Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
April 23, 2024 | 1:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Tower Ballroom - IUPUI

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ben Miled, Zina; Buckman, Christopher; Butters, Rebecca; Carlton, Rebecca; Cohen, Rachael; Dam, Gregory; DeSawal, Danielle; Evans, Cindy; Froysland, Hayley; Goff, Philip; Johnson, Colin; Kini, Ranjan; Kravitz, Ben; Maxcy, Brendan; McCoy, Chase; Medina, Monica; Morgan, Gin; Palmer, Megan; Perez, Rodrigo; Popham, Susan; Ramchand, Latha; Ramos, Bill; Reck, Cate; Rivas, Jaynne; Schult, Carolyn; Sciame-Giesecke, Susan; Shrivastav, Rahul; Slayback-Barry, Denise; Stucky, Thomas; Wert, Joe; Whitten, Pamela

MEMBERS ABSENT: Allen-Brown, Kayla; Barthlow, Deanna; Cycholl, Garin; Eaton, Kristine; Eisenstein, Marie; Elliott, Rob; Eskew, Kelly; Jones, Kevin; King Thorious, Kathleen; Lester, Jessica; McLean, Donna; Need, Andrea; Nichols-Boyle, Shawn; Trinidad; Windsor, L. Jack; Raji, Aaliyah

GUESTS: Lee, Karen; Prather, Anthony; Baer, Mark; DaDay, Jerry; Gladden, Jay; Holmes, Ann

Agenda

1. **Approval of the minutes of February 27, 2024**
2. **Consent Agenda** (2 minutes)
    *   U12-2024: Change to ACA-38, Faculty and Librarian Promotions – Elimination of reference to April Board of Trustees meeting to reflect the Board's new schedule.
    *   U13-2024: Change to ACA-16, Student Academic Appointments – Removal of information covered by policy UA-22, Employee Relationships Involving Students, and inclusion of referral to that policy.
    *   U14-2024: Change to ACA-21, Faculty and Librarian Annual Reviews – Replacement of "Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs" with the "Academic Leadership Council Executive Committee."
    *   U15-2024: Change to UA-03, Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Misconduct – Addition of reference to policy UA-22, Employee Relationships Involving Students (Section III.D).
3. **Executive Committee Business** (10 minutes)
    Philip Goff, UFC Co-chair, IU Indianapolis
    Colin Johnson, UFC Co-chair, IU Bloomington
    Carolyn Schult, UFC Co-chair, IU South Bend
4. **Presiding Officer's Report** (10 minutes)
    Pamela Whitten, President, Indiana University
5. **Question/Comment Period** (10 minutes)
    Council members may ask questions on the floor. Faculty who are not members of the

Transcript

Whitten ([00:02:28](#)):

Good afternoon. Hi. Well we're at 1:30, so I think we will get started. I see some name tags, but they're folks that are presenting and stuff, so maybe they're coming closer to their time of presenting. That is

some good speed walking. Nice job. Nice job, Danielle. So let me call everyone to order and wish you all a good afternoon. I know lots of us are counting down the days to graduation, but that count varies which campus you're on at this point. I know. And so for me it's all the campuses, which I say with all seriousness, which is good to hear because you guys, man, you guys know how to throw parties for our graduations. They're happy days on every single campus. So we're going to start with approval of minutes from the February 27th meeting. Do we have a motion for approval please? Thank you. So move. Second. Second. Very good. Any discussion? Okay, hearing none. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Aye. Okay. Any opposed? Say nay. Okay, the minutes are approved.

([00:03:47](#)):

Okay, so now moving to the consent agenda. So we have added consent agenda items to this meeting following Robert's Rules of Order, a consent agenda groups together items that can be approved in one action rather than having to all be addressed individually. Minor policy changes that were sent to the faculty for review in advance of the meeting are being presented as consent agenda items today, and each item listed on the UFC agenda references the minor change. Are there any items that someone would like to request be removed from the consent agenda to be considered individually?

([00:04:27](#)):

Okay. Seeing none, we don't require a vote for these items as a consent agenda. Rather, if no one has any objections, they will be adopted. Are there any objections? Hearing none. The consent agenda items are adopted. Okay. Moving on to our next order of business, which is executive committee business. We're here from our executive committee folks, actually our UFC Co-chairs. I'm trying to think of the fancy word for it. It's just not coming to mind. Today. We have the next 10 minutes for our three campus chairs, our co-chairs, UFC Co-chairs to present, excuse me, we'll start with Carolyn Schult from IU South Bend, who represents the regional campuses. Then we'll go to Colin Johnson from IU Bloomington and then Phil Goff from IU Indianapolis. Carolyn. Okay.

Schult ([00:05:23](#)):

I think Colin wanted to go last, but we can. Okay.

([00:05:28](#)):

Some of you might've heard these remarks. I gave these at the trustees meeting, but the RFC thought it would be valuable to share them with this group as well. So today I'm going to share some of the good work we're doing at the regional campuses in attracting and retaining students as well as some of the challenges we're facing in continuing that work. As I'm sure you're aware, the demographic cliff is approaching. There'll be fewer and fewer high school graduates in the coming years. The regionals have adjusted to this increased competition for students by joining an innovative collaborative and online degree programs. We offer five BS degrees in business and technology with a combined enrollment of over 1100 students. The courses are shared among the regionals. While student support services and academic advising is provided centrally by IU Online. We expect these programs to continue to grow over the coming years.

([00:06:17](#)):

Liberal arts programs can also thrive in the online environment. The online history BA degree is a model of collegial partnership between the regional campuses. It exceeded every expectation for enrollment, so graduate degrees were added shortly after the BA degree launched. I see Haley beaming with pride over there. More than 200 students are earning degrees in history during a time when the humanities are under siege in many places. So more partnerships may be coming as the campus has addressed their low enrolled programs. These are programs of too few students to remain viable to remain a viable

option on any single campus. But multi-campus collaborations may give us a way to preserve as many of these disciplines as possible. While we are striving to be good stewards of our resources, the regionals are underg growing budgetary stress that will increasingly affect our ability to teach and support our students.

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

At the same time, we are ramping up our student services for IU online. The distance education fee was eliminated, resulting in close to a $10 million negative impact on our budgets. In an era of declining enrollments, we simply can't absorb cuts of the size without impacting the services we provide. Another source of stress is the proposed increase in university administration tax and I'm looking forward to hearing more about that today. Currently the regional campuses pay a much higher proportion of their budgets for centralized university administration costs than Bloomington or Indianapolis. As the budget redesign process progresses, we'd like to see all the campuses share in the severe alignment proportionally so that the campuses with the smallest budgets are not asked to pay the highest percentage. We also like some clarity on what services are included for the money that goes into the university administration tax. I hear regionals offer the most affordable four year degrees in the state.

([00:07:57](#)):

We offer a great comprehensive education, not a cheap education. All five regional campuses rank higher in the US News and World Reports social mobility index than any of the Purdue regionals. We have room to raise tuition to release some of the stress on our budgets and still remain a very affordable option. We are doing our best to be fiscally responsible and make good use of the resources we do have. All the regionals have healthy cash reserves. Collectively, the regionals met their target enrollments for this year and are on track to do so again in the fall for the most part. But these targets are declining year by year as the state produces fewer high school graduates. We worry that the cycle of cutting fee income while increasing payments for central administration will seriously impact our ability to meet the needs of our students and region. In the face of these challenges, however, the regional campuses continue to work together to deliver the least expensive, most valuable education to a range of undergraduate and graduate students, including a disproportionate number of first generation and historically underrepresented students. This is an important mission and we welcome the support of everyone here in carrying that out. Thank you.

Whitten ([00:09:02](#)):
Colin.

Johnson ([00:09:08](#)):

So the first bit of news that I have to report is that we have elected our new president-elect, bill Ramos, who will be following Danielle DeSawal in representing the Bloomington campus in the years ahead. So thank you very much for serving the BFC. As most of you're probably aware, last week I presided over a meeting of the full faculty of Indiana University Bloomington at which a conspicuously sizable majority of the nearly 900 people in attendance opted to express through procedurally orderly means their lack of confidence in the leadership of Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs Carrie Docherty, Provost Rahul Shrivastav, and President Pamela Whitten. This meeting was convened in response to a properly executed petition submitted to me in my capacity as president of the faculty on March 28th by more than 200 members of the voting faculty, which is more than four times the number of signatories of such petitions required under the terms of section 4.3 of the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty.

([00:10:05](#)):

As I noted in my comments at the April 2nd meeting of the Bloomington Faculty Council, this was not a turn of events that I particularly welcomed, not least of all because responding to my colleagues call for such an assembly entailed an extraordinary amount of additional work on my part and the parts of many, many other people at a time in the spring semester when everyone already struggles to keep up with the crushing demands on their time and attention. I and my colleagues embraced the charge handed to us by the petitioners, however, because our constitution makes clear that such meetings are indeed the appropriate means for making "decisions not within the ordinary course of business," which mercifully entertaining motions of no confidence in campus and university leaders is not. In the weeks leading up to the April 16th meeting and indeed throughout the whole of this past year, I have been intentionally circumspect about making public statements regarding the administration's conduct. My own feeling about this has always been that participating in such discourse, let alone contributing to it, is beneath the dignity of the office that I currently hold.

