Rahul; Sciame-Giesecke, Susan

MEMBERS ABSENT: Eaton, Kristine; Eisenstein, Marie; Elliott, Rob; King Thorious, Kathleen; McLean, Donna; Trinidad; Windsor, L. Jack; Allen-Brown, Kayla; Raji, Aaliyah

GUESTS: Neal, Aaron; Leftwich, Anne; Huber, Michael; Smith Jones, Angela; Gladden, Jay; Daday, Jerry

Agenda

1. **Approval of the minutes of December 12, 2023**
2. **Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)**
Philip Goff, UFC Co-chair, IU
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. **Report on Domain & Email Changes & Updates from Chief Information Officer (15 minutes)**
Aaron Neal, Deputy Chief Information Officer
Anne Leftwich, Associate Vice President, Learning Technologies
6. **Questions/Comments on Report from Chief Information Officer (10 minutes)**
7. **Report from University Relations (15 minutes)**
Michael Huber, Vice President, University Relations
Angela Smith Jones, Associate Vice President, State Relations
8. **Questions/Comments on Report from University Relations (20 minutes)**
9. **Discussion on Academic Calendar (15 minutes)**
Susan Sciame-Giesecke, Vice President, Regional Campuses & Online Education

Rahul Shrivastav, Provost & Executive Vice President

Jay Gladden, Interim Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

10. **Questions/Comments on Academic Calendar** (10 minutes)

11. **Proposed Changes to ACA-33, Academic Appointee Responsibilities & Conduct, & STU-00, Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, & Conduct** (15 minutes)

Danielle DeSawal, Chair, Policy Review Committee

[Action Item]

U9-2024: Proposed Changes to ACA-33

U10-2024: Proposed Changes to STU-00

12. **Questions/Comments on Proposed Changes to ACA-33 & STU-00** (10 minutes)

13. **Updates from the University A.I. Taskforce** (15 minutes)

Jerry Daday, Executive Associate Dean & Co-chair of A.I. Taskforce

Kevin Jones, Associate Professor & Co-chair of A.I. Taskforce

14. **Questions/Comments on A.I. Taskforce** (10 minutes)

15. **Proposed Amendments to ACA-05, Bylaws of the University Faculty Council of Indiana University** (10 minutes)

Philip Goff, UFC Co-chair, IU1

Colin Johnson, UFC Co-chair, IU Bloomington

Carolyn Schult, UFC Co-chair, IU South Bend

[Discussion Item]

U11-2024: Proposed Amendments to ACA-05

16. **Questions/Comments on Proposed Amendments to ACA-05** (10 minutes)

Transcript

Whitten ([00:15:27](#)):

Good afternoon everyone. I'm going to call us to order. We're at 1:30. Hope everyone is doing well on this typical February day were it's 70 degrees. I guess that's the state of the world right now. Good afternoon everyone. I hope you're all doing well and ready for a good UFC meeting today. We'll start the meeting with approval of the minutes from our December 12 meeting back in 2023. Do we have a motion for approval?

Johnson ([00:15:59](#)):

So moved.

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

Thank you. Do we have second? Okay, I see a hand up. Thank you. Any discussion? Okay, all those in favor, please respond by saying aye or I guess aye. Aye.

Schult ([00:16:19](#)):

Aye.

Whitten ([00:16:20](#)):

Very good.

Multiple ([00:16:22](#)):

Aye.

Whitten ([00:16:24](#)):

Any opposed? Say nay. Okay, we'll take the minutes as approved. Thank you. The next item on the agenda is executive committee business, so we'll hear from each of our UFC Co-chairs. Phil Goff from IUPUI, I guess I could say that still for a few more days. Colin Johnson, of course, from IU Bloomington and Carolyn Schult from IU South Bend of course, who represents all the regional campuses? Phil, I think you're up first.

Goff ([00:16:55](#)):

Alright. It's good to see everybody friendly faces on the screen with IU Indianapolis only four months away, faculty here are paying increasing attention to the new strategic plan, particularly for our campus and thinking about ourselves here in this community and there is much to be excited about with a new substantial infusion of funding from the state the first time in many years as well as welcoming our new chancellor, Latha Ramchand, welcome. Good. Nice to see you on the screen especially. Along that excitement there still remains among some, a certain level of regret at seeing IUPUI moved to the history books. It was a strangely named and underfunded little engine that could and did for 54 years and it'll be important for us in the coming weeks to both say goodbye to something we built and hello to a new future that is being established day by day on a solid foundation and I think that's how we have to move forward with this. Beyond the local, of course, we're all paying attention to what's going on.

([00:17:58](#)):

About a mile from my office, there were multiple bills about higher education that were filed and most are no longer with us. Thankfully. I want to thank President Whitten for being the only leader of a public university in the state to come out against the post-tenure review. So thank you Pam. I do really, it was a shot in the arm as I told you before. It really was and I want to thank Michael Huber and Angela Smith Jones who we'll hear from later and their team for their work. I can say having lived in the capitol now for 25 years, IU has a better relationship with the legislature than it has in many years and I hope that it'll begin to pay off more and more in the days to come. But I guess because IUPUI/IUI is here in the capitol, we paid special attention to this, it appears we will be stuck with SB 2 0 2 with its vague definitions and proclivity to I think politicize our work, and rather than take the easy path of simply decrying the bill, we can take the next step of learning how to work together to get beyond it and to continue doing our good work and continue recruiting and retaining the top faculty.

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

I think it'll be especially important in the days to come for the faculty, the administration and the trustees to work together in a culture of conversation and collaboration after SB 2 0 2. If we don't, I think we'll lose the heart of Indiana University and the fact is we all want the same thing and I think together the faculty administration and trustees working together, we have a better chance of achieving it. Thank you.

Whitten ([00:19:34](#)):

Thank you Phil. Colin.

Johnson ([00:19:36](#)):

So I'll just follow up on that and I will say Phil sort of stole my thunder in terms of thanking President Whitten for her willingness speak publicly about SB 2 0 2, so my comments will be a little shortened for that reason. So first of all, thank you very much. It's a pleasure to see you all again. It's been several months as you know. It will come as no surprise to any of you to hear me say that Spring has been a busy semester in Bloomington. We continue to try to make headway on several aspects of the campus strategic plan as I think President Whitten noted. We've been gifted with some unseasonably lovely if rather unpredictable weather, and that has brought out sort of ahead of schedule some of the sense of liveliness on campus that usually doesn't arrive until after spring break. I can always tell Spring has arrived when all of a sudden our students tear off their clothes and start jogging around campus. It's like, Hey, spring is here. Everybody's out in middle of February.

([00:20:33](#)):

And of course, we've also had the occasion to celebrate numerous individual and collective wins including prestigious fellowships, ones student awards and recognitions that are just beginning to be bestowed and major grants received. And of course there's also the impending eclipse, which I know we're all looking forward to. I've already purchased my rations ready to eat so I can hide in my basement during part of that and avoid the 400,000 people who are scheduled to arrive in Bloomington, but I'm sure great fun will be had by all. And of course, how could it not be with William Shatner and other people coming to campus to celebrate it? So that's all for the good. At the same time as Phil noted or well at the same time as I'll note it will probably come as no surprise to anyone that we have since I saw you last faced some challenges in the Bloomington campus including a number of controversies that have garnered local, regional and national attention.

([00:21:30](#)):

We have also witnessed significant shifts in public debate in the State House as Phil noted about the nature of higher education, most notably in the form of number of measures currently being considered by the Indiana General Assembly. At moments like this, I think steady leadership is essential not only in terms of navigating the increasingly complex waters in which we all swim, but also in perhaps just as importantly in terms of our leaders willingness and ability to reassure students, faculty, and staff that the institution so many of them know and love remains on a solid footing and remains committed to certain core principles. For that reason, again, I would like to join Phil in thanking President Whitten for her willingness to, I think most importantly, not only give voice to her own concerns about some of that legislation, but also to give public voice to what I'm sure she recognizes as the concerns of her colleagues. And I think that that's an enormously important dimension of being a good leader. And so I'm grateful for her willingness to do that, particularly because of the fact that I think ultimately she ended up giving voice to concerns that are held by colleagues throughout the state, at public universities throughout the entire state.

([00:22:45](#)):

So thank you for that. In closing, I just want to underscore in a forward-looking way the importance such gestures have and especially emphasize the crucial importance of expressions of reassurance, the importance they can have at moments such as this, particularly when they're directed at faculty and rendered in terms those directly associated with education. And I would include students, faculty, and staff obviously in that calculation in terms that all of those people can understand and recognize as familiar. It is absolutely true that many of the customs and traditions of the academy seem strange and idiosyncratic to those who live and work outside of it. It may also be true that we need to do a better job

than we have done historically of explaining to wider audiences the necessary inviolability of things like academic freedom and the institution of tenure.

(00:23:43):

But it is also true that it is precisely these conventions of American higher education that have helped it achieve the global preeminence it still enjoys even under circumstances of increased global competition. So I guess I would say to anyone in a position of leadership on this call, elected members of this council and university level administrators, campus level administrators, those gestures of reassurance are essential for faculty and for students and for staff. People need to hear that. They need to be communicated with in terms like I said, that are familiar to them and I cannot underscore just how important those gestures are at this moment. So for all of you in your dealings with your colleagues, with your students, with your staff, please take a moment in the midst of new incredibly busy lives to acknowledge those concerns, to take them seriously and to give people space to feel whatever sense of anxiety they're feeling and to help 'em work through that because that's a crucial part of leadership as well. Thank you.

Whitten (00:24:48):

Great. Thank you, thank you. Thank you for the kind words and I appreciate the reminder that we are all in this together as well. Thank you, Carolyn. You're batting cleanup.

Schult (00:25:00):

And I'm sorry my voice isn't quite what it should be. I used up all my voice on the RFC meeting earlier today, but I also want to add my thanks to President Whitten for being willing to go on the record with her concerns about s SB 2 0 2. Many of the regional campuses passed resolutions expressing similar concerns and objections to the bill, and so your leadership was really important for giving us that avenue to make the statements on our own. Right now, many of the regional campuses are in the midst of grappling with reorganizing academic structures and examining the viability of our low enrolled programs to save money and to prepare for the coming demographic cliff. It's difficult work. We want to preserve these disciplines to give students in our region a full range of options to study so that we can live up to our mission as comprehensive regional universities.

(00:25:53):

We don't want to cut anything, but we expect to see more collaborations between the regionals with hybrid or online programs so we can continue to offer these degree programs in a cost effective way. We also continue to have concerns about the effects of the changes to the university administration tax. Currently, the regionals contribute a higher proportion of their budgets to university administration compared to our proportion of tuition dollars. So we'd like to see all the campuses share in this realignment proportionally so that the campuses with the smallest budgets are not asked to pay the highest percentage. The regionals get a lot of bang for the buck, so all of the IU regionals rank higher than the Purdue regionals in the US News and World Report social mobility rankings, and we cost less than Purdue does. So we want to keep offering great value to our students, but we can't do that if we continually cut budgets year after year. So if we could keep just a little bit more of the tuition that we generate, I'm sure we can do great things with it. Thanks.