([00:11:07](#)):

What has become clear to me over the past several days, however, is that other parties involved in public debate now unfolding feel less of a sense of self-restraint. I therefore find myself compelled to speak to a few talking points that seemed to have made their way into public discussions in the days immediately following the votes last week. The first is the claim that the votes that took place last week are somehow "unrepresentative" of the faculty's actual will or inherently illegitimate because they only involve 900 members of the voting faculty who are able to make time in their schedules to attend a three-hour meeting on two weeks' notice. As serviceable as this claim may appear to be from the perspective of those seeking to downplay the vote's significance, I would point out that this is precisely the same argument that the most vociferous advocates of the vote have tended to make to me both leading up to it and in its wake.

([00:11:56](#)):

Indeed, in the days following last week's vote, I received dozens of communications from IUB faculty imploring me to send the votes taken last week to the full faculty via electronic ballot, even though the procedures outlined in our constitution do not require that I do so and in fact arguably prohibit me from doing so, given the fact that the various quorum thresholds outlined in that document were very clearly met. I have resisted such calls from my colleagues because I think acceding to them would set a terrible precedent for this institution or at least for IU Bloomington, by which I don't know if anybody would like for us to be dealing with questions of things like confidence in our leaders by way of SurveyMonkey. I think that would be a very bad precedent to set, but I do want to assure everyone on both sides of this debate that we have the power to go down that road if anyone thinks that it would be beneficial. I am fairly convinced that it would not be. But if I continue to hear claims on either side that the vote is illegitimate, then we will certainly entertain that possibility.

([00:12:58](#)):

The second is the claim that what these votes demonstrate more than anything is how resistant to change my colleagues are. As convenient a story as this is to tell, it also is not borne out by facts. In the decade leading up to the most recent change of leadership at both the campus and university levels, IUB was the site of an extraordinary amount of change including the creation of five new schools, if I'm counting properly, something on the order of 140 new degree programs, the construction and renovation of dozens of academic buildings, as well. Like everyone else in the world, we also weathered a global pandemic, which involved entirely upending the way we did virtually everything. To claim that the faculty of IUB are categorically resistant to change or unwilling to entertain the idea of change simply isn't supported by historical evidence. It doesn't mean they love every change they're confronted with, but that claim is specious.

([00:13:49](#)):

The third is the claim that the faculty's vote make Indiana University Bloomington "look bad" because one of them involves IU's first female president. This is such a cynical point that I'm loathe to even address it. But more than that, the implication that my colleagues are somehow irrationally hostile to women in positions of leadership simply isn't born out by facts either. It is worth remembering that the Bloomington campus specifically was led by women for nearly 15 years. Legal scholar Lauren Robel most recently and philosopher Karen Hanson before her. Indeed, Hanson became the first incumbent of the position of IUB Provost when it was created in 2006. And I can assure you that my colleagues and I did not always agree with either Provost Hanson or Provost Robel, but they never got close to calling for a vote of no confidence.

([00:14:43](#)):

So the claim that somehow Bloomington is not supportive of women in positions of leadership again strikes me as Ill-founded. And if anything makes, there are many things making Indiana University look bad right now. That is not one of them. I understand why people are interested in responding to this series of events in the way they are, but I would just say this: It would be great if everyone could spend a little less time and energy trying to manage the optics of the situation which we now find ourselves and a little more time and energy trying to address it.

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

I'm happy to say, genuinely happy to say, that in the days following last week's vote, I have already seen evidence that both Provost Shrivastav and President Whitten are listening with greater care than ever and making genuine efforts to engage with the IUB faculty in new and newly collaborative ways, and I am grateful for that. But I will tell you this, this other stuff, the sorts of statements and insinuations I just described that seem to be circulating broadly in the media and through other routes, often the pest of people with a particular interest in shilling a particular case, does nothing to move the ball forward in a constructive manner. Quite the contrary, in fact.

Goff ([00:16:04](#)):

Okay, here we go. I want to welcome everyone to town. As you know, this will be the UFC's final gathering at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis. The next time we meet face-to-face, we will be hosted by IU Indianapolis. A lot of work has gone into this transition and I want to thank my colleagues, some of whom are here in this room. Between the Vision 2024 working groups and the 2030 strategic plan committees, over 400 faculty and staff both dreamed together and then got their hands dirty. When the president and board first announced the realignment, two years seemed like plenty of time, actually I think it was just enough time. I appreciate the dedication and energy given by so many of my colleagues to make this happen. Like everyone around this table, we in Indianapolis will be diving into the various facets of the implementation of what once was SB 2 0 2.

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

I appreciate the president's and administration's working with the UFC and individual campuses where so many of the existing frameworks already exist for the new five-year reviews. When the UFC Executive Committee met with the president and the Academic Leadership Council's executive committee last week, it was clear that we are on the same page about the importance of getting this right and having faculty councils and their existing committees play a significant role. We in Indianapolis share the rest of IU's concern about how the DEI aspects will play out in the long run. We understand this will be a developing story and we need to wait for all the information to be collected to begin any work in earnest. In all of this, we pledge our continued cooperation and maintaining our commitment to DEI

principles for our faculty, our staff, and our students, especially people of color and those part of the LGBTQ plus community.

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

This faculty is suitably proud of having received the higher education excellence in diversity award, which recognizes colleges and universities that demonstrate an outstanding commitment to diversity and inclusion. Having won it all 11 years the award has been in existence, one of only five institutions nationwide to do so, we will need to be ever vigilant in this area in the coming days to retain and attract good people who can help us achieve our goals for the region and the state. Finally, after 31 years as a professor, I've recently developed a habit of celebrating my personal Thanksgiving in November and my professional Thanksgiving in April and May. So I want to offer here my thanks to Lana Spendl, who runs the UFC and the BFC with incredible grace and tons of savvy. The only person on her level by the way is Karen Lee, also around the table who makes the engine of IFC not only run but run on time and in the right direction. And I want to thank my UFC Co-chairs, neither of whom I knew before this year. Your wit is matched only by your deep wisdom, and I thank you for both, as you made me both laugh and learn. Finally, thank all of you for your service to the UFC this year and I'll see you in the fall at IU Indy.

Whitten ([00:19:20](#)):

Very good. Thank you to all three of you for those updates and perspective. So the next item on the agenda is the presiding officer's report, which would be mine. And so let me start by saying that we know the end of the academic year's rapidly approaching as I acknowledged before, and it's been an eventful year to say the least, with many wonderful achievements by students and faculty and staff that we should all be celebrating. However, we also have troubling global events and legislation closer to home that we're all living with and are going to be continuing to live with, I think we've all come to appreciate in the coming years ahead, as well. And so the university's 11th president, Herman B Wells, he helped build IU and particularly the Bloomington campus into what it is today. Really a world-class, public research university campus grounded in the liberal arts, which of course we seek to retain, that offers an outstanding education across a wide range of disciplines, as was acknowledged in Carolyn's comments too. Its renowned faculty across all of IU are leaders in their fields, conducting groundbreaking research and imparting knowledge to students, as well. And so at IU in Bloomington and at all of our campuses, greatness isn't just a goal, it's our legacy, it's our identity and it's really our promise moving forward in the world. But to ensure the continued greatness of our campuses, we have to acknowledge the challenges that present themselves today, challenges that are bigger than any one of us. Among these are challenges to our sources of revenue, a growing skepticism about the value of higher education and a political climate that's marked by deep partisan divides. And I think that frankly is probably understating that last challenge. And I also want to acknowledge that these challenges are not insurmountable with all of us working together. Our campuses can still come out on top and indeed rise to even greater heights.

([00:21:24](#)):

But to achieve that in the 2020s and beyond, our approach has to be different to some extent. And so in the spirit of the importance of honest, direct and transparent and sometimes awkward conversation here at the UFC, which I think is so important, I want to address last week's vote of no confidence by the Bloomington faculty. And I want to just speak straight, if I may. So I want to begin by saying that receiving input from faculty, a group of faculty through whatever form they choose is always helpful and can be instructive as we work to move forward together. No matter what form it takes, it's always helpful. Many of you on this council represent campuses that weren't part of the vote, so I thought I would take just a minute and recap the elements of the petition to the Bloomington Faculty Council to

call a special meeting to consider the votes of no confidence in the provost and the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and myself.

([00:22:19](#)):

So the petition employed by the BFC for the faculty meeting and vote states that the administration has encroached on academic freedom and shared governance and provided the following specific complaints, which I will just take a few moments to address. I won't belabor them, but I will just take a few minutes. So the first one is sanctioning faculty. And a few faculty members have indeed been sanctioned, but only one faculty member, Professor Sino, and I say his name because he has spoken so much to the media and other places and been very public and his name has been very public. Only one professor has chosen to go public and has selectively given information to promote his side of the story rather than the full investigative findings. And of course, I'm going to say this, because it's true that I'm limited in what I can address publicly, and because there's information that we can't share, this matter has been misinterpreted.

([00:23:18](#)):

I will note that this case involved a long-term history and an array of considerations including weighing patterns of behaviors from those involved in navigating conflict between university and campus policy. But all of us have to hold ourselves to a higher standard. And when behavior rises to levels that are unethical, threatening, or even illegal, we just can't tolerate it. It's my understanding that the professor in question has not shared a complete picture of this situation and however frustrating it may be for people not to have the full situation, certainly those people that have had to work on this issue, this really challenging issue, as I said, I'm unable to share the entire file, other than to share with you there is much more than has been made public that exists.

([00:24:09](#)):

The second item on the petition is canceling art exhibits. And again, I actually am only aware of one instance where this happened, the plan exhibition by Samia Halaby. And I will confess that the decision that folks had to make regarding this cancellation was agonizing, absolutely agonizing, such a struggle, not who we are and not who we want to be at all. And I hope we never find ourselves in that position again. We take pride in IU's legacy of artistic excellence and in our commitment to displaying and engaging with powerful art, that's who we are and that's who we will continue to be. It was not a decision made lightly. It was actually to be a three-month event, and due to security concerns that would've continued for months, combined with public safety resource limitations at the time the decision was made, that there just was no choice. And I appreciate the frustration sometimes in hearing security and safety issues. So let me be clear, let me be a little clear, if I may. There was and is a desire across campus to have many, many events, especially in this time and age. Most people don't see the extent that public safety and others behind the scenes are having to work on a continuous basis to address and manage and frankly try to keep people safe. So a desire across campus to have many events, sometimes deemed controversial, particularly related to the events in the Middle East. We have a finite number of public safety officers at the university. This is a problem everywhere. It's every university, it's every city and town that I know of. Everyone has limited public safety officials. We would hire more if we could. We would hire our way out of this problem if we could. They don't exist right now. We would use funds to hire more security if we could in a lot of situations. The resources just are not there all the time anymore. It's just different than it used to be. If you know of people that are interested in being public safety officers, please encourage them to come to IU, because we certainly need more. So we have a finite number of public safety officers at the university, and if we'd arranged to cover this event for three months, it would've impeded our ability to be able to safely hold many, many other events as well as daily operations of our university. And when we talk about daily operations,

we're talking about things like Greek parties, and fraternity parties often require a little sport, as you can imagine. Arts performances, big sporting events, crimes, there actually is crime that goes on campus or attempts at crime that go on on campus on a regular basis. The calls that we have about perceived threats and harassment that have escalated since October 7th tenfold, all the time, they're happening all the time. And then just the daily security that happens at an institution, as well. Again, we don't like this, but we have finite resources, and I can't stress enough my sympathy and empathy for frustration with this decision.

([00:27:37](#)):

This was a Sophie's choice, frankly. So I will say that the Bloomington campus has successfully hosted, because it always wants to get to yes for events that people want to have, it doesn't matter what your perspective is, it doesn't matter what you want to say, we want to say yes, we always want to say yes. So the Bloomington campus has hosted approximately 85 Muslim and/or Palestinian/pro-Palestinian events in the last seven months. And these are just the formal ones. These are not the ones where groups of people are chasing after tour groups and other things going on on campus. These are formal events happening. A vigil for Palestine in Dunn Meadow on October 9th, a rally held by the Palestine Solidarity Committee on October 28th that drew about 200 attendees, a Palestine teach-in at the IMU with three professors and over 130 attendees back in November. Students for Palestine vigil at the Sample Gates on November 11th, the Palestine Solidarity Committee hosting IU professor of ethnomusicology David McDonald to discuss the music history of Palestine in the Global International Studies Building. That was in December. December 7th, A PSC protest at the Sample Gates on February 10th, weekly sit-ins at the Starbucks in the IMU in Bloomington, student group meetings that occur virtually every week. And many of these events require security and that security is important. There is a risk to safety for people, and you guys are, I think, probably seeing things on the news now that demonstrates what happens when emotions escalate, as well.

([00:29:17](#)):

The campus also hosted at least 43 Jewish events since October 7th, including the lighting of the Menorah at the sample gates of course in December, on the 10th, multiple Shabbat dinners including a Shabbat dinner for a thousand people in Dunn Meadow, that was successfully held on the campus, an event called Faces of October 7th that was held in late January, a webinar on antisemitism, Jews, and Jewish culture on April 15th, and many, many others. And a lot of these events were held at Chabad House and Hillel that have required extra security for folks at those sites, even though they're off campus, because they're considered IU events.

([00:29:59](#)):

A third specific item on the petition stated that the administration failed to proactively and effectively stand against the Indiana legislator's violations of academic freedom and faculty protections. I don't think anybody at this university understands the faculty's frustration and concern about this legislation more than I do. I want to be very clear. Our government affairs team worked tirelessly and actually with some success in adjusting the language of various bills. But particularly when we look to Senate Bill 2 0 2, which we're going to talk some more about in just a minute, I was the only state university president to make a public statement raising concerns about Senate Bill 2 0 2. And I was surprised. I put it out there and thought, okay, all my friends are going to get on this bench with me and waited for their statements and realized there was not going to be another statement from a university president. And indeed there were, I believe two universities that were in support of this legislation as well. So just as a reminder, back in February and February 7th, the statement that I issued was, while we are still analyzing the broad potential impacts of Senate Bill 2 0 2: We are 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 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, 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.

([00:31:51](#)):

And I stand by that, and I have even as recently in the last few weeks reiterated that feeling with people in our general assembly. In addition, I actually aggressively supported university organized faculty testimony to highlight our collective concerns. IU was the only state university that organized faculty to express their views on that legislation. And of course the faculty that we organized and invited to express their views were not coming to express views in support of that legislation. They went to the State House and sat for an eight-hour day to wait to express their concerns about that legislation, as well. So we are living in a time that is so different than it was even a decade ago, and no doubt we're going to sometimes be unable to influence the outcome of some legislation in a state with the political climate that we're in. And so I want to make sure we all have clear expectations and understanding of what I am actually able to influence and do in the state in terms of legislation.

([00:32:50](#)):

The next specific item on the list is that we unsuccessfully attempted to separate the Kinsey Institute from IU. And so I should say that our aim from the moment that the legislation passed, barring state from funds from supporting the Institute, our first and foremost aim was to ensure that we protected the Institute and its powerful research. And so we sought external legal counsel, we worked internally with the director of Kinsey and other folks and made clear that our goal was an outcome that would protect the Kinsey Institute and ensure its long-term success. Nothing less than that was going to be acceptable. This is understandably an emotional issue to many, and a number of things were posted and said that did not reflect the actual process of determining a decision for Kinsey. And so after the initial proposal to separate the Kinsey Institute, we heard the consensus from the Kinsey constituency. And so the provost gathered data from multiple sources, and he charged a working group to host listening sessions, find the issues, and determine ways to address them. And so we came up with a final structural decision that was shaped by extensive faculty input, as well external stakeholders' input, and ultimately approved by the IU board of trustees. I would suggest that this is actually a good example of working collaboratively and taking our time, not rushing and arriving at what we hope will be an effective solution for our beloved Kinsey Institute.

([00:34:23](#)):

Fifth, the next item on the list is that we disregarded the 2022 faculty vote in support of graduate student workers who sought to form a union. And so I have to say that a decision about a graduate student union is actually above my pay grade frankly, but I do want to clarify that in my first year at IU, and I came in the summer of '21, and that fall, much to my surprise, there was a huge outcry from many graduate students about compensation, just kind of came out of nowhere. It was huge. And so I asked for a review of compensation for student academic appointees and found that they had been asking for multiple years, and no one had responded, and they were right, they were under undercompensated. So in that year, we announced an increase in the minimum stipends. We also waived mandatory fees and affirmed our commitment to ensuring that minimum stipends would remain in the top half of the Big 10 peers. This year we conducted another review and found that to remain in the top half of the Big 10 peers as we had committed, we needed to raise stipends again. And so we'd done so and this was announced some time ago, and it's effective July 1, as well.

([00:35:34](#)):

And the sixth item on the petition is that the administration to publicly support IU faculty member Dr. Caitlin Bernard. And as a reminder, she was the physician who garnered some publicity right after the abortion legislation was passed in the state of Indiana. And so in this case, I actually joined executive Vice President for University Clinical Affairs and dean of the IU School of Medicine, Jay Hess, and President and CEO of the IU Health System, Dennis Murphy, on July 27th, 2022 in affirming our support for her academic and clinical excellence. We actually thought it would be more powerful if the three of us came out with the statement together. And we made it publicly, as I said on July 27th, 2022. And that statement read as follows: Dr. Bernard has always demonstrated sincere concern for the wellbeing of her patients and the education of her students. It's what makes her a well-respected doctor, researcher and educator and a member of the faculty in good standing with the IU School of Medicine, as well.