Whitten (00:26:59):

Great. Thank you. Thank you as well, Carolyn, for those remarks. The next item on our agenda is the presiding officer's report, which is my report. So I want to begin by welcoming Indiana University's

newest senior leader Latha Ramchand, who began as the inaugural chancellor of IU Indianapolis just on February 12th and I guess is taking part in her first university faculty council meeting today, so we're glad to have her here with us. She comes to us from the University of Missouri where she served as the executive vice chancellor and provost, and then prior to being at Mizzou, she was at the University of Houston, excuse me, as a faculty member and as the dean of the CT Bauer School of Business, which is terrific. We're so glad she has all that experience at an urban university and can bring those lessons and ideas to us in Indianapolis.

[\(00:27:50\)](#):

She earned her doctoral degree in finance from Northwestern University and both her master's and bachelor's degrees in economics from the University of Mumbai as well. We had a reception on the Indy campus to welcome Latha on her first day and it was lovely to see the turnout of support of people that are so excited to meet a new leader on that campus and I hope that any of the UFC members who haven't had a chance to meet her yet will take the opportunity to do so. I know she's anxious to see all of you. I'm very confident that Latha's background and her experience will accelerate our momentum will help to ably establish IU Indianapolis as one of the nation's premier urban research universities, and of course expand the university's impact in central Indiana and beyond. So speaking of IU Indianapolis, we are now 88 business days away from the official launch of the IU Indianapolis campus.

[\(00:28:49\)](#):

The Vision 2024 implementation steering committee's really just continued this year with amazing work and they've made great progress really on all of the tasks that have to be completed by July 1 to ensure a seamless process for our students. I'm very happy to report that the December site visit by the Higher Learning Commission and their subsequent report indicated that we met all the requirements and the application associated with this realignment is on the commission's February agenda for approval. I think the HLC Board of Trustees is meeting on end of this week, Thursday and Friday to take up our approval. Meanwhile, extensive communication efforts are underway with IU Indianapolis students to really generate enthusiasm for the transition and these communications are targeted at those students that are going to be directly impacted by the alignment. For example, those students that are currently in the school of science or computer science as well as students in general.

[\(00:29:50\)](#):

And of course we know that communications are also so important and really intended to help increase our students' understanding of what the realignment means for them and for their peers, and of course our commitment to always ensuring that they have an extraordinary experience and are successful as IU students in Indianapolis as well. So moving to the strategic plan, IU 2030 work also continues of course on the implementation of the IU 2030 strategic plan across all the campuses. With those individual efforts occurring on each campus. University communications efforts continue to align with the priorities from the 2030 plan, really driving cadence of announcements and media coverage that have been highlighting key initiatives and frankly been getting lots of attention as well. These include the university's research investments, of course, the most recent IU Indianapolis partnership with Eli Lilly to boost talent pipelines, news about IU state leading research funding as well, and just a number of things that are fun to communicate and share with those outside of IU.

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

And so to showcase the progress in IU 2030 moving forward, the university is also in the process of preparing a suite of dashboards that we're hoping to launch in July on all IU campus 2030 sites. And so these are being developed by University communications and marketing and the institutional analytics office for IU. So the intent is that the dashboards are going to feature results that are organized of

course in the three distinct pillar sections and they'll be structured to highlight key results and the successes and the common sense of data across all of our campuses as well. Let me transition while we're in the communication realm and talk a little bit about the branding campaign. I hope that you are all aware that we launched a new branding campaign for IU in October of last year, and so work began really almost a year ago to conduct market research to ensure that the campaign would be authentic, yet confident and bold and that we would look to the future that we've collectively planned and outlined in 2030.

[\(00:32:05\):](#)

And so the tagline of the campaign is Bring on Tomorrow. I hope you are seeing that in various places. We've been running digital ads on national news sites, we've been advertising on social media platforms and billboards. Obviously we've updated the IU homepage. Hopefully some of you if you've been traveling, have seen a nice six foot IU trident at the Indianapolis Airport. Every time I go by it, somebody's having their picture taken with it. I have heard there are people asking where the big P is going to be. I don't think that's going to be happening anytime soon. I also hope that you've seen the new national spot that's running on the Big 10 network and cable and streaming networks throughout Indiana. It was actually also featured during the Super Bowl in the Indianapolis market. We heard from a lot of people who saw it there, and so we're currently working to integrate the Bring On Tomorrow platform across all of our schools and our campuses and certainly IU Online as well.

[\(00:33:01\):](#)

Lemme jump to the Indiana General Assembly and just add a little bit to it. I know comments were made of course by our three campus leads as well. As most of you know, the Indiana General Assembly is currently in session. This is not a biennial budget year, so the legislature is actually in a short session where its intent is to focus on other policy matters and as you have undoubtedly heard, and if you hadn't heard, hopefully you heard some of the beginning of comments made today, there's legislation under consideration that contains language to be very frank. That's concerning to all of us at IU and I would venture to say in higher education as well. A little bit later in the meeting we're fortunate enough to get an update and have the opportunity to hear from our VP of university relations, Michael Huber and his associate Vice President for state relations, Angela Smith Jones, who are closely tracking several pieces of legislation that could impact IU and are just doing tremendous, tremendous work this year.

[\(00:34:07\):](#)

I know the piece of legislation that we're hearing the most about is Senate Bill 2 0 2 and if you will allow me to read to you, I just want to make very clear the statement that we came out with immediately that I came out with immediately just to reaffirm that this continues to be our position no matter how the final language comes out. And so the language that was made very public was while we are still analyzing the broad potential impacts of SB 2 0 2, we're deeply concerned about language regarding faculty tenure that would put academic freedom at risk, weaken the intellectual rigor essential to preparing students with critical thinking skills and damage, our ability to compete for the world-class faculty who are at the core of what makes IU an extraordinary research institution. We went on to say we all share the common goal to maximize the university's capacity to make scientific breakthroughs, attract talented students and faculty drive economic development and create better outcomes for all Hoosiers as crafted.

[\(00:35:09\):](#)

My concern is that Senate Bill 2 0 2 risks unintended consequences that threaten not just the stature of Indiana University but the economic and cultural vitality of the state, and again, our government relations leaders will update you on Senate Bill 2 0 2 and other pieces of legislation that they're tracking

in a few minutes later on this meeting, I would just affirm that no matter how ultimately the language comes out in this bill and or others, we will work forward to being compliance in the legislation, but we will do so in a way that is highly collaborative across our campuses and that we feel very comfortable and confident retains the values that we have at Indiana University as well.

[\(00:35:54\)](#):

Kinsey, lemme talk a little bit about Kinsey this week. For many of you who are supporters and appreciate all the good work that Kinsey has done in its past I think 75 years or so later this week, the board of trustees are going to consider a recommendations received from the Kinsey Institute working Group to determine a path forward in response to legislation that was passed last year that would prohibit the institution's use of actual state direct state funds. I certainly am grateful to the working group and to many members of the IU community, which includes not just those currently on campus, but alum and other supporters of well who have been just great at participating and providing feedback. They attended listening sessions and participated in other ways. Though I don't know what the course of action the trustees will take and as they consider the recommendations, I want to be abundantly clear.

[\(00:36:49\)](#):

Once again, I've said this multiple times, but once again in relation to this, that whatever solution is chosen, IU is committed to ensuring that the Kinsey Institute, its name, its research, its scholarship, the collections, its educational initiatives, that all of this continue in perpetuity as a pillar of intellectual freedom and academic inquiry at IU. And so whatever solution is chosen by the trustees, IU faculty who have appointments and affiliations with the Kinsey Institute will maintain those connections. All collections associated with the Kinsey Institute will remain at IU and will remain in service of the Kinsey Institute's research and educational mission. We're also committed to robust fundraising to support the institute. A fact that I shared with that I had conversation with the IU Foundation board of directors earlier this month as well. We have to comply of course with Indiana state law while achieving these objectives, but I want to acknowledge that for whatever reason there's been some misinformation and confusion around the proposal heard in the fall.

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

I'm not sure why or what the intent was that, but nothing has changed from day one. These have always been the university's goals for the future of the Kinsey Institute and no matter what happens, all of that will stay in play. Kinsey Institute will continue to function and operate as it always has and hopefully in exciting ways in the future as well. As one of the nation's leading research universities, the Indiana University really is deeply committed to fostering intellectual inquiry. We like robust discourse and the freedom to explore topics that expand knowledge. And so only in these conditions can our students best develop the critical thinking skills that are going to equip them for success. And can our world-class faculty reach new heights of the discovery that they seek? So again, however the trustees choose to proceed, the Kinsey Institute is going to remain an important piece of our wider mission of providing an excellent and relevant and responsive educational experience for all learners.

[\(00:39:03\)](#):

It's going to continue to seek to pursue transformative research and scholarship and creative activity, and of course look to create better outcomes for Hoosiers as well. And so let me move toward closing with just a few highlights of recent successes across the university. And this is tough to do. I acknowledge the challenging times and often frustrating times in which we live, but people across this university continue to do and accomplish really amazing things. We are, for example, already seeing success toward our goal of increasing externally funded research under the IU strategic plan. For the first seven months of fiscal year 24, total sponsored researches up almost 11% over the same time

period last year. And actual sponsored research is up over 18% over the same time last year. And these positive results really demonstrate the quality of the outstanding research that's being conducted by our faculty.

[\(00:40:04\):](#)

DOU research that drives innovation expands knowledge and of course spurs economic growth in Indiana and beyond as well. On a related note, recently we announced that the IU School of Medicine received 243 million in total funding from the National Institutes of Health during the federal fiscal year 23. And according to rankings that are released by the Blue Ridge Institute for Medical Research, this means that the IU School of Medicine ranks number 13 among public medical schools and NIH funding and number 29 among all schools nationally. And so this is a record for the school and really shows great progress toward the IU 2030 goal of ranking in the top 10 for all public research universities. I'm also happy to report that applications are up at IU Bloomington as of February 22nd, the Bloomington campus had received just about 67,000 applications for next year. This is a 25% increase over the number of applications just from the year before.

[\(00:41:08\):](#)

So lots and lots of people around the country, around the world view IU as a place that they want to come study and learn, which is a wonderful comment on our institution. We're also seeing success in the area of advancement. The IU Foundation reports that as of just a few days ago in February, \$147.4 million in philanthropic support have been raised, which is a 33% increase over the same time last year. In addition, new three year records have been achieved in measured contacts and donor visits, which of course has to happen to help educate folks about why it's so wonderful to contribute to this university. A recent report by the National Association of College and University Business Officers indicates that IU managed the 16th largest endowment among public universities in the United States in fiscal year 23. Of course, I want to stress that those funds in endowment are typically committed to things.

[\(00:42:05\):](#)

So it's not that those are dollars that we could just use and reallocate as we want. People typically commit them for specific types of scholarships or faculty support as well, but it's still wonderful to be in that place. A recent report on the voluntary support to education from the Council for Advancement and Supportive Education indicates that IU secured first among public universities in Indiana and 18th among public universities in the US for gifts and non-governmental grants received in fiscal year 23 as well. And for the ninth consecutive year, IU Bloomington was named a top producer of the prestigious and highly competitive Fulbright US Student program, which of course is the US Government's Flagship International Educational Exchange Program. And so for this academic year, 13 IU Bloomington students were offered Fulbright Awards. This year's Fulbright class includes Maria Peduto of Indianapolis, who has used IU's resources to visit every one of earth the Earth's continents.