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

So those were the six specific items that were listed in the petition, but I want to go further than these six items. As I said in an email to the Bloomington faculty, I pledge to listen and learn. I don't have all the answers. I need to hear from people and understand what the issues are and also hope that people will come forward with good ideas so we can address some of these things, because I heard one faculty member say, it's just not the campus it was 30 years ago, and I don't know any place in the world that is what it was 30 years ago. There's just been so much significant change. So over the summer, I plan to take steps to better understand where there are issues of concern and where there are opportunities at the campus and school levels, to engage with the faculty on matters of importance to them and to the university.

([00:37:31](#)):

So Danielle, in the spirit of two-way dialogue, I urge you to bring things to my attention sooner rather than later. Please don't wait until there are two weeks left in the semester to come to me with things. I'm committed to working collaboratively with you and our faculty. And of course it takes multiple parties to communicate effectively, and I have gladly taken a seat at the table, and there's plenty of room for everyone else to come, as well. And I would ask that you please extend the same practice to Rahul and Carrie. They are both good people, working from a place of integrity and the entire university community will benefit in the coming years by enjoying a respectful dialogue with them as they navigate almost impossible situations. I know they will listen, because I know how much they care. I've seen it.

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

I want to move on and take a moment to acknowledge the Indianapolis faculty and thank them for all the hard work they've done this year. It's tremendous what you guys have done and pulled off. It's an amazing feat. I also want to commend you for being forthright when you brought issues to my attention and sometimes you brought stuff to me that I pushed back, but you pushed harder usually as well, and for being willing to work through hard issues. So grateful, that's so important, which has frankly in Indianapolis led us to where we are today on the verge of launching a campus that will serve students and this city even more effectively. It's just an exciting time here on this campus. And I also want to speak to our regional campuses for just a moment if I can.

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

In many ways, we all should take a moment and recognize that our regional campuses really are our heroes and should be our heroes in many ways. For years, they have dealt with falling enrollments and budget challenges. I mean four years, it has been the norm on regional campuses. But despite these challenges, the members of IU regional campuses get up every day and they go to work serving students in their regions in remarkable ways. And I'm on all of their campuses multiple times a year and they've

got a bounce in their step and a smile on their face and they figure it out. And it has not been easy and it's not going to get easier. I mean, I recognize that. It's part of the challenge, but it's not unique to regional campuses in Indiana. This is the norm everywhere in the United States for regional schools.

([00:40:06](#)):

Sometimes I hear rumors that there are plans to close regional campuses. I hear that from folks. Let me be clear. The rumor is entirely untrue. And I should tell you, I don't even know how to ask you to please be cynical when you read things on social media because unless you see it publicly said, it is not true. And the range of things that I read about myself or planned activities are sometimes funny and sometimes scary. This is a case when there are rumors of closing a regional campus where it is not true. And so all of you on a regional campus today, I want you to bring that message back to your campuses if necessary. We have hard work ahead of us to address the challenges the campuses face. We do. I don't want us to fool ourselves. We're going to have hard conversations and we'll remember what's important and always focus on those values.

([00:41:07](#)):

But if you hear a false rumor on social media about closing a regional campus, please do your part to dispel that myth. We're not closing regional campuses, we're not closing them. They're there. They're such an integral important part of their communities that they will remain and they will figure it out and we'll help 'em figure it out and then someday things will turn and swoop back the other way. Okay, let me transition now and talk a bit about IU strategic plan. So as you all know, because so many people are participating in it, our trustees have charged us with making difficult but necessary decisions to ensure that IU emerges as a leader among elite research universities. And of course, we're doing that through IU 2030 strategic plan. And as I have said multiple times before, I'm so impressed by the active participation of thousands of members of the university community who help set goals through their work on committees and their input and open forum as well.

([00:42:06](#)):

And so we're still early in the implementation process and there's still a lot being designed. I know that, but we're already making impressive progress and advancing our three pillars. And this summer we should have a dashboard launch that will highlight success in some of our metrics. So it'll be public and you can all go to it all the time, as can people who fund us and lots of other folks, and they can see the progress that we're making in a lot of the important metrics that have been set by our various campuses as well. Okay, so let's move to the happy topic of Senate Bill 2 0 2 if we can for just a moment. So whoever the magic man is with slides, perfect. He got it.

([00:42:49](#)):

We need to talk for just a minute about this past legislative session, in particular 2 0 2, regarding faculty tenure and other pieces that I thought. I've met with the UFC executive Committee actually a couple of times, we've talked through this, but I thought it might be helpful if we all talk through what I've talked through with the executive committee and then we can see if there's any questions or even further suggestions on better ways to handle things. And so I promise I'm keeping this bite size, it can overwhelm pretty quickly. So if we can go to the next slide.

([00:43:28](#)):

So we know that this was a bill that was signed into law by the governor in March, and the bill entails four key components. And the four components include new reporting requirements, formal complaint process requirement, tenure and promotion, and a fifth-year review. And I know many people are referring to it as post-tenure review, but it's actually a fifth-year review because it applies to all faculty. I

just apply to faculty on the tenure stream, DEI positions programming and required statements, and the effective date is July, this July just coming up. Okay, next slide. Okay, so if we look through the new reporting requirements, the law mandates new reporting, which is going to capture the number of DEI-related staff and instructional faculty, both full and part-time. It also requires that the reporting of the number of adjudications from people who have submitted formal complaints made based on the lack of efforts to foster intellectual diversity across the institution and in accordance with the required process outlined in the bill.

([00:44:39](#)):

And so in order to address this, we already have robust reporting and tracking processes, and we have relevant units that are reviewing data and practices to ensure readiness to report as requested by the state. So the people basically who manage the data should have the process to be able to gather this and report as required by the state. I should add the caveat that let's just say nobody in this room wrote this legislation. It is ambiguous. It is so ambiguous. You could drive a Mack truck through it, and there's so many places where we have no idea what it means. And I know you guys are going to have lots of specific questions. The UFC exec committees has been great about bringing up some of those questions. We have a whole team of people being led by project manager, Mike Beam, and a number of other people that are all over this and working on it.

([00:45:35](#)):

But it's not going to happen overnight. It's going to take some time to do. But I want to be clear that you could ask me for example, well, what exactly do they mean by intellectual diversity? You tell me. I mean, literally there's not a place you go to understand a lot of these concepts and constructs that are in this legislation. And so we will hopefully use that to maintain the approach that we would like to take toward things as we'll see in just a second. Okay, next slide On formal complaint process. So the law mandates the implementation of a formal complaint process for reporting potential instances of non-compliance of fostering cultural and intellectual diversity. We have existing conduct policies on campuses across the university, and we have an anonymous reporting hotline. And so these should fulfill this mandate. So we don't need to build something new, we don't need to start from scratch and define it in some way when we have something that is in place that a lot of people designed that seems to be working.

([00:46:49](#)):

So we're just going to leave it alone. We're just going to start with this. Next slide, please. Tenure and promotion and the five-year review. So the law requires considerations of intellectual diversity during tenure and promotion processes. Law requires a process for a fifth-year review and promotion review. The law outlines predicted speech as it relates to tenure and promotion considerations. And so this is a little bit of an old slide. So it says University Faculty Council executive committee and others will work collaboratively to identify what needs to be done. We've done that and so we actually have a process for what's coming next. So kind of hold that thought. Let's go to the next slide and we'll come back to that hopefully in the last slide. This is, I think, an older set of slides than we used the other day. So maybe some

Sciame-Giesecke ([00:47:46](#)):

[Inaudible]

Whitten ([00:47:46](#)):

That'd be nice. Thank you. I don't know what version I have, but okay. Let's see.

Sciame-Giesecke (00:47:55):

I think that's what was instead of the

Whitten (00:47:59):

Okay, so what the new slides should say. So basically we met with university UFC exec Council a couple times, and in the last round we agreed that to do this, the work moving forward, we needed it to happen on campus levels, right? Because every campus has their own promotion-tenure process. Everybody's got their own annual review process, everybody's got different ways they come at policy that's in place for some of these things as well. And there was no desire, I have no desire to try to attempt to make a one size fits all across Indiana University. That just seems illogical to me. And so rather than this be a UFC task, we're going to push the work to the campuses and the faculty councils at least will start it on the campuses to figure out how each campus is actually going to pull forward. So in this case, the campus faculty councils will identify what needs to be done to meet the requirements in alignment with existing structures and policies. And I can't state that strongly enough.

(00:49:13):

We have things in play that work. So if they work, we don't need to change them. So if you're happy with the way your departments have defined in their bylaws all the things you need to do for promotion and tenure, you're good, right? I mean, that already exists, so that's fine. And we'll move on. We don't have to reinvent the wheel. Everything almost that we need for this July 1 date, we should have because they exist on our campuses already. And so my attitude is why wouldn't we use what we have already worked so hard, what your faculties have worked so hard on all these years and updated and made the acceptable standard for activity. So each campus is going to identify what needs to be done, existing annual views, ethical contact, and protected speech. So what you already have on your campuses are going to be the foundation.

(00:50:13):

What exists will just roll in and on July 1st, we'll say, this is all the stuff that addresses this. And then we'll need sufficient consistency and transparency all across the campuses. And that's really what's going to be key. And we'll talk about that in a second. But we can't have a campus where some people, some departments reliably do annual reviews and some don't. Right? That would be an opportunity for the general assembly to ding us, right? How can you argue that? Let's say that your campus decides a fifth-year review is a process that's done based on the annual evaluations for the prior four years. And if the annual evaluations for the prior four years are acceptable, then the fifth-year review is acceptable. I'm just using that as a hypothetical. I'm not saying that's what should be the case or will be the case, but just as a hypothetical, if that were the case and you have units on your campus that aren't giving annual evaluations or they're not consistent or transparent or thorough in regard to what's in somebody's contract, then we'll get dinged, right?

(00:51:21):

Can't be a smiley face on an annual evaluation. It's not going to suffice. So there'll be some work probably for faculty councils to do to make sure that that's the case. And some people have told me, oh my gosh, yes, it's fantastic. I was at Kokomo yesterday. And they're like, oh, no, Pam, we got that at Kokomo. And then I've had people from other campuses going, oh, I don't think so. So I have no idea that will be for the campuses to work out. The new DEI and intellectual diversity requirements. I have no idea if this is the right slide anymore. So I'm just going to talk off the current slides and we'll make these available to you guys since we have a disconnect. So the new law requires that certain DEI positions programming and offices promote cultural and intellectual diversity. That is the phrase that the

legislation wants used and requires that the phrase cultural and intellectual diversity and underrepresented students be included in language related to campus diversity committees in certain DEI efforts.

([00:52:20](#)):

So if we were to have a campus committee on some aspect of DEI, we would need to make sure it had the words cultural intellectual diversity in there and underrepresented students in there in some way in the description. But that's it. I mean, no, nothing. We don't have to do anything with them, we just have to insert them. So maybe we'll just have a catchall sentence we stick at the end of everything that says, this committee addresses cultural intelletual diversity and underrepresented students. We'll find a way to make sure that the language is included in whatever is necessary. The new law also prohibits consideration of diversity statements and affirmations in admissions, enrollment, and employment decisions. And so we know in an admissions and enrollment, the Supreme Court ruling that happened before didn't really affect us because we haven't really done, we haven't used various demographics for admissions decisions on any of our campuses.

([00:53:21](#)):

We're not a highly selective institution. I think the most selective of all our campuses is pretty close to 80% acceptance rate. So it's really the schools that have real challenges with so many people apply, and they only have a few spots that are going to be challenged by the new Supreme Court law, the employment issues related to employment. We have to figure out how we're in compliance. So we've got people working centrally and units are going to get a memo detailing what a unit might need to do to ensure compliance with this, if anything. So that's coming. People behind the scenes are working on that for various units. And so then the next step for campuses, let's see if that slide's there. Let's roll the dice.

([00:54:07](#)):

I think this is right. So if you can see this, ensure that annual reviews are occurring in alignment with existing policies that I just talked about. So whatever policy exists on your campus for doing annual reviews, you make sure that it's actually occurring on your campus. Outline, a process for conducting fifth-year reviews aligned with existing annual review processes and structures. So that will be a second thing for each campus level group of people to work on. Campuses will need to ensure that initial tenure recommendations take into consideration the expectations of fostering free expression outlined in Senate Bill 2 0 2. We are looking into it, but we've always been a university that fosters or promotes free expression. So we'll see if the language contradicts what we've always done in relation to that expectation. And then, as I said, the anonymous reporting hotline that some people refer to as ethics points, it's it's one and the same.

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

We'll be where IU collects complaints related to the free expression elements that are outlined in Senate Bill 2 0 2. It's where IU already does collect them. If someone wants to register a complaint, it already occurs at the university through this capacity. So it's an established system with academic issues resolved through faculty affairs in the Office of Institutional Equity. And we'll try it. We'll see if it works. I mean, we'll see if this is the right answer to this particular issue, and hopefully it is. And if it's not, we'll come back and fix it. You guys will come back and fix it, right? If it's something that needs to be tweaked or adjusted in some ways. So the way we left it was each campus faculty council president over the summer is going to come up with how they want to design, how the campus is going to work on this.

([00:56:08](#)):

And I understand that your faculty councils all work a little bit different, and they're going to let us know by July or so, middle of the summer, because it says fifth year reviews, so we don't have to do the fifth year reviews. July 1, we can take some time. I guess technically we could wait five years, but we'll see what everyone wants to do. So we have a little time, and in the ensuing period, Mike Beam and his team are going to figure out more, hopefully learn a little bit more, maybe get some more information from ICHE. So we're a little bit more educated about this. And obviously there will be a liaison assigned to each faculty council on each campus to work with you related to this. And then over the fall semester, I suggest you take your time and work with your faculty as appropriate, and we'll get it figured out. Anybody have a question or a comment or a better suggestion?

Goff ([00:57:17](#)):

I like it.

Whitten ([00:57:19](#)):

You like it? You get to do it. Okay. Very good. All right. Let me. I know I've talked a lot today. I'm just about done. Let me just maybe transition for just a second. Whoops.

Stucky ([00:57:38](#)):

President Whitten.

Whitten ([00:57:39](#)):

highlights, and I won't take much time because

Stucky ([00:57:41](#)):

President Whitten, I apologize. So one thing that had come up in the IFC meeting most recently was there was at least one faculty member had noted that there was a September reporting requirement, and that was engendering a fair bit of consternation among folks about things happening over the summer without them, without most faculty being around. So I think the group here understands that we've got some time, but if there's any way to sort of distribute that message that no, it won't happen while you're gone and you just come back to some completely fully formed

Whitten ([00:58:23](#)):

Sure. Like an update message.

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

Yeah.

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

Okay. Yeah, absolutely. It's a good idea. And nothing would be done, especially now that we're going to have this mechanism on each campus, and I would be surprised if Mike doesn't have some type of working group that's a representative from every campus that don't occasionally get together. I mean, I suspect you guys will want to share ideas, or at least maybe it'll be a commonplace for updates because they're going to learn stuff in the coming weeks and months that we just don't know yet, or we're going to learn that we're never going to know and we'll proceed forward. But no one's going to be making decisions without them going through the campus level, the things that would affect a faculty practice.

There could be things on data you have to gather that we have to turn into the state and stuff that will be handled behind the scenes, but not anything that would be a faculty impact. Thank you.

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

Okay. Quick spring semester highlights. With its official launch just over two months away, the number of applicants from potential first-year students for IU Indianapolis indicates great excitement for all kinds of reasons and all kinds of things have been done, but it would be remiss of me even though she's not here today, not to acknowledge Nancy Paton, the new Vice President of Marketing Communication, who is doing a lot of work in a lot of areas we never did before. And every metric indicates that you do have to talk about yourself publicly as a higher education institution. So in part, I'm sure that's not the only reason, but as of April 8th applications for IU Indianapolis for fall are up 17.2% over one year ago. And admits are up 11.2% year to date as well. So that's really wonderful news. Congratulations. We're seeing success in our efforts to enhance fundraising productivity.

([01:00:11](#)):

As of the third week of March, 181.4 million had been raised, which is 44% more than the same time a year ago, which is great. IU's regional campuses. We're selected to participate in the American Association of State Colleges and Universities Student Success Equity Initiative, the program, which is funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. It's a comprehensive multi-year initiative that's designed to help institutions close to the equity gaps of their black, Latino, indigenous, and low income students. It's a wonderful initiative. Little 500 was held this past weekend, and each year the IU Student Foundation in Bloomington raises money to support a student focused initiative. Really warmed my heart today to see that this year's campaign partnered with the office of the Chief Health Officer to de-stigmatize mental health on campus. And so they're raising money to build a mental health space on campus that students can use for a mental health break in between classes. Three juniors in the Department of Biology in Bloomington were awarded the prestigious Goldwater Scholarship for the 24 25 academic year.

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

These scholarships are given to students who plan to pursue a research career in science, math, or engineering. IU's newest Goldwater. Scholars are Alik Malaka Casey, Lauren Ren Garcia, and Rose Nicholson. And I'm confident that they're going to represent IU with distinction as they participate in this exceptional program. And of course the biggest, the most important highlight of all is the 20,005 students who will earn degrees on our campuses around the state next month. I look forward to celebrating with them and their families and of course all of you as well. And so that concludes what I hope the longest report that I ever give at the UFC. We have a few minutes allocated for a q and a time for any campus lead up here. Anybody wanted to ask a question? Okay, I'm sorry.

Rivas ([01:02:29](#)):

Yeah, thank you for the opportunity to ask the question. Well, I was glad that you mentioned it about the regional campus closing story on the media online because I believe that the closure of regional campus, despite is not something that is planning to be in the short term. I would like to know more about a well develop explanation, not me, I mean in my campus about our future. It's not clear. I understand your plan is not to close it now, but I also agree with you about the importance in the regional economic development of the campuses.

Whitten ([01:03:22](#)):

So first of all, please don't use the word now at the end of your sentence. You said, I understand you intend not to close the regional campuses now. Take the now off. We're not closing the regional campuses.