[\(00:43:06\):](#)

Maria is working on a research project in Bali focused on how local communities are restoring and protecting Indonesia's rich coastal ecosystem. She hopes to use this experience as she pursues an interest in the impacts of ecosystem restoration on food security. Maria and our other Fulbright scholars are shining and inspiring in my opinion examples of IU sustained commitment to the international dimensions of teaching, research and service as well. So that concludes my report today. The next item on the agenda is the opportunity for 10 minutes of questioning and comment. And these questions and comments can be for me or they can certainly be for our co-chairs have already spoken. We've got our campus leads on the call for us as well who certainly would be available to jump in as well. We didn't

receive any questions from faculty outside the UFC, but I'd like to open the floor to any questions from current members for the 10 minutes that we have allocated.

Reck (00:44:35):

President Whitten, you're muted.

Whitten (00:44:39):

Sorry. Thank you. So I said I would not make us sit here for 10 minutes in silence for no reason. So we'll move on to the next agenda item, which is the report on domain and email changes from Chief Information Officer Aaron Neil. And so the floor is yours.

Neil (00:45:09):

There we go. Hopefully you can see a slide deck. I've got a short slide deck here. Again, my name is Aaron Neil. I am the deputy CIO here at Indiana University. And with me here today is Anne Leftwich, who is the associate Vice President of Learning Technologies. We appreciate the opportunity to talk about the email domain consolidation project, also branded as the one mail project. So you're likely to see that in future communications. And as I said, I've got a few slides here I'd like to walk through, but really want to reserve some time for me to respond to your questions. So what is the one mail project? It's an effort to unify all IU email under a single iu.edu domain. So the primary purpose is to improve security, but we can also look to leverage the IU brand, simplify support, and reduce some costs.

(00:45:58):

The timeline for this migration is by the end of the year for those that are on the iupui.edu and iupc.edu domains and by the end of 2025 for all other domains. On the right hand side here, you'll see that all the domains that we currently support, 10 and all. And for clarity, it should be noted that we all have one mailbox that is essentially @iu.edu and all other email addresses forward to that single inbox. So why does this help us from a cybersecurity perspective? The primary way in which cybersecurity attacks start are through phishing emails. And last year IU identified over 500 millions email spam messages, and that's nearly 38% of all email that came into IU. These messages, these are messages that we don't want delivered to your inbox, and despite all of those automated tools that we have to identify phishing messages, last year we had over 3000 accounts compromised.

(00:47:01):

And that's not just that their password was compromised, but also that second factor of duo was compromised as well. Today we have over 404,000 active personal email accounts, and you may ask why is that possible or how is that possible? Looking at the numbers on average, every IU account has two active email addresses. Everyone has an iu.edu email address, and nearly everyone has at least one campus specific email address. And this was a function of how our systems worked by default previously, everyone who got an iu.edu email address were automatically provisioned a campus specific email address for the campus that you're associated with, whether you realized it or not. And actually since 2016, the default has been @iu.edu, but many people, like I said, don't even realize that they have another email address for a campus. So with this project, we expect to eliminate 200,000 email addresses, which last year received over 125 million spam messages.

(00:48:14):

Again, those messages that we don't want delivered to your inbox, simply this is a numbers game about reducing the threat based upon reducing the number of numbers of accounts that can be addressed. If we look at who's impacted by the change, 96% of all students today already have as their primary email

account @iu.edu. If we look at those numbers for faculty and staff, it's 52% of the faculty already use @iu.edu and 56% of staff are using @iu.edu. And I have some raw numbers at the end for those that are interested to see the actual numbers of folks impacted. I also want to share quickly where we've the groups that we've consulted and shared information with about this project. This was socialized and shared back in November, and we've met with all of these groups over since that time, and you have likely seen some information about the project and either IU Today or in the UITS monitor. In terms of resources available and tools that we have,

[\(00:49:28\)](#):

we have a number of links out here that will provide you some additional information on the project. The first is a project page that lists a number of frequently asked questions that we've heard so far and we continue to add to. The second is a knowledge-based article that gives you information about how you can get it started with the change. And the third is about a weekly digest report that I'll talk about here in a second to help you understand when you're getting email that's being sent to a campus specific address. And the last is an email address that we've put out there and are monitoring for any questions that might come about, and we'll work directly with those folks either in person or via email. But I want to just give a little brief piece about how you would get started, which is referenced in the KB article that I mentioned. If you have a campus specific email address as your primary email, the first step is really for you to change that primary email address to be @iu.edu.

[\(00:50:31\)](#):

And there are instructions in the knowledge base on how to do that. This effectively means two things. One, your email address will show up in the global address book with an @iu.edu. And two, when you send emails, they will come from your @iu.edu email address. You can take these steps today or you can wait for us to do it for you. We can administratively change your primary email address to @iu.edu and fix all those places and systems internally where you have specified your campus specific email address. So if you're subscribed to Listservs or you're using Egencia or Chrome River and a few other places, we will administratively make that change for you so that you don't have to do it. We will then start sending a weekly digest report on Sundays that will notify you of the messages you received at your campus specific email address. So it will include the number of emails that you received, a list of the distinct users that sent you those messages, and then a spreadsheet that has the time sender, the subject, the date of all the messages that you received over that one week period for you to review.

[\(00:51:45\)](#):

So we'll also include in that email a sample reply text that you can copy and paste into a message so that you can notify those senders. My email has changed. Please take note of it. It's now username@iu.edu. And then finally, we will provide a page where you can go deactivate your campus specific email account when you're comfortable doing so.

[\(00:52:12\)](#):

I wanted to highlight a few things. One thing that we're planning to implement based upon feedback from the community when we reach the end of this project, so 12/31/2024 for IUPUI and IUPUC and 12/31/2025, for all the other domains, we will put in place a custom bounce message to notify senders that are still trying to reach you. So the message will notify the sender that the campus specific email address is no longer valid and that users can be reached at the username@iu.edu. There is one caveat with that, the sending email service must be configured to accept this custom message coming back to them. And based upon our testing, we know that services like Google, Gmail, Yahoo, Hotmail, all accept these custom bounce messages. We did find out, however, that Microsoft, by default does not accept a custom bounce message. So while this will definitely be helpful, it's not foolproof by any means.

(00:53:15):

So this is in direct response to some of the feedback that we have received from the community. I also want to call out one other additional item that we've heard from faculty regarding publications. We realized that there are historical publications that may reference a campus specific email address. We work with the libraries and we'll continue to work with them on a KB article or knowledge-based article to assist you in getting those references changed where they can be, and to provide you with additional recommendations for updating your faculty profiles, your LinkedIn profiles, and other places that can be used to aid those who may be looking for you to find you in regards to your publications. We also have information on establishing and using an orchid ID for the future publications as a means for you to maintain your identity connected to your publications for the long term.

(00:54:12):

Finally, I want to give you an update on where we are with the project for the regional campus. We've already updated all of the primary email addresses to be @iu.edu. We did this administratively for over 4,000 accounts, and at last count we've had less than 10 support tickets related to the change, so it's gone fairly smoothly. The regional campuses will start receiving the weekly digest report, the first going out to IUPUC yesterday with the rest being delivered starting on Monday. We've had a number of questions about how this impacts group accounts. Group accounts will also need to change as well, but they are a little bit more complex and we're actively working on assessing these and we'll be communicating out to the owners of these group accounts in the coming weeks. And finally, we expect to begin communicating to IUPUI users with direct mailings within the next three weeks or so.

(00:55:13):

Our plan was to move the regional campuses first, learn from that experience. We've made some modifications to our documentation and our processes. Let that burn in for a couple of weeks, and then we'll start targeting those that are impacted on the IUPUI campus. And finally, here are the raw numbers I made reference to of the impacted users. The column that's most relevant, at least from my perspective, is the second to the last column here where the primary email is set to a campus specific email domain. You'll see the total number of impacted users there is 24,209. That was before the start of the project. We know we've moved over 4,000 already and a number of folks have already done this on their own. So that's what I had prepared. I'm happy to answer any questions you might have.

Leftwich (00:56:06):

Aaron, there was one question from Rachael that said, how long will the custom bounce message stay up?

Neil (00:56:14):

Yeah, that's not determined yet. I see no reason why it cannot stay up indefinitely. The downside of that is there will be lots of people who will reach out to you via your campus specific domain for reasons that you don't want them to, and we will continue to notify them that they can find you @iu.edu. So we don't have a set time at this point, but there is technically no reason why we couldn't do that indefinitely.

Whitten (00:56:49):

Great. Thank you so much for that report. Let's take the slides off if we can and just make sure there aren't any other questions before we move on to the next topic.

Perez ([00:57:05](#)):

Yes. One quick question. How does the use of the bounce message affect the possibility that we'll start getting a lot of news spam going from people who are starting to collect the new addresses?

Neil ([00:57:22](#)):

Yeah, it is certainly a risk, and it's one that we have to weigh between those who feel strongly that we need to provide the ability for folks to find us where we have publications and other things out there that are in documentation that we cannot change versus the risk of telling folks: Now we can find you @iu.edu, hence my waffling on how long we keep that message in place, but it's something we're going to have to consider.

Whitten ([00:57:53](#)):

Thank you. Any further questions? All right, Aaron, thank you and thank you for that awesome shot behind you.

Neil ([00:58:06](#)):

Thank you.

Whitten ([00:58:08](#)):

We appreciate it all. We will move onto the next item on our agenda, which is a report from our university relations team. And so I want to turn the screen over to Michael Huber, the Vice President for University relations, and Angela Smith Jones, who's fairly new with us, incredibly talented, our associate vice president for state relations, and invite them to present their report and then address any questions.

Huber ([00:58:31](#)):

Thank you, president Whitten. Michael Huber, vice President of University Relations for almost a year and a half here at IU. It's been an honor in that time meeting many of you, those of you I haven't met, look forward to meeting sometime in the future. This was now my second legislative session working for IU, and I want to introduce, as President Whitten said, our newest colleague, our new associate vice president of state government relations, Angela Smith Jones. Angela, I think you're with us. Angela, you here?

Smith Jones ([00:59:05](#)):

Can you guys hear me?

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

Yes. Yeah, we can hear you now. Okay, great. Okay.

Smith Jones ([00:59:10](#)):

It's so soft. I'm so sorry. I can't.

Huber ([00:59:15](#)):

No problem.

Smith Jones ([00:59:16](#)):

Let's see. I'm going to turn it up.

Huber ([00:59:19](#)):

We can hear you better now. I think we're good. So we will provide a quick update on the state legislative session. We know this particular session has a few bills which impact higher education and a few in a significant way. So the update we're going to provide you for this afternoon's UFC meeting is very timely because after this meeting, Angela and I will both be back at the State House. So I will share my screen. Can you see the slides that say legislative update? Okay, great. Great. Okay, Angela, can you hear us? Okay, so one thing that we want to emphasize is apologies to all of you who have, do you want to do it right here? Yeah, I can't hear. We're we're going to call an audible right now and working our technical issues. One second.

Smith Jones ([01:00:24](#)):

Sorry.

Huber ([01:00:24](#)):

You're fine. Got to be flexible.

([01:00:30](#)):

Okay. Can you hear us? Great. Okay. Okay. So if you can see the map of Indiana, this is the, of course, the balance of power in Indiana. We've got super majorities in the State house and in the state Senate. And so what that means is when we want to advance policies that are really important to IU and occasionally we've got to play defense, it means that it's a math problem. It means that we've got to be gaining support among Democrats and Republicans and with the super majorities in the house, it also means that you've always got to have enough Republicans and Democrats usually when you're talking about higher ed to advance the policies that are important to IU. Now, the other thing I want to express is there's no monolithic Republican party in our state or in other states too. You're talking about different segments of Republicans. While we have seen some Republicans in this legislative session who we have some work to do, you might consider that some of them are not highly aligned with higher ed. You have a lot of Republicans in different segments who don't necessarily speak for that group. And Angela, this is an area where you have a lot of personal experience if you'd like share.

Smith Jones ([01:01:42](#)):

Yeah. What we found the most important thing is developing relationships with all of the legislators regardless of area of the state or party affiliation, because that is where you can identify who your allies are. And then also even if they are opponents to higher ed or anything that's important to us that you want them to tell you and be direct and upfront with you so you know how to calculate your next strategic move.

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

So can you see the slide that says 2 0 2? Great. Okay. So this is where we'll spend the majority of our update because even though there are a few issues that impact higher ed, this is the issue where we've received over 80% of the input and the energy and for good reason Senate Bill 2 0 2. I'll ask Angela to step through the key provisions of the bill.

Smith Jones ([01:02:33](#)):

Okay, well, we're going to tell you what originally was a part of it, and that is that the board of trustees are still required to create a committee on diversity equity throughout all of the campuses. Also, regarding some specific parameters on tenure, there's new reporting for the state budget, which encompasses offices of diversity, equity, and inclusion. There used to be a proponent or a phrase in there that addressed board of trustees appointee powers that is now gone. And then there's also the basis of this is that they want to create an atmosphere in higher ed that is ideologically diverse, that is supportive of freedom of free speech and freedom of expression in a university campus.

Huber ([01:03:20](#)):

And the provision where we've received the most amount of input from you and from other faculty members is regarding this five year review that's written. And I'm just going to be blunt with this group because I've talked to many of you before. It's very vague the way it's written. And I'll defer to Angela. Angela is an attorney. I'm not an attorney. So legal reviews in our team are Angela, working with General Counsel, Tony Prather's office. It's just vague enough that this review, if you're any faculty member every five years has to go through a review of how he or she contributed to a culturally or intellectually diverse environment. And it is vague enough that it has raised huge questions about how those reviews are to be conducted. Now, trustees of the state university set the terms of that review, but it was enough that President Whitten two weeks ago came out expressing major concerns in opposition of 2 0 2. So that is a fact in terms of where we are in the legislative process, and this is where we're monitoring these bills day to day. When I provided these slides yesterday, we expected that it would have a second reading in the house, which is yesterday. And then the latest on that, Angela

Smith Jones ([01:04:33](#)):

Is the latest, is that there was only one amendment that was accepted that an amendment was filed by Representative Banning, who is the sponsor in the house, very tiny tweak, which basically allows the board of trustees to delegate the authority for creating the policy on tenure. But that is still required that there still be a five-year tenure review. The rest of the amendments were defeated and it passed second reading. And so now today it is eligible for third reading, which is the final phase. The third reading is the final phase in the current chamber, which is the house.

Huber ([01:05:07](#)):

The president's stance on 2 0 2 has not changed. And so at her direction, we've been the last two weeks talking to any legislator who will listen, trying to devise various ways to get that language changed or to get the five-year review out. Now here's a complicating factor which I will mention, and this is a public statement made by the chairman of the House Education Committee. His name is Bob Bain. We believe there are at least two other state institutions that are actually supporting 2 0 2 in its current form. We have been unsuccessful in getting other universities to bring their full throated opposition to the bill, and it's created an awkward situation where it feels like it's kind of IU administration out on its own, even though we know from testimony that happened two weeks ago. And again, I want a special thanks to many people on this call to go around. Thank you, Colin Johnson. Thank you, Cate Reck, thank you Phil Goff, for all of the communication and helping us manage the communication from people who are concerned about this bill because there was testimony two weeks ago with a large variety of faculty and students from state institutions. IU is only one yet. Purdue faculty involved state faculty and others. But to date, this hasn't changed. To our knowledge, the IU president is the only president on record opposing 2 0 2 next steps. Angela, before we move on to talk about a couple of other bills on 2 0 2,

Smith Jones ([01:06:35](#)):

Oh, actually I think I summarized where we are now is waiting on third reading, whether it's adopted or not, approved or not, and then continue. So we'll continue to keep you everyone apprised of what the next steps are after the third reading.

Huber ([01:06:51](#)):

Can you see 1179? So flip to 1179. This is another bill impacting higher education. I don't want to say it's not as concerning because there are a couple of provisions which would impact Indiana University, but I would say the ones we would want to call to your attention, I'll let Angela.

Smith Jones ([01:07:08](#)):

So one, it limits on making any official statement on behalf of the university. It must be approved by the board of trustees outside of speaking specifically to the financial and operations of the university as we know, that would be extremely difficult to impossible to operationalize. And there's another component to it, which actually deals with intellectual property and the way it's defined covers copyright, whether it's copyrighted or whether it is patentable or anything in between. Any works by any professor in any area that's utilizing university resources. We're not allowed to transfer licensing of any of that to a known foreign adversary, which the list continues to change, which makes it extremely difficult to operationalize again because of the vagueness of the language.

Huber ([01:08:03](#)):

And that is a common theme right now. And before we leave and let you carry on with the agenda of your UFC meeting, this common theme of legislation, which when you dig into the implementation, it's just vague in how universities would actually administer it, is kind of a common challenge that we're dealing with right now. We don't see that changing anytime soon, but we'll come back to that. Other things we want to mention that impact higher education 10 0 1, we won't spend more than a few seconds on this. You have a movement across the state to find ways to fund apprenticeships and things like that from an economic workforce development perspective. These are very positive things. We appealed early on with other universities for the state to find a different funding source for these apprenticeship programs that when what was originally proposed, and that was the O'Bannon, Frank O'Bannon Scholars Program and 21st Century Scholars, which are a really important tool in funding students at four year universities in Indiana. So I'll defer to you, Angela. They basically agreed to punt that to the next session.

Smith Jones ([01:09:05](#)):

Is that right? I do want to put a pin in that, that just last year, our legislature decided to make it automatic enrollment, so we don't even know what the drawdown will be for eligible students across the entire state on utilizing those 21st century dollars and Frank O'Bannon dollars. So that was a very premature bill when we don't even know if there would be money left for students to do apprenticeships.

Huber ([01:09:28](#)):

Again, these other bills, they have an impact, but not as disruptive SB 8. The new requirements on IU, the SB 8 that we'd want to mention are,

Smith Jones ([01:09:38](#)):

Yeah, just that we would start studying the efficacy of issuing associates degrees and also looking at how do we issue degrees within three years versus four years to help the trajectory of changing curriculum and getting students out faster. So that's that one.

Huber ([01:09:57](#)):

And then some other more reporting transparency requirements. These are new things, but the idea of publishing key data on the homepage and things like that, it maybe wouldn't exactly be the way I think a lot of us would implement it, but they're bills that if passed would be at least workable to IU. I'm going to stop sharing the screen there and ask before we take any questions, President Whitten and others, is there additional context that would be helpful?

Whitten ([01:10:32](#)):

No, I think you guys nailed it.

Huber ([01:10:35](#)):

I'll say this for context if we do have time for a couple questions. So Angela and I, prior to having the honor of joining IU have worked together in different capacities, including, I think I kind of know Angela's biography now by heart because we've been working together for almost 20 years. But she recently ran DEI and Government Affairs for Health and Hospital Corporation in Indianapolis, Marion County, so includes Eskenazi Hospital. She was deputy Mayor for economic Development for the city of Indianapolis. And then we worked together when I was CEO of the Indy Chamber of Commerce and the regional EDC. Angela was the general counsel and the number two policy person, dual hat. So here's what I want to say. We've been through a lot together, including nine years ago. You remember the religious freedom laws and there was the RFRA battle and so different employer, different context, but we put together a very large business coalition Indy chamber. Our employer at that time was the first business organization in the state to oppose that legislation. My recollection is IU chose to oppose that as well.

([01:11:43](#)):

Angela and I talk about very often, especially this year, how much the goalposts have moved. And we've even said that if a law like RFRA surfaced today, marshaling the opposition would be very, very different. It would be much harder. The number of elected officials, legislators who have this mistrust of institutions has increased. And so while we will continue the opposition of 2022 and finding solutions to change 2022, as long as that five-year review language remains in, and we'll do that till the end the next couple of weeks, it is a situation made much, much more difficult. And so whatever happens in the next two weeks, and President Whitten has heard us say this, we will have to take IU out to people's communities and go five to 10 steps further than we ever have bringing the story to people in their own communities because there are just a lot of people and a lot of elected officials.

([01:12:46](#)):

It's not the majority, but it's a significant segment who don't fully appreciate and understand the opportunities and also the great assets of higher education, maybe in a way that they did 10 to 20 years ago. And I'll be honest, it has been a difficult session. I know for any of you faculty following these debates, it's been difficult as well. So we appreciate the coordination so far. Before we take questions, Angela, I mean, is there anything else that you can think of?

Smith Jones ([01:13:13](#)):

No, that's perfect.

Huber ([01:13:14](#)):

So still the game's not over. We're late in the third quarter essentially. But yeah, this one has been tough. And I'll say I'm usually an optimistic person. Next year will be a budget session in Indiana. We expect that that one will be just as tough, if not tougher. So we all have our work cut out for us as advocates.

Whitten ([01:13:38](#)):

Great. Thank you. I don't know if you guys were on the call at the beginning when Phil Goff attempted us to inspire us all with, no matter what happens, we all got to figure it out together moving forward as well. Who has questions for Michael or Angie?

Perez ([01:14:01](#)):

Hi, Rodrigo Perez from Indianapolis here. I would like to ask, what if any, is the content of the definition of diversity as it pertains to, does it just talk about diversity in general or is there any sense that diversity has some specific meaning?

Huber ([01:14:27](#)):

I'll answer and then I'll defer to Angela. Dr. Perez, it is very general, but if, for those of you who have seen testimony from the sponsor, there is no question, and this is in the public record, that the sponsor, the premise of the five-year review provision is that the sponsor believes that conservative students on college campuses in Indiana are not having their voices heard. And so one of the things that he's trying to accomplish is in creating an environment where faculty will hear all sides and also draw from a broad range of influences in their teaching that include conservative voices. I have my own views on how big a problem this actually is. We have diverse students on all of our campuses. We have international students, some of whom who don't speak English, their first language. We have first time college students who don't have the kind of mentoring and supports, and that's why we have the group scholars programs and things like that. So without being snarky, I think Angie and I have our own thoughts about the premise of the question being asked. But to answer your question, the language is very general. Did I miss anything? Yeah,

Smith Jones ([01:15:48](#)):

No. General and vague and difficult to apply.