Rivas (01:03:33):

I understand you are not going to close and I agree with, and I support your statement about the importance of these campuses in our economy in Indiana, the rural Indiana. However, you must also agree with me that those rumors have some basis. For example, in the IU East, the centralization of the online education was a big, big, has a very big impact because we lead and we develop all the online education and it was closed suddenly. What you say about regional campuses being financial struggle was not true for us. We were in a very strong financial position even during covid. So right now we move it from that situation to a situation in which we have a new chancellor that is telling us we are failing in our financial situation and we have not achieved our goals when we have been working many years on developing the program that is right now the collaborative program. So the main point about, I mean this is one of the impact for IUE, but also there has been other changes, important changes tied decentralization of position marketing, internet, technology. As a business professor, I understand the cost efficiency of these measures, these measurements. However in our campus, the question is how far are these cost efficiency measurements or the strategy is going to be taken? That is my question, my concern

Sciame-Giesecke (01:05:45):

Are you talking about the IU East campus?

Rivas (01:05:48):

I'm talking about the whole campuses.

Sciame-Giesecke (01:05:49):

All the regional campuses.

Rivas (01:05:51):

How all these rumors about closing the campuses are coming are right now in people's mind and a speech because there's several measures that has been taken, cutting positions, centralizing things. So the concern of people is how long are going to be taking these measures or these measurements.

Sciame-Giesecke (01:06:18):

I appreciate you sharing that particular concern. As obviously someone who's lived on a regional campus her entire career, that is my passion is to be sure that we are sustained and we will be sustained. We are all five regional campuses, are an excellent financial health. And I want to say that again, we have good cash reserves, 20, 22, 25 million. We have been successful and we have been very prudent. We are doing cost efficiency measures because we have lost a tremendous amount of students. And so for example, at Southeast, what was your highest enrollment at Southeast? Probably almost 8,011. It was 72, 7200 we're down to about 3200, 3200. So that's a tremendous loss of 5,000 students over those years. The facilities are the same, the faculty numbers are the same. This is not financial exigency. So we have maintained the faculty. We have to find some ways to save some efficiencies in order to survive.

(01:07:32):

South Bend was in the same situation. I dunno what your highest tuition, I mean student was, it was over 8,000. 8,000. There're about 4,200 now. So the situation is one with a very much of a declining student population, but the faculty population has not declined at the same rate because they're tenured faculty members. We have not removed any tenured faculty members. We're continuing to try to find some ways to use some of the central services at IU to take some of the burden off of the campuses. That's one strategy. Other strategies are to continue to look to the IU online portion and now each campus is about four to 500 students and I just heard just before I came to this meeting that we're seeing that about 32% of our undergraduate enrollment in online is coming from outside of Indiana. That's what we need because Indiana isn't growing young people.

(01:08:30):

We don't have enough students in Indiana, so we have to reach out to the United States to see if we can pull some students in. And we've done that. So the regional campuses are lifted up by about four or 500 online students. So we're going to continue to try to build that. We have several spokes in the wheel that we're trying to do, but there is, and I reiterate what President Whitten said, there is no even close chance and I think Dwayne when he comes up to talk about university that there's no close chance that any of the regional campuses are anywhere near close of a financial exigency. So those are complete rumors, have no standing in them. We are right now in a pinch of some funds because of some of the transition of the distance education fee to the current model. But again, we have significant, IU East for example, is about a million dollars. They have significant $22 million in reserves and they'll be able to meet that challenge through that cash reserve. So I appreciate your concern.

(01:09:34):

I would say that there's probably nobody who speaks more passionately about the regional campuses to the president who's always listening about how important they are, how we must help them to get over this hurdle, this huge hurdle of a demographic challenge. And we will get over it, it will turn and we've got strategies and we've got great chancellors who are doing really good work to ensure that, and I think we're working very hard at it. So I appreciate your concern, but I think we are moving towards this and again, faculty are good and the budgets are good and our programs are good, but we have got to change the way we look a little bit when you dramatically decrease almost in half your size.

Rivas (01:10:21):

Thank you Susan, for your answer. I also, I mean I appreciate your answer, but I also want you to let you know that I'm not talking for myself, I'm just talking about how these rumors are created and how would you address that? It's not about me, it's about would you address that because it's like you are mentioning something in one direction but what people is seeing is actions in another direction that campuses are getting smaller and smaller, people is moving out. So it's just how you manage that contradiction so people feel safe and don't start to believe in rumors that are not true.

Sciame-Giesecke (01:11:02):

I think all of our chancellors are doing really good work of being very transparent with the budget, very transparent. When President Whitten came, we sent targets of what we thought we could be, could our enrollment be and let's get that target out there and then let's go after that target. Let's quit talking about 8,000 students and let's get to where we really could be and we have set those targets and then the past two years we have met those targets. So we've got it. Now we know about the size and a 3000 size institution is a great size of an institution to do the work that we do with the students that we have. So I think we're in good stead with the size that we have with the faculty that we have. We're going to

continue to do efficiencies as we possibly can to make sure that we're using our resources where our students are and I am happy to come as are all the chancellors and their financial officers to address any kind of rumors or any kind of concerns that people have. Just was on the Kokomo campus yesterday, on the east campus last Monday. So we'll continue to share that story because I can hear your anxiety and I can hear your angst about being at a place that you see is dramatically declining. What is my future? And I can tell you there is no one more passionate about making sure that we continue to do this work than I am.

Whitten (01:12:23):

Oops. I think we've got time for one more question. Yes.

Cohen (01:12:25):

I think this goes with this. I guess I'm a little confused and it's great to hear the regionals are doing great, but for the last seven to eight years, every presentation I've heard in the budget is the regionals are losing money, losing money, losing money, and I think that is the conversation everybody has heard for the last seven to eight years. So this is the first time I've heard that the regionals are actually doing well and not, and so I don't even think it's rumors that it has been the story since I've been at IU for 10 years now, and so it's really interesting to suddenly hear, oh no, it's not the case at all. I don't know where you got that, because that is the presentation we've been given for 10 years. So I think you have to talk, you're going to need to start talking to a lot of people to turn around the conversation if that's not the case.

Sciame-Giesecke (01:13:29):

Well, I think the conversation, the message of the past 10 years I would say, and you all can help me with that one, is that the regional campuses are losing students, which means that they're losing enrollment, which is they're losing tuition increase. So yes, they are losing money, right? As students decline, you are losing the resource which is tuition and state appropriation based on that number of students. You're right on that one. They are losing money and we've been saying that for seven to 10 years, but it's not really losing money, it's losing enrollment, which means that you're losing revenue and as you lost revenue, you still have the same structure, the same physical plant and the same faculty and you still have that to deal with. So you have all these expenses but you have less and less revenue. So you're absolutely right. What I'm saying to you now is that we have rethought what those enrollments should be and we're finding ourselves about 3000 to 4,000 depending on the campus.

(01:14:30):

We know that that's a good size. We know that we can support that with the structures, et cetera that we have and we have found that we can maintain that enrollment, that revenue source, and so we can make sure that these institutions are healthy and are delivering the services they need to deliver. So that's the good news that I'm saying to you now is we've done the hard work and we are at a place that's really good. You're absolutely right. For the past seven to 10 years, some campuses more than others. I came from the Kokomo campus, we had growth the 10 years that I was there, so the different, East had the same thing. So different campuses experience different things at different times. You're right, we lost money, we lost revenue because we lost students. It's just the way maybe people are phrasing it. Hopefully that helps you a little bit.

Whitten (01:15:25):

Great, thank you. All right, Dwayne, if you're ready to provide your report, I think we are ready for you.

Pinkney ([01:15:30](#)):

Okay.

([01:15:33](#)):

Let's see. Oh, it was on before. Okay. Thank you President Whitten and thank you all for the invitation. I will walk through, I have about 12 sides here and I will not read them word for word, but I want to give you a picture of where we are with the UA budget for 2025 and to do that I'm going to start with a refresher of budget redesign. We have talked about the budget redesign in several forums including lead sessions earlier in the year or last year and at the provost retreat in Indianapolis as well. But for refresher, the budget redesign is aimed at, or I'll talk about the what is it? It is a move transition from the more traditional RCM budget to a hybrid budget model where funding for central administration and funding for the campuses is established at the same time as opposed to happening in one place in isolation and then budgeting funds being moved to another place. It is a more seamless process and the why to improve our overall budget process, the efficiency of that process, and I'll say a bit more about that when I get into a bit more of the details, but also to make that process and the resulting budgets more transparent and to better align our resource allocation to the IU 2030 strategic plan. When this will happen, the first phase of budget will happen in two phases and the first phase of redesign will be implemented with the FY 25 budget. The second phase, the campus allocation processes for FY 26. So to drill in a bit more on the UA funding model and to consider a little bit why change here, and again, it is focused on developing a more efficient, more transparent and less complex budget model to reduce and eliminate a lot of the assessments, the transfers, the chargebacks that we have in the current model as we move money around to fund central administration and to base fund recurring needs as opposed to having a budget that is sufficient for one year but not necessarily sustainable going forward.