Huber ([01:15:50](#)):

Dr. Popham IU Southeast.

Popham ([01:15:54](#)):

Yes. My question concerned, one of the amendments I was under the impression that the board of trustees mandate that had been amended and that amendment had been approved. Is that correct?

Huber ([01:16:18](#)):

The language in 202 that would have, that would've had the Indiana General Assembly nominate two trustees for all state universities, one from the house and one from the Senate, and then each of those trustees would replace existing trustees in our state universities as it, as it would've impacted Indiana University two trustees from the legislature, would have replaced two alumni elected trustees. As of last week, that language is out, and this is where, I'll throw it to Angela, but we are not high fiving each other yet because it could get tacked onto another bill. The odds, the odds of that happening are significantly lower now, but we have to stay vigilant to see if it gets added to another bill.

Smith Jones ([01:17:06](#)):

That was the word visually through until what they call a signing day, which is the last day of the legislative session. Until that day comes, we have to keep our eyes open, our heads on a swivel and just look for opportunities and places for them to reinsert that language. But at this moment, it is not in existence anymore. Right. Thank you,

Huber ([01:17:27](#)):

Cate Reck.

Reck ([01:17:29](#)):

Hello. First, I just want to thank you for being accessible. I've had a lot of conversations with both of you over the last two weeks or so, so I just want to thank you. But here's my question. There's so many faculty who are incredibly excited to be helpful and they want to be part of the solution. Do you have suggestions for this body about what's the best way for faculty to help you do your job so that they're not, I don't know, somehow getting in the way or doing something that's counterintuitive or counterproductive to your methods? So are there better mechanisms for faculty and your office working together? What's helpful for you?

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

There are a few different things, and if we do our jobs right, there would be a few different ways that faculty could contribute. One is we need, and we've talked with President Whitten about this and she has ideas about this, we need a better roadshow. Honestly, Indiana University attracts the highest amount of research dollars of any institution in the state, including Purdue. Okay? That's not known by enough people around the state. The diversity of degree programs within Indiana University is not fully appreciated by people around the state. And so one of the blessings of a very difficult situation the last three weeks, and Cate, you've fed us a lot of these great ideas, is faculty stepping up saying, I want to be a part of the positive message. I don't like it when people are saying these things about my institution that just aren't true. And so there are a few different ways, but one of them is we're going to, and I don't say this casually because it's going to take some work to organize these efforts, but taking the message to people where they are in their communities and showing them the breadth and diversity of the degree programs that we have is really, really important. I don't know if you have additional thoughts there, but

Smith Jones ([01:19:24](#)):

No, that was excellent.

Huber ([01:19:30](#)):

Dr. Jones.

Jones (01:19:33):

Thank you. I want to say first I appreciate the football analogies because basically what we're doing is adjustments. The best coaches always do adjustments. You don't keep doing the same thing and expect to get a result. So I appreciate that. In terms of your work, my question is how can we keep the positivity, because you all just listening to you, there's a positive light despite some of what appears to be negative around us. So how could we help each other remain positive in the midst of things that seem to be going against the way we would like them to go?

Huber (01:20:15):

So I'm going to cue up Angela Smith Jones. This I'm going to tell you about something she's been saying for years, and that is, I'm paraphrasing, I'm going to ask you to say it, but it's like no matter your politics, it's still Indiana and almost every one of our legislators are highly relational people and they value personal relationships. And many of you know this, many of your elected representatives or senator or your city counselors, and you have those kinds of conversations, but there's no substitute for a respectful dialogue in a coffee shop or whatever. Fill in the blank. This is your thesis.

Smith Jones (01:20:57):

I always say that the secret to working with our super majority is finding that thread of common humanity because there's something similar between each one of us and they are human. And so even if they are on the polar opposite side of where you are on some policy issue, there is a thread of commonality in our humanity, and that is the way to continue to work with the legislature. And I would say for you colleagues and peers, as we all work together, it's just really trying to, this is one of my gifts. I don't even know how I got it, but even on today, Michael and I are like, oh my goodness. And I'm like, we got to keep fighting. Yay, let's go.

(01:21:34):

So you got to just try to find the silver lining and realizing that as we stay together and work on how do we implement whatever the final legislation is with just keeping in mind, we are here to represent Indiana University. We are here to make an incredible impact on our state for our students, the talent, the businesses, the world. If that's how we lead, then we'll be able to keep that positive energy and be able to implement whatever comes our way.

Huber (01:22:01):

Two other things, and again, it's going to be on us to help organize this. I mean, we can't do it alone. So the counterintuitive relationship thing is real. So if you're a faculty member who leans liberal, a respectful relationship you can develop with a Republican is going to be infinitely valuable, or if you're a faculty member who leans conservative, a respectful dialogue with the Democrat is going to be hugely, hugely valuable. And so we have to figure out ways to broker this and make this happen. The other thing I'll say, and President Whitten, I don't want to put words in your mouth, but it's like President Whitten's been to, I don't know the exact number of counties, but it's a majority of counties in the state. We're up to 60 something. Anyway, this institution, the name IU, still means something in every corner of the state. And so don't underestimate sports and arts and culture and all of those things. Science, of course, but those things that IU brings that are real, that is a huge connection opportunity that I think sometimes a lot of us underrate medicine, don't forget that doctors, okay, yes.

[\(01:23:10\)](#):

But the last two weeks have been awful. So let me, we try to stay positive, but the last two weeks have been awful. Sorry, Dr. Kenny.

Kini [\(01:23:24\)](#):

Hey, thanks for giving a fantastic report on what is going on. After the first article that came out, I did reach out to my Republican congressman over here who represents our district in Indianapolis. I know him because from Covid times, I always have a conversation with him what's happening, and only one question I asked him, what do you anticipate if this passes the results would be, are you thinking of 10% of the faculty will leave the universities? Are you anticipating more of the conservative students will be joining our university? And he just looked at me. I have no idea. So they do not see beyond what is happening. What do you anticipate as the results of this? Because there has to be some discussion about results of it. He said, I have no clue. And he talks to me frankly about a lot of things. He said, he has no clue. That could be a point we can use whenever we pitch what is going to happen at the IU in the future. So I just thought I'll mention that my interaction with the local legislator.

Huber [\(01:24:39\)](#):

Thank you. Thank you. Again, not to keep repeating ourselves, but one of the things that Angela and I have flagged in this session, and it's been happening for a little while, but there was a time, especially those of us who've been in Indiana for some time where certain things were happening nationally, and maybe a law gets passed in Indiana, you might not agree with it, but there's at least a substantive discussion. But what a few of these bills have in common is they haven't been very thought through with respect to implementation. And that is, and I'm as much as I'm going to say right now. And so that is a trend that we're seeing and that as we prepare for the next legislative session, which is a budget session, we've just got to know. And that's, thank you for sharing that story, Dr. Kenny, and that is disturbing. Thank you. Others there? I'm checking out the chat.

Whitten [\(01:25:43\)](#):

I think we have time for maybe one more if there's another.

Huber [\(01:25:53\)](#):

Colin.

Johnson [\(01:25:54\)](#):

I just want to take the opportunity to join others in thanking you for your work. And I can imagine I was there for one day and I can imagine weeks of dealing with what you all deal with every day and being in the room is enormously exhausting. Michael, we've talked about this a little bit before, but I'll just say it in public. I just want to reiterate the point Cate made about, I think the eagerness of faculty to be productively involved in helping to advance the institution. I mean generally, but especially in the eyes of people who I think fundamentally just we've kind of lost touch with them in a way. And I think that there was a time in this institution when the Indiana legislature got kind of concerned about something. Our response would not necessarily have been to sort of try to keep them at arm's length and kind of protect ourselves from them.

[\(01:26:51\)](#):

It would've been to actually invite them down and say, come and look at what we do. We have nothing to be ashamed of. We can talk in an engaging way, in a respectful way about what we do. We can disagree with one another about things in ways that are not only respectful, but interesting. And I think that all of us need to get back in the habit of figuring out how to do that. I mean, as a civil society, but we need to get back in the habit of doing it in a kind of coordinated, thoughtful way. And I do think that the reality is, given how concerned faculty are, they're either going to do it in a coordinated way or they're going to do it in their own way. And I think it's better for us to do it together than to sort of do it in a kind of untutored way. So you all have a role to play in that, not when you're in session, not when, but after the session ends, but we really need your leadership where that's concerned, and I think you'll find many very responsive, willing collaborators amongst the faculty.

Huber ([01:28:00](#)):

Thank you, Colin. And you have shared that over the last couple of weeks. We appreciate, and again, I think it's given Angela and I appreciation for the faculty councils too, and the time that you all do spend, because when there's a thousand points of input, it's helped organize the communication as much as possible. And I believe we'll be better the next time around when we run into this situation in another session. But yeah, point taken, was something Colin just said, also made me think, you would be shocked or maybe not, how many of the legislators supporting 202 themselves have gone to IU or have children at IU. So that just is what it is. And so that provides an opportunity as well. Let's see the message from the chat.

Whitten ([01:28:55](#)):

I'm going to wrap us up now. Thank you so much, Michael, Angela, I that you all will first of all take comfort and confidence both in frankly the level of our university relations team, and this is just two of the staff. There are others that aren't here with us today. I hope that you'll be willing to share with your colleagues who perhaps have, don't quite understand the level of dedication and impact and work that goes on to address these issues. I think we all have to in 2024 also have a realistic sense of the influence that we can have in many cases, even though we will keep on fighting the fight, it is a different day than it was even or four years ago. So we've got to figure out how to navigate in that world as well. And certainly the bigger the team, the bigger the 10th, the better for all of us. We agree with that. So thank you guys so much for all the work that you're doing. Please hang in there.

Huber ([01:29:53](#)):

Thanks for your support president.

Whitten ([01:29:56](#)):

Okay, so we're going to transition now to a discussion on the academic calendars. And so to present this session, I'm going to turn the screen over to Sue Sciam-Giesecke, the vice president of our regional campuses, Rahul Shrivastav, of course, the provost of our Bloomington Campus, and Jay Gladden, the interim provost of the Indianapolis campus.

Sciam-Giesecke ([01:30:15](#)):

And I'm going to take the lead in this discussion. Just really want to applaud the RFC who took on a challenge last year or the year before. Carolyn, I don't know. Last year was maybe our first year. I'm trying to remember the dates and all of that. But our students were sharing with us that they really would prefer to have a common calendar among the regional campuses that many of them were taking

classes from different campuses. We do have a lot of collaborative degrees now, and they weren't getting a fall break together or a spring break together and those kinds of things. And it was problematic for them. So they worked very, very tirelessly. They did such a great job. They brought together a common calendar for the regional campuses. And so the next question that is forthcoming is really, should Indiana University writ large have a common calendar?

(01:31:06):

We do have students that are taking classes as we've looked at some of the data from all of the campuses, Bloomington students taking regional campus classes, IU Indianapolis, taking Bloomington and regional campus taking Bloomington classes. So students do have different breaks, and it is not something that gives them respite at a time that they really could use it. So that's kind of the history of where we are and how we've led to this particular point in time and asking for some consideration of a common calendar for all of Indiana University and Rahul and Jay, I don't know if you want to jump in or

Shrivastav (01:31:46):

I'll just echo that we've looked at the data, and again, I know the RFC particularly worked really hard, so congratulations to all of you for aligning it. I think there is an opportunity to further streamline it. Our calendars are not that far apart. They are off by only a few things here and there. I know they are further off in terms of culture, but not really off as much when you look at it on the calendar. I think having a more unified structure allows us to work in a much more synergistic way. For example, we have the accelerated master's programs in Bloomington, and they have really picked up steam. We have a couple of hundred students enrolled in those already in maybe 18 months, less than 18 months. But those kind of programs can become viable across campus if we have a more synchronized calendar. So I think there is an opportunity to do this better, and I hope collectively this group can look into possibilities and move forward.

Sciame-Giesecke (01:32:53):

I took a little bit of leadership and asked Jeff Johnson, the university registrar, what he thought about all of that, and he already has a list of all kinds of ways that he thinks we could make it happen that he'd love to share. So if there was a group that was going to take a look at this particular issue, he'd be happy to jump into that conversation.

Whitten (01:33:17):

Great, thank you. Let's open the floor for any comments or thoughts.

Goff (01:33:34):

I'll jump in, Sue. Hopefully in about a half an hour we'll be creating this new academic affairs committee, and that's one of the things the executive committee has talked about putting this on their docket right away, because there'll be representation from all the campuses in that, and hopefully that can help move things along the discussion along.

Sciame-Giesecke (01:33:55):

Good. Carolyn.

Schult (01:33:58):

If I remember right, our spring calendars are actually pretty closely aligned. It's mainly the fall calendar that would need to be tweaked. Is that correct?

Sciame-Giesecke (01:34:06):

Yep. Bloomington uses the week of Thanksgiving, which makes a lot of sense for them, right? Students travel from afar, the regional campuses and Indianapolis do something in October and just a few days on Thanksgiving week. So yeah, we're close. Real close, Tom.

Stucky (01:34:26):

Thank you. I think for me, sometimes these things tend to get down to this campus versus that campus, and it's often hard to see somebody else's perspective. So one thing I might advocate would be to identify a set of high level principles upon which everybody can agree before we actually get to the question of the calendar. And one of them that I would suggest would be student wellbeing. There's a fair bit of data, and I'm not an expert in this, so I'm only reporting what I've heard, and I suspect we actually have some folks who could talk to this issue about particularly the fall semester and being a real time of change for students, especially as they're beginning college. So it'd be really useful to keep that sort of student wellbeing as one of the, because obviously we want them to be in a position where they can effectively learn and those kinds of things.

(01:35:28):

But first and foremost, we just have to be aware that there's some real emotional and mental health challenges that many of them are going to be dealing with that, especially again in that first semester, but it could be in any semester. And what I have heard from several folks is that in particular, there needs to be a meaningful amount of time that students can physically get away in the middle of the semester. I don't know what that time is. I think if I remember right, in Fort Wayne, we actually had a three day fall break at one point, but that was like 20 some years ago. So I don't know if there's ever been a three day fall break, but it strikes me that it was longer than two days. I could be misremembering that. Anyway, point being that I would start with that high level principle that first and foremost, we want to make sure that we keep student physical and mental wellbeing as our primary or one of our primary drivers. So I'll stop there.

Sciame-Giesecke (01:36:41):

Any other comments, Colin?

Johnson (01:36:43):

I just have a question for my colleagues from the other campuses, which is I think when we've tried to think about this and tried to figure out what the kind of optimal solution would be for all of the campuses, I mean, one way to think about it is everybody loses something they have. Another way to think about it is everybody gains more latitude by kind of accepting the allowances that individual campuses have, but that then has implications for things like when the semester starts and all sorts of other things. One of the issues that hasn't, I think been touched as a possibility is the idea of making better use of finals week. And I raised that because one of the conversations that's currently being had on the Bloomington campus is a conversation essentially about how finals actually work in the year 2024 for most people, because it turns out that there are a lot of classes that still have in class finals, but increasingly people are using online technologies and all sorts of other things in order to collect final work for the semester and all sorts of other things.

[\(01:37:43\)](#):

And just schedule-wise, that entire week isn't quite populated, even on Bloomington's campus in the same way that it has historically been. Cate's making a face because chemistry. Anyway, we could put a pin in that, but the bottom line is there may be some flexibility there, and I'm just wondering as again, a rough survey, how much people on other campuses feel that finals week as it's currently configured is used optimally? Because I think if we're looking for example, for a day here, a day there that we could kind of swap around in order to make all of these things possible without endangering our accreditation and meeting minimal requirements in terms of time on task and that sort of thing, that's maybe something to think about as well. So I don't know if anyone really quickly on behalf of the regionals, since you have an aligned calendar on behalf of Indianapolis,

Schult [\(01:38:36\)](#):

I can jump in on the regionals. We also have a mix of people giving in-person finals versus just submitting final projects online. But we also have students that have, they might only be on campus two days a week for their classes because of their work schedule or family obligations, and so we'd have to be careful if we were going to try to shift finals week away from their regular class time, it could be quite disruptive for them if we tried to squish it all into a shorter period of time. So we have to be careful about that.

Sciame-Giesecke [\(01:39:08\)](#):

Jeff had a lot of great ideas that I think you could take a look at. He talked about extending class time that could be disruptive to classrooms, so there's always complicating variables. He also talked about is it possible to have some remote days so that the whole week of Thanksgiving is off for every, but maybe it's a couple of remote days rather than online days. So he was just brainstorming all kinds of things that I think would be very helpful to your academic affairs committee, Phil, as they take a look at it. So highly encourage you to bring him the business he's in is counting the minutes and making sure we meet those.

Whitten [\(01:39:51\)](#):

Great. Well, thank you. Thanks for the good discussion. And Phil, thanks for starting us off with the optimistic opportunity that there's a group that's about to be formed that can take this on for us. So that's terrific. Thank you, Sue and Rahul as well. I'm going to move us on the agenda. So next in the agenda are proposed changes to ACA 33, the Academic appointee responsibilities and conduct and STU 00, the Code of Student Rights responsibilities and conduct. Please note that this actually is an action item, so we will endorse it by vote at the end of any discussion that we have. So I will call on Danielle DeSawal, the clinical professor and coordinator of the master's program for higher ed and Student Affairs at the School of Education at Bloomington and chair of the UFC Policy Review Committee to present these proposed changes. Danielle?

DeSawal [\(01:40:44\)](#):

Great. Thanks, President Whitten. All right. I'm going to pull up a slide deck. Do we see change to ACA? Excellent. Alright, so I'm going to leave it in this form. I think that's probably going to look a little better just to let me move through it. So we're going to look at changes to ACC 33 and STU 00. I'm going to go through both because they're interconnected and then we will need to do two votes at the end, but we'll do that at the conclusion of the total presentation. So the reason for the requested changes, so IUB campus constituents came to the BFC to share concerns when looking at the implementation of STU 00,

the code of student rights last fall and concerns were expressed throughout the semester regarding the student appeal processes for those found responsible for academic misconduct in the classroom.

[\(01:41:47\)](#):

So these changes come primarily to us with a focus on students' rights to appeal their academic misconduct that they're found responsible for in the classroom. So the implications for the current language were related to that due process in that a unit, a school, college campus cannot require, according to the current language, that a faculty member has to report the case to allow a student to engage in the appeal process. If the faculty member indicates that they do not find the case, that they have accused the student of academic misconduct to be significant misconduct. So what we did was requested feedback from each campus Faculty Governance Council or Senate, and what we presented with them was what was originally an ACA 33. So what happened was in December, 2022, the UFC implemented a change to ACA 33 that added the word significant to the description of the responsibility of academic appointees to report academic misconduct or as it's phrased in here dishonesty.

[\(01:43:00\)](#):

The challenge with this was that, as you can see from the quote from the language that was presented, it was indicated that there were no changes to ACA 33 in the rephrasing of this specific component. Now that then resulted in the fact that ACA 33 impacted how we looked at STU 00. When we look at academic responsibilities and conduct ACA 33, what we would like to do is remove the word significant from C six and replace it with academic, which provides alignment with the original language that was in ACA 33 before December, 2022. And then additionally, thank you to our colleagues at IU South Bend for noting something for us to amend in order to align with what will be in the student code is that instead of using the word dishonesty, that we use the word misconduct and then that will actually align with the processes in the student conduct code in regards to academic misconduct.

[\(01:44:06\)](#):

Same changes for STU 00. So when we look at STU 00, the university task force that proposed the changes for this that had approval in April, 2024 were required to align the language from ACA 33 in the student code, even though a number of them opposed, that the fact that ACA 33 had the language they needed to align it for STU 00. Then when we tried to put it in place, at least on the Bloomington campus, we ran into lots of significant challenges. So same exact change, remove significant from part two B three, replace it with academic to align with the proposed change in ACA 33, same request. This is the only location where dishonesty is used versus misconduct in the student code. So we want to then put misconduct in place of dishonesty so it aligns and flows correctly, actually, for students to read that feedback from the campuses.

[\(01:45:06\)](#):

So one of the things that was great was when we sent this out, we got a lot of feedback back from the campuses. The campuses that preferred to keep the language the same were IU East and IUPUI faculty Affairs Committee. The campuses that supported the change were IUB, IU Southeast, IU South Bend, IU Kokomo, and IUPUI student Affairs Committee. The insight from the feedback actually provided some ideas for recommendations as we begin to move forward. The concerns that were expressed were primarily focused on the management of academic misconduct at the campus level. And so it was the submission processes for academic misconduct cases, and then clarification of when to report an academic misconduct case, which are all handled at our individual campus levels. So some recommendations request that the office of the Vice President for Student Success work with each campus to provide training and communication on the reporting and consequences of academic misconduct for faculty.

[\(01:46:06\)](#):

Really just kind of a reminder of what it is that our roles are, how that works. And then also I think simultaneously what could happen on the individual campuses are to look at the procedures for managing student conduct on those campuses since that falls under the legislative authority of the faculty. And so this would be a great time to look at what the complications are with any reporting mechanisms and discuss what that needs to look like in order to work with our Student Affairs student services units more closely. As we look at academic misconduct reporting. Two votes are required, one for ACA 33, which I recommend we do first and then STU 00. Again, I also request that we do a motion to amend this request so that it will read academic misconduct for each of those two changes and questions.

Whitten [\(01:47:06\)](#):

Do we have any questions? We'll talk about ACA 33 first. Any questions or comments? Danielle, do we need to do and vote on each one separately?

DeSawal [\(01:47:21\)](#):

Yes. If you do ACA 33 first, I think President Whitten, that'll set us up to align with STU 00.

Whitten [\(01:47:28\)](#):

Okay. Do we have a motion to make those revisions to ACA 33

Schult [\(01:47:34\)](#):

President Whitten, there's a hand up for Rachael Cohen?

Whitten [\(01:47:36\)](#):

Hey, Rachel.

Cohen [\(01:47:41\)](#):

Sorry. Just a quick question slash clarification, and I may have just missed it in your presentation, Danielle, ACA 33 is the Academic Appointee Responsibilities and Conduct.

DeSawal [\(01:47:56\)](#):

Correct.