([01:18:08](#)):

And I won't read all of those, but the focus on having a more refined process, a more efficient process and a more well run process is why we are underway with this funding model. The UA funding model. Some of the current funding mechanisms that we use to establish the UA budget, there's the university subsidy or the tax, there's the tax and assessments, I'll talk a bit about that and also internal recharge. So what is the university tax? University tax is a broader assessment to the campuses that moves money from the campuses to central administration to stand up those units, and assessments are direct. So for specific things, the campuses have direct assessments that they also pay in addition to the tax. In addition to the tax and the assessment, there are also these internal recharge or billing arrangements. There are transfers that take place for a variety of services and many of these are one-off, some are more group related, but there are just a number of these mechanisms that are in place that move money from the campuses to central administration. And our efforts again are focused on standing up the UA budget and supporting those costs that are well-known. They are established, they do not go up or down with a wild variance. And so providing a more stable budget, a more stable budget environment is a high priority.

([01:19:56](#)):

Some of the functions. This next slide is just to give you a picture of some of the functions and the organizations that are encompassed within administration because oftentimes when we talk about university administration, and I find myself doing this and I hear it often as well, it is like some disembodied entity that exists separate and apart from Indiana University and separate and apart from the campuses. And I am doing all that I can to stop that from playing in my own head and the way that I

communicate to change that and also as I hear that characterization to do everything that I can to change the way that we're thinking about administration because administration is seamless. The things that happen in university administration and this list is illustrative. It is not exhaustive of the things that happened within university administration, but everything that happens there happens for the good of Indiana University and the campuses.

(01:20:57):

The work that happens on the campuses cannot happen without the support, the services and the compliance functions that reside within central administration. So we just have some listed here, but I've said in many forums that everyone can relate to payroll. I know that there are people on the campuses who are involved in that process, but if there was no central payroll, whatever transactions they're submitting, whatever paper they are pushing or buttons they're pushing would go nowhere. It would stop and no one would be paid. And the same is true with purchasing and travel and all of these activities that make for a well run university, not just one campus, all of our campuses and all of the university. So this is just again, an illustrative list, not exhaustive. So to focus on the budget itself, the university administration budget for FY 25, we estimate that the expense is $352 million.

(01:22:01):

That is our best estimate to date. We don't think that that is all because again, we know that there are these arrangements, these billings and the transfers that exist that we are working tirelessly to get our arms around and to get our heads around. But these things are, you think you found them all and then another pops up. So we are working and we'll continue to work to find those, but our best estimate is this is our true cost of administration today, but the campus contribution that we are asking for FY 25 is $309 million. So that delta between what we think the real costs are and the contribution, we will find ways to support that delta for the next fiscal year or two. We know that we have work to do in terms of finding efficiencies within university administration, but not just in central administration but in all administration.

(01:23:03):

So we'll be working tirelessly to control our costs, but we also know that cost containment and cost control is not the total. The only response will also have to be focused on how we share and how we split revenue to support these functions. But for FY 25, that number is $309 million. When the president saw the $352 million, she pushed back on us, on me mightily to get that number lower. And so we have established that lower number for FY 25. We will make that work and we're committed to doing the work to get that number down. I will say this and you'll see in some of the later slides that that $352 million, even though it looks daunting and it is because it is a big change from one year to the next, even at that 352 million level, Indiana University is a well run university by and large.

(01:24:06):

We have opportunities to be more efficient and to be smarter in how we distribute our effort and cost across the university. But even at that higher number, we are not a runaway bureaucracy and you'll see that in one of the later slides. So a bit more about the 25 budget. What that budget will do is obviously it will continue to support the base budget that we have for the current year. It will also provide for salary increases at the 3% level that we're doing for all of IU. It will also accommodate not all but a good deal of the alignment and recharge that I've talked about. So we've got our arms around a lot of that and that is included. That alignment and recharge is from the university administration to the campuses. It does not include the billing arrangements that exist on the campuses. That will be in the phase two work, but that's not what we are referring to here.

(01:25:06):

This is primarily between the campus and UA and to some extent within UA itself, the UA charges itself for certain things and so we are eliminating those charges. IU online is not included in that number. We'll continue to focus going forward on eliminating the billing from UA outside of the preliminary funding model and then the recharge centers and of course we'll continue our alignment of core operational activities, things that are moving from the campuses to central administration, human resources, information technology, marketing and communications. And in all cases that work is happening in cooperation with the campuses. It's not that anyone is going in and just grabbing these functions and pulling them over where it has been determined that it makes more sense to do that work centrally. That work is moving over and the budgets are moving with that work. So these are not new positions, this is not new cost.

([01:26:07](#)):

It's moving the cost from one place to another. So that last bold line at the bottom is an indicator of where we will be in FY 25. If you control for the salary increases and the realignment, the UA budget is relatively flat for FY 25 at the $309 million. You've got salary increases and you've got the realignment and that's what the UA budget will include for FY 25. Some future considerations will obviously continue to identify efficiencies. I've talked about that within UA and with our colleagues on the campuses. Phase two budget redesign, I've got in here that it will start. It has already started. That work is underway. I have seen and or met with the working groups, Bloomington, Indianapolis. I know the regionals are underway as well. Then that last bullet down there, we will have to, it is imperative that we build a long-term financial planning tool.

([01:27:13](#)):

I know that departments, that units that the campuses have these tools, but we don't have a tool that we can use across Indiana University so that our planning is aligned and integrated so that we know when we are planning, we're not just planning for cost on the campuses, we're not just planning for cost within university administration. We're planning together so that we know what all of those costs are and to the extent that we pull the levers to address those costs, we're doing that at the same time. So that will be a pretty signature achievement for us to have that integrated planning. Some other future considerations, we'll be tracking savings. We've had savings to date as a result of the changes that we made within UA and between the campuses in ua. Most of that savings has been distributed. We didn't move that to the center.

([01:28:08](#)):

If for example, a unit moved some people from the campus to it, it in many cases covered the cost of that move and wherever they were saved those savings stayed on the campus. That hasn't been the case in every example of an alignment, but there have been some savings and we're tracking those because not that we want to scoop them up, but we want to make sure that we're documenting and demonstrating what those efficiencies are. And again, some other considerations for UA billing, we're going to focus on the billing and the recharge, not the campus. What happens on the campus in this first phase of work and we won't get all of the UA billing for July one. We'd love to get it all, but we know that we can't. So we'll continue to do that work. This will also we'll be automatic chargebacks payments that we make for utilities and certain things will be excluded like external billing and contracts and grants.

([01:29:10](#)):

We know that we'll have to have chargeback or internal recharge for contracts and grants. If you're putting an expense on a grant, you have to have an established rate. And so we'll continue with that. That will be excluded from the work that we're doing. The work will happen in phased approaches.

Those first two phases are concurrent. The second phase will go a bit longer. We'll be doing a deeper dive in some of those areas and then that more integrated planning that I've talked about in that third phase, we're really trying to pull this all together between the campuses and central administration. Some concluding thoughts for 25, again, the best estimated expense, 352 million. The campus contribution for FY 25, 309 million. Again, that bullet that if you adjust for the compensation increases only and for the realignment or the alignments, that base operational budget for FY 25 will be relatively flat.

(01:30:18):

The majority of the university's 4.2 billion revenue remains deployed on the campuses. The 309 million campus contribution to UA translate to 7% of the IU total revenue budget. And that kind of goes back to my earlier remark that you are not just a bureaucratic organization where all of your money is going for those important services that we talked about and we know that we need to fund them and stand them up and support them reliably, but that's what our budget looks like. Even at the 352 million, you might be in the 8%, you are still in the single digit area and in many organizations an overhead of 30% is not unreasonable. We don't are not asking to go to 30%, but just for context and perspective, this is where we are. The phase two of budget redesign will focus on campus allocation models and this is where we will need your focus, your effort, your attention. I know that you're already engaged in that work it it's critical work central administration. We will be involved and engaged in that work supporting our campus partners to pull that work through for implementation in FY 26. It goes without saying that this work is complex and complicated, but our focus is on the long-term health of Indiana University and aligning our budget, our budget model, and our budget process with our strategic direction, which is one of the primary motivators in doing a budget redesign in the first place. So thank you.

Whitten (01:32:07):
Any questions for Dwayne? Everybody still awake?

Pinkney (01:32:15):
I have that. That

Whitten (01:32:16):
Was not intended for you Dwayne. Sorry. I've been sitting here for a long time.

Ramos (01:32:18):
When do we stop saying RCM?

Pinkney (01:32:23):
I think we'll be in a place to say that we have a hybrid budget model and that will be an accurate characterization of the way we do budgets at Indiana University.

Schult (01:32:38):
So I'm happy to see the 352 down to 309 million and you say that translates to 7% of the total revenue. So there's a lot I don't know about the budget, I'll say that, but why is the percentage so much higher on the regional side? I think all the regions are in double digits in terms of what they contribute.

Pinkney (01:32:59):

Economies of scale.

Schult ([01:33:01](01:33:01)):

Okay. It still seems like you're picking on the little kids.