Cohen [\(01:47:59\)](#):

Okay. But the other one is talking about student conduct. Right?

DeSawal [\(01:48:04\)](#):

So the ACA 33 is what is our essentially ethical responsibility as faculty members to report academic dishonesty. And then STU 00 was the student code. The language from ACA 33 had to be used in the student code when talking about the reporting of academic misconduct.

Cohen [\(01:48:29\)](#):

Okay. So can you just tell me again what section of ACA 33 are we replacing? Because ACA 33 has other parts about academic responsibility, and so I just want to make sure we're clear about where we are changing in ACA 33,

DeSawal ([01:48:45](#)):

Hold on. Let me re-share.

Cohen ([01:48:48](#)):

Sorry, again, I think I missed it, but I got confused about why we were talking about ACA 33 suddenly.

DeSawal ([01:49:01](#)):

Yep. Is that good, Rachael? Primarily for me to take the screen down for President Whitten?

Cohen ([01:49:25](#)):

Yes. Okay.

Whitten ([01:49:32](#)):

Any other questions?

Johnson ([01:49:34](#)):

I would just point out ACA 33 is a large rambling policy that covers many, many things, and this is not the last time we will be hearing about it this year. So it just is how it's all put together. So yeah.

Whitten ([01:49:47](#)):

Thanks, Colin. All right. Do we have a motion for that specific change?

Jones ([01:49:52](#)):

Yes. I'll make a motion to with the removal of the word dishonesty and replace with misconduct for ACA 33

Whitten ([01:50:03](#)):

There a second. Second.

Schult ([01:50:06](#)):

The academic. Kevin.

Jones ([01:50:11](#)):

Correction, academic.

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

Any discussion? Okay. All those in favor please signify by saying aye.

Multiple ([01:50:26](#)):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Whitten ([01:50:31](#)):

Those opposed nay. Okay. Motion passes. Now we'll move to STU 00. Do we have any questions or comments about STU 00? Would someone like to make a motion?

Ramos ([01:51:02](#)):

Motion to accept?

Whitten ([01:51:04](#)):

Second?

Cohen ([01:51:07](#)):

I'll second.

Whitten ([01:51:08](#)):

Thank you. Any discussion?

Schult ([01:51:13](#)):

Do we need to make the motion for those specific words again, or is that already included?

Whitten ([01:51:20](#)):

The motion is for the specific words. Is it not Danielle?

DeSawal ([01:51:25](#)):

It is. I think it'll be fine because on the slide, so it's in our documentation.

Whitten ([01:51:30](#)):

Okay.

Ramos ([01:51:32](#)):

I can make the motion per as written on the slide.

Whitten ([01:51:35](#)):

Thank you. And I assume the second still holds any other discussion? All those in favor? Aye.

Multiple ([01:51:44](#)):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Whitten ([01:51:48](#)):

Opposed? Nay. Great. Thank you. That motion passes. Thank you, Danielle. We are ready to move on to the next item, which is updates from the university's AI task force. So to present these updates, I'm

going to turn the floor over to our co-chairs who are so anxious, they got the slides up and ready to go. So Jerry and Kevin, I think you guys are on.

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

Thank you very much for the opportunity to report out on the generative AI task force, myself and Jerry. Today we will be presenting what was asked for us to give report on the deliverables, which are, as I'll describe later answers to questions that were posed in our charge. First, just a quick touchstone for us all. We're talking about generative ai, okay? We're not talking about AI plural. We're talking specifically about generative ai. And if you wonder what generative AI is, if you look at that picture carefully, you'll see that's a generative AI picture, okay? That was created adobe by Adobe in the Adobe stock using generative AI. It is not real people. So as you know, this transformative technology has entered our landscape in every way possible. For those of us who have been around long enough. Remember when we had dumb terminals in the workplace, we moved from dumb terminals to PCs, and we moved from PCs to, well, you know, the rest of the story, this transformative,

([01:53:38](#)):

some people say disruptive, technology has and will change how we work. That being said, many of you are probably using some of these tools. If you've not used any of them, I encourage you to take a look at least one of them because they keep coming on a daily basis. Now, what we were charged with doing as a task force is to, as it says, gather necessary information to thoroughly evaluate essential questions. In essence, what we're trying to do is look at how we can integrate, coordinate, and work with the various usage of generative AI across the entire campus. We know that all across all the campuses, there are people who are using generative AI. The question for us is, all right, how do we make this somewhat of a coordinated effort and look at policies and other actions to ensure that we are working toward the same ends with generative AI?

([01:54:55](#)):

So we have several questions that we are addressing. You can find those on the UFC website for further information. These are some of the people involved. Quite a great group of people have enjoyed working with them so far, faculty appointed members, president appointed members, and students. So the way to approach this task was not just all of us in the room together trying to figure it out. So we've subcommitted it around these following categories, guiding principles and ethics, faculty development, pedagogical use, research, scholarship, student use, AI skills, university, administrative function and service. And for those of us on the committee who apparently don't have anything else to do, we've been meeting every Friday, we meet sometimes two or three times a week during the week. It's a committee group of people to try to advance our understanding, our work, our policies, et cetera, around generative AI at IU.

([01:56:02](#)):

So here is what we are delivering today. Okay? Well first let me say what we're going to deliver on the 27th. On the 27th, we will deliver answers to all the questions. Okay? Summary of our findings and recommendations, a plan for integrating AI into, generative AI specifically, into the university, including goals and timelines and resources, recommendations for relevant policies, communication practices, administrative roles. Note the key is we are making recommendations. We are identifying findings. We are not making decisions. We will pass that on once we finish our work. So let's look at what we have today. Today we've addressed question one that is, general principles should govern the crafting of policy and guidance related to generative AI as the technology continues to evolve. Now, when I show you this slide, you're going to look at it and say, wow, that's all good stuff.

[\(01:57:14\)](#):

It is good stuff. But if you really do the research on this, very few universities have stepped back to say, okay, how should we guide our work and use with generative AI? What should be those ethical principles that help us in our decision making as we choose to use it for, say, an assignment or use it for, say, research or ask students to use it or engage with us with it? So we have listed a number of things based upon multiple sources of ethical practice. We've narrowed them down to this list of six. Now, due to somewhat time limitations, I'll just show you some of what this means. But we have created a fairly thorough document that we will be sharing at some point, which explains how these ethical principles apply to generative AI use. And someone commented in our group about this. They said, well, these are things that apply to all forms of teaching and all forms of research. And then they ask the question, are we doing these things? Well, the point and premise that we want to make is you have to place a stake in the ground and say, these are the things that we're going to strive toward. We may not always 100% achieve these things, but if we use these things as our guide, then it will help us to use this tool in the most ethical manner possible.

[\(01:59:07\)](#):

So deliverable two, which we have now, this is a little different. One of the questions asked us about artifacts produced using generative AI, or the fact that generative AI has been used to produce artifacts subject to the terms Public Records Act, and what policies and practices might be required to ensure that Indiana University remains in compliance. They act along those lines, pace work and broadcasting so it can read fast. Now, when you look at that, the answer is already present. The answer is present. Lemme show you how there's something called the Indiana Access to Public Records Act. Okay? And if you click on that, you would find what the legislature has come up with for that. Now, as far as IU is concerned, one of the things we understand is that it gives any person the right to inspect and copy public records. And here's the short answer.

[\(02:00:07\)](#):

If someone were to ask you about, oh, I want to see those AI records that you've been using or you've been generated, that would be something to turn over to our office of OVGc office, Vice President of General Counsel. So the answer to that question is we don't have a specific answer for it because we recognize the principle that people can ask for any bit of usage, any artifact that you have created with generative ai, but there are some constraints. And if you were to receive a request, you should refer that to the OVGc folks, they can help you. Now, something else that comes out of this, when you think about that question about the records, okay, well, again, this is somewhat settled for us. There's something called FERPA, which we all know about, okay? And with FERPA, as it applies to the Records Act, we want to consider the fact that FERPA guides how we are to release information.

[\(02:01:41\)](#):

So while anyone can ask for information from us, we know that FERPA creates some ways that protect the information from being released. So let's go further with that. As you know, personal identifiable information disclosure, access, security and consent. And one little piece to look at with regard to generative AI is consent. Now, we're going to have to evolve this a bit further, but when you are using student data, the simple answer is, well, you should not use student data in generative AI. But the question is a little more complex than that. But a guide for us is that consent may be required to use any information associated with students. Again, this is not a one shoe fits all solution. It is one that requires continuous conversation and potential legal guidance in terms of how we are to use student data. Alright? Now that's my part of this presentation. I'm going to turn you over to Jerry because those are the two things that we have delivered so far, if you will. We have answers for at the same time, the

groups have been working very productively, and Jerry's going to walk you through the progress of what the committees have been working on. Jerry,

Whitten ([02:03:31](#)):

Jerry, we're going to ask you to wrap this presentation up in about five minutes.

DaDay ([02:03:33](#)):

Okay? Yeah, absolutely. I can get through it for a very quick President Whitten. So just very quickly, these subcommittees are working on the other four questions through the lens of faculty, professional development, scholarship and teaching student use and university administrative functions. So Kevin, the next slide for faculty development and pedagogical use, the subcommittee clearly sees generative AI as being really promising and enhancing for student learning. But the elephant in the room is the potential to circumvent the learning process. So there's been some discussion around the use of GAI detection tools. Major concern with those is reliability and the legal exposure to the university. Should a student be falsely accused of using GAI on an assignment, Kevin, the next one for me. So some important considerations. The subcommittee really wants to adopt a learning first approach. We need to articulate clear course policies when we start talking about generative AI.

([02:04:29](#)):

University policies should be clear on what counts as evidence around generative AI misuse. So we're having some conversation around that. We need to recognize and honor the IP rights of students. And you're going to see in all of these, professional development is critical in each of these areas that these groups are working on. Kevin, for research and scholarship, we've had some really good conversation around policies that we might need to look at for research and scholarship. The next one, Kevin, we've spent a lot of time talking about research, data security and validation. One thing IU doesn't have is a research data management policy. And we think if such a policy was created with generative AI as a part of that, that might be able to be used in a way where, Kevin, the next slide, all of these policies that relate to research and scholarship could point to that new research data management, policy funding agencies.

([02:05:30](#)):

When we apply for funding from external sources, they require a data management plan. We could reference those policies, that policy when applying for those external funding opportunities. Kevin, under student use and AI skills, students are telling us they want and need guidance on the acceptable use of generative ai when and how it may be used. Our university really has to think about how we help students build digital competencies. And we don't want to exacerbate a digital divide where some students are using these technologies and others aren't, and the students who are using them maybe are doing better in classes than those that aren't. And so we need to really think through that. We may need to take a look at the student code of rights, responsibilities and conduct for review and possible revision. And Kevin, let me just jump to the last one here just for time sake.

([02:06:26](#)):

Down the bottom. Yep. Right there. In terms of university administrative function and service, our staff want, and they say they'll need professional development on the use of generative ai. They want education on the abuse, the misuse, and good use of GI as it relates to their roles at the university. And so a desire for professional development, webinars, workshops, and the need to identify effective use cases and guidelines for how we can use GAI. So these are the conversations that are happening at the

subcommittee level, all with a pointing towards answering those four remaining questions that are before us that are in the charge. So we're happy to turn it over for questions, comments, and input.

Whitten ([02:07:11](#)):

Great. Thank you. Thank you both for that comprehensive report and the good work that you guys are obviously doing already. Maybe we could take the slides off and invite anyone to ask any questions or provide any input at this point.

McCoy ([02:07:32](#)):

Thank you for this. And I was just curious if you could speak to some of the conversations you had about students wanting guidance and then also where you posted about clear course policies. In part because I've had students who've expressed that they have been punished by one faculty for committing academic misconduct and using it in a way that another course has told them that is entirely appropriate. And so then this gets to sort of a problem where we're encouraging them and guiding them in one case and then punishing for the same act in another course. So how have you guys addressed that? And started to think about that as a way to help our students?

DaDay ([02:08:17](#)):

Chase, it's a real issue. There's a lot of diversity and opinion in terms of how generative AI should be used in classes. I think by and large, on the task force, we know this isn't going away and it's only going to grow over time.

([02:08:31](#)):

So how do we help our students utilize it? How do we coach our students to utilize it in an ethical way? So there's opportunities to teach students about the ethical use of these technologies through assignments in our classes. But there are faculty who are saying outright on their course syllabus assignments, you can't use generative AI. And if they are using AI detection tools, they're highly unreliable. So there's real problems and we're exposing our university to potential problems if we're falsely accusing students of using generative AI. So we're unpacking this now and trying to figure out what is the best path forward in terms of policy recommendations. What it's ultimately going to come down to, I think is a lot of professional development for us. Like the days when we started standing up new online courses 20, 30 years ago, and coaching and professional development for our students as well. Kevin, I don't know if you'd say anything else, but

Jones ([02:09:29](#)):

Just simply stated, what we're working toward, and we don't know where this is, but we're trying to find a baseline across the university to bring basically everyone up to a level, wherever it is. For example, the analogy is Canvas in theory, everyone who is a faculty member should know what Canvas is and know how to use it a little bit. So the same thing is with generative AI. We need to bring everyone to that baseline, whatever that is. And then that will allow students to have a common experience across the university.

Whitten ([02:10:11](#)):

Thank you. Any further comments or questions?

Jones ([02:10:16](#)):

We do have a question for you all. If Chase has his hand again though, go ahead, Chase.

McCoy ([02:10:22](#)):

Sorry. Just one thing, as I was looking through, I would encourage you all to think about adding sort of not just the ethics of how it should be used, but the ethics of these particular systems and how I think it should be important to sort of reinforce that sometimes generative AI will reinforce our own biases. And we assume that AI is an objective thing, but it really isn't. I mean, there are a lot of articles out there about the problem of AI hotness that all images that are generated tend to produce beautiful people. And that's just one of many, right? And so I think it's something that we need to, I'm just encouraging you all to consider that as you go through and think about how to educate us on how to use these tools

Jones ([02:11:08](#)):

And good news, Chase, that's in that thick report that we have. We do look at that about bias. It's in there. So thank you for that though, Colin.

Johnson ([02:11:19](#)):

I was just saying first, I'm definitely changing the title of my class, the Fall to AI Hotness. It hadn't even occurred to me, but it seems like a real opportunity and I bet it would be highly subscribed to. So there's that. Second, I just wanted to thank everybody for their work on this. I know this was a tall order, but it's a task we wanted our colleagues to undertake. I think that you all are extremely well positioned to do this work, and I'm glad that this is an area where it's not just that we're leading and not following, we're actually producing through your work. I think a version of this that really is ours. And I think that that's a really important thing when you're kind of creating a new culture around a new tool and a technology. So thank you for that. And I guess, well, I'll leave it at that just for time's sake, but I just want to take the opportunity to thank you all. I know you've taken on a huge task

Jones ([02:12:14](#)):

And if we can leave you all with anything, please let us know if there's people we should be talking to. We're trying to talk to as many people as possible, so it's not just a little group, small group people together. We are trying to reach out and talk to various people to collect different points of view, different thoughts. So if you have those people or you are one of those people, please reach out to us and we'll talk to you and get your perspectives. And then also, as you're thinking about that, feel free to communicate about ways that faculty and students and staff are using Generative AI at IU. If you know about those things and you want to share about those, please do reach out to Jerry and I or any member of the committee task force.

Schult ([02:13:00](#)):

I saw Andrea Need raise her hand earlier. Did you want to add something? Okay,

Whitten ([02:13:09](#)):

Well, let me thank Kevin and Jerry for the good work, but I know you guys still have a ways to go. So we'll look forward to seeing the rest of the work that you're doing as well. And obviously we know that'll be just a first step in what will be a lot of product and service and policy we need to develop around these very, very interesting issues. So thanks guys, appreciate it. We'll move on to the next item, which I believe is our last and final item on the agenda, which is proposed amendments to ACA 05 bylaws of the

university faculty council here at IU. And so to present these proposed amendments, I'll turn the floor over to our UFC Co-chairs, Phil, Colin, and Carolyn.

Goff ([02:13:53](#)):

Well, I drew the short end of the straw. The short straw. So I'll be presenting, and I have to apologize, I inadvertently lied to Sue and the president. We're not actually creating this committee today because it's a change to our bylaws. It has to have a first read and discussion today and then we'll bring it back to you. What we're talking about here basically is adding two new UFC subcommittees. The current committees are the Honorary degrees committee, the budget advisory committee, policy review committee, faculty affairs technology. And then about two years ago, we created the research affairs committee. What we want to do is create two more committees, much like in the spirit of our creating the research committee two years ago. Basically we need a couple of UFC level committees that correspond to our larger academic mission. Now, when you think about faculty research, student affairs, academic affairs, those all exist on the campus level as well. But what about those topics that sort of cut across campuses more generally? And we need some sort of a way to modernize the way we do things in the UFC to keep up with how IU itself is modernized and centralized over the last several years. So we need to create venues for high level cross campus conversations between faculty and administration.

([02:15:28](#)):

Some of you have been around me for a while and you know that I keep harping on the fact that if we really want shared governance, we have to do our part in this. And that means to modernize ourselves. And by creating these in these areas, part of the academic mission, we think that we're doing just that. The first of these would be a student affairs committee, and it is for the most part, I've got to say this is all based on what we did a few years ago with the research affairs committee. So a lot of the language and the charge is the same. The Student Affairs committee oversee matters pertaining to are connected with policies and practices related to students throughout Indiana University. The UFC SAC will communicate with IUB, IUI and regional campuses, student affairs committees, and with the office of the Vice President for Student Success.

([02:16:22](#)):

The committee should advise the Vice President for Student Success and the University Faculty Council on Student Matters, collaborate on university-wide plans for strengthening the student's education and experience and where appropriate develop university-wide policies and procedures that aim to improve student success at Indiana University. Now, much like we did with the research affairs committee, the executive committees from the different campuses shall appoint nine members to this committee, two from Bloomington, two from Indianapolis, and one member each from IU East, IU, Kokomo, IU, Northwest, IU South Bend, and IU Southeast. The committee will be co-chaired by a nominee of IUB, IUI and the regional campuses and their terms will be for two years staggered. I'm going to move on and then we can discuss both of these in a minute.

([02:17:14](#)):

Alright, I don't know why. Oh, oh darn. There we go. The Academic Affairs Committee oversees matters pertaining to or connected with policies and practices related to the academic enterprise throughout Indiana University. The AAC will communicate again with IUB, IUI and the regional campuses Academic Affairs Committees, and with the IU President's Academic Leadership Council. The committee should advise the Academic Leadership Council and the University Faculty Council and Academic Matters, collaborate on university-wide plans for strengthening the academic curriculum and where appropriate developed university-wide policies and procedures that aim to improve academics at Indiana University.

This one's a little different. A standing online education subcommittee appointed by the UFC Executive Committee will report to the a c. The reason for that, if any of you have been around, when Sue Sciame-Giesecke and her crew went on their roadshow, which was really an excellent roadshow, I have to say, all with the idea of hitting the reset button on IU Online, you may, if you've been in any of these presentations, you'll know that the outside consultants report called for more faculty involvement and faculty governance, a role for faculty governance.

[\(02:18:36\)](#):

This does that. And it also embeds online education into the larger academic affairs at IU and does not segregate it aside as something different somehow or other. It is very much part of who we are right now and where we're going. So we think having IU online as a permanent subcommittee to this committee makes sense. Again, choosing members will be the same. The only other thing I'll note though, when it talks about that the online education subcommittee will appoint one committee member, therefore IU online always has a seat at the table with academic affairs and conversation can go back and forth between those. And again, the co-chaired by nominee of IUB, IUI and the regional campuses. That's it. That's the presentation. We would bring this for a vote next time, but the idea today is to take any questions or suggestions, concerns.

Johnson [\(02:19:45\)](#):

And Phil, if I can just add something just so everyone's aware, I think the idea here is that in reality, any of us who have been involved in the enterprise of Shared Governance know that councils of any sort are really important. They're representative, they serve as kind of vetting mechanisms for really important policy that affects all of us. But the reality is the hard work of sitting down and hammering out the details of policy language to be considered. And I think ideally, the hammering out of that language in direct communication with people in administrative appointments, positions who ultimately then need to use policy and collaborate with us to solve problems they're encountering. And also to make sure that what we propose as policy is actually kind of practical. And implementation really does work best when there are smaller working groups that have a clearly defined task that can deal with stuff quickly in a focused way.

[\(02:20:43\)](#):

And the system that we have right now, I think when the UA level administrative structure was a little more robust and all these other things, we've moved in a slightly different direction. Administratively a lot of that was coordinated at that level, and this body really relied on those people to sort of feed stuff into the system and to respond to it. That's changed in ways that are helpful, but it has left kind of a gap in some regard in terms of our ability to have space to do the hard work of thinking about university-wide policy. And I think that these additions, partly because it worked well with research affairs, these additions are meant even though it may look like the sort of proliferation of committees, it's actually meant to sort facilitate a degree of dimness and efficiency and effectiveness and speed. That is just really hard to achieve when you have to rely on everything coming up from individual campuses being circulated around and then sent back down for comment. That will still happen, but it will happen in a much more coordinated way. At least that's our vision for this.

Goff [\(02:21:43\)](#):

Yeah, well said. Thank you. Other comments or questions? Well, I won't be like the teacher in Ferris Bueller sitting and waiting. I suppose if you do have other comments and questions to send them to one of the co-chairs and we can take them up then with the executive committee and try to hammer out

something that works for everyone. Thought went into this. I think that the wording gives us plenty of room to roam, but also gives us some direction and creates conversation partners between UFC and university administration. That, as Colin points out, has worked really well in the research committee that we created a couple of years ago. So thank you.

Whitten ([02:22:39](#)):

Great. Thank you. I appreciate it. And that concludes our final agenda item. Thank you to everybody for the thoughtful discussion today and great presentations. And obviously I want to thank all the folks who organized and this meeting on together for us. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Goff ([02:22:58](#)):

So moved.

Whitten ([02:22:59](#)):

Second.

Ramos ([02:23:01](#)):

Second.

Whitten ([02:23:02](#)):

Alright, we are adjourned. Thank you to everyone. I look forward to seeing you in person for our next meeting. Take care.