Pinkney ([01:33:08](01:33:08)):

I would be remiss, thank you for asking the question. We will be, I have committed with Sue's advocacy and the president's to doing a rebate exercise in fiscal year 25. What that means is there is an algorithm somewhere that is in the lore of history at this point about how those costs are allocated among the campuses and we will be revisiting that algorithm and being more explicit about what those drivers are and we anticipate that there will be relief for the regionals as we do that work. And we will be doing that work in fiscal year 25 for implementation in 26.

Whitten ([01:33:59](01:33:59)):

Okay. It looks like there are no further questions or comments. So the next item up is the report from the UFC Budgetary Affairs Committee. So I'll now turn this over to Mark Baer's, an assistant professor of acting and directing up in Gary IU northwest and it says Ann Holmes from the Fairbanks School of Public Health. Is she here?

Baer ([01:34:19](01:34:19)):

Yes. If you want to come down and join Ann, there's a place for you.

Whitten ([01:34:22](01:34:22)):

There's a place with your name on it.

Baer ([01:34:27](01:34:27)):

Thanks everyone. So Ann and I have co-chaired the budgetary affairs committee this year and it's been a pleasure to work with everybody on the committee. You can see the names there. The committee kind of came to life in November around the LEAD session focused on the budget redesign and we realized quite quickly that the membership of the committee this year, I believe I was the only returning member to the committee. So as Carolyn just kind of mentioned, there was a lot of learning to do for committee members and I think this year I want to thank, Dwayne stepped away, but I want to commend Vice President Pinkney for engaging with this committee. You can see the, let's see.

([01:35:24](01:35:24)):

We met not only with Dwayne but with a number of other financial leaders across the system to try to understand the finances of the regional campuses to understand the finances of IUPUI and IU Bloomington a little bit better and to learn about this process. So just an overview of what the committee learned that has been echoed here. The overall financial health of the institution is good that there was a concern that was echoed in a number of meetings that further cuts in particular at the regional campuses or other units could impact the ability to serve the missions of those campuses as we've known them, the IUPUI is suffering some enrollment recruitment drops as well, but perhaps is rebounding now. So it is interesting to have worked with Dwayne over the spring and seen the evolution toward today's presentation with regards to the UA funding and the budget model. And I think there's been good interplay with the members of this committee and the financial leaders asking questions and learning on this front. We are concerned. I think a reasonable concern, professor, is the, as we

reorganize the budget and centralize some services, how will we evaluate the efficiencies that are gained? How will we evaluate the success of centralized services? Will those services retain the quality that retrain or improve the quality that they have been in the past? I think is an important question that the committee's been asking. Is there anything else on that topic?

Holmes ([01:37:47](#)):

Just that there's a scale effect. There's a scale effect and so part of this is we've got two campuses that are probably large enough to be able to support these support services independently, but if that were to happen, we wouldn't support the regionals adequately. And so there will be a trade off I think, and it comes out at IUPUI often that when we have had centralization in the past, there's been a decline in responsiveness and how do we evaluate that? We heard similar comments from our friends in the Bloomington campus and we haven't seen beyond a suggestion of a survey, how we might evaluate just how well they perform in their support services once it's been rearranged.

Baer ([01:38:36](#)):

Right? And also just a kind of squirreliness about will there be savings with regards to the economy of scale, but how will we evaluate those savings? How will we know what we've saved? Do we have a goal for what we're saving? There's clearly some unclarity there, clearly unclarity, if that makes sense. So just some lingering concerns having gone through this six months of meetings that came out of discussion from the committee pay equity now that graduate student instructors have been given support, does that line all the way up through adjunct and lecturer positions as well? Do you want to address the IUPUI bullet points there?

Holmes ([01:39:40](#)):

Well, I didn't realize I had to speak, but okay, so there's a concern at IUPUI when we were asked by the UFC presidents to come up with any campus specific concerns and the one that came up, there were two really that came up when we touched base with IUPUI. One is we are going to be a smaller campus and that there will probably need to be reductions in the fixed overhead to support the smaller campus. And all that largely depends in part on how we will negotiate fees with the Purdue side and how we might negotiate fees with the school of medicine when the school of medicine does whatever the school of medicine does. I have after 30 years given up trying to predict that one.

([01:40:30](#)):

The other thing that came up mostly with the IUPUI and the regional reps was concerns about how IU online has changed or is changing and being able to figure out how that's going to impact particularly the regionals who seem to have bought into the previous IU online, which was more of a degree completion program rather than what's emerging now, which is more programs of scale. And so that's all transition costs and it's just a matter of knowing what's going to happen and then having the magical ability to forecast the economic impact. I'll go back to the comment that was raised earlier about the regionals and their economic position. I will say our first meeting with Dwayne Pinkney, he said everything is fine financially and literally anyone who wasn't from Bloomington went. And so we had Yebei.

Baer ([01:41:34](#)):

Yebei.

Holmes (01:41:36):

Come speak to us and for the regionals what was really clear is that they have gone through a tremendous amount of pain recently over the last five years. So they've had their enrollment drops, they've also had a substantial cut and that's what they're feeling and I think there needs to be some way of reassuring that the cuts have started to plateau and I think it would really benefit if we could have three and five year pro forma type budgets tied to enrollment guesses. I know we do that on our campus and it helps a lot. So if we could see that and the average hides so much, on average we're doing great, but there are specific entities, specific campuses, specific programs within campuses. I'm sure they're really feeling the pain and just to respect when people bring those pinch points to your attention. Is that good?

Baer (01:42:34):

Yes. Thank you so much. You can see why it's been a pleasure. So as we kind of hand the committee off to the next year, I think things to watch are equity and salary compression, of course, evaluation of the UA investments that we're making now for both quality and efficiencies and improved communication across the system of faculty governance. I think this has been a successful collaboration this year.

Whitten (01:43:11):

Terrific. Thank you. Does anyone have any questions?

Rivas (01:43:21):

Sorry, in the budget when you mentioned evaluate the efficiency about the cost we are saving when the new integration of the services, I wonder if you plan also to have evaluation of the quality of the services. I mean it is worthy to have very cheap service or save money if the services is not providing the quality or covering the expectation of the different campuses. How we can address that?

Holmes (01:43:56):

Well that's part of the recommendation for the evaluation and at this point I think VP Pinkney has suggested we do surveys and there's been some pushback from the committee members as to whether that would be adequate or not, but it's probably a good place to start or my qualitative research friends would say you do some kind of qualitative research and focus groups. I don't know, it would have to be coordinated with the administration however,

Baer (01:44:34):

But we did share that. We shared that concern in the committee. Anything else?

Holmes (01:44:42):

And it's in the report as well. If the committee turns over 100% again or 95, they'll know they have to look at it next year.

Whitten (01:44:51):

Well, very good. Thank you for your work. It's important. Is there a question over here?

Kini (01:45:00):

Yeah, I have a question more of a clarification. As the income from the end, the downsizing takes place at the regional decreases, then we are moving towards centralization of services. The savings from them will handle the declining enrollment of the campuses. That's the conceptualization. Is that a bottom line? I know vice president said 3000 students. Is there a bottom number? At which point we say we are in serious trouble? Is there some simulation that you guys have done?

Baer (01:45:39):

Is there a bottom line

Kini (01:45:43):

Or maybe I'm not clear. Are you

Sciame-Giesecke (01:45:44):

Asking if there is a bottom line of the number of students?

Kini (01:45:46):

At which point even the savings that was made by the centralization is not accommodating that then we are in serious trouble? Is there something that in the projection we are seeing, 3000 is fine, our savings from the centralization of services is accommodating regional campuses. Is that some number you have in mind when it comes down? We are in dire straits.

Holmes (01:46:09):

The cost savings that I referred to earlier were done at the campus level.

Kini (01:46:15):

Pardon?

Holmes (01:46:16):

The cost savings that I mentioned earlier. When we're talking about the past, say five years, where the budgets appear to have been brought back into alignment, have been done at the campus level,

Baer (01:46:31):

Usually

Holmes (01:46:33):

Cutting that has been done at the campus. So the concern is going forward to do a better job. I think there has been a tendency, at least on my campus, to have aspirational goals that were consistently missed. And so every time we missed them, it caused anxiety and depending on who your dean was and who your chair was, the anxiety was pushed down to the faculty level is to suggest that we do projections going out three years, five years. That's what we've been doing at Indy with reasonable enrollment targets, which I believe is what you were alluding to. And then if you miss your enrollment targets, if they've been conservative, then it's a real problem as opposed to what I think in the past has been a gap between reality and aspiration.

Whitten ([01:47:39](#)):

I think that's really well said and it's important. When I first came here, at least on the original campuses, the enrollment numbers used to budget were from years ago. So South Bend for example, would set a budget based on an expected enrollment over 8,000 and then every year be in crisis mode because it didn't come anywhere near 8,000. And that's part of the good work they did was they actually did a market study to look at what are reasonable realistic enrollments and then to rightsize the budgets based on those enrollments and that's a really important piece of it.

([01:48:16](#)):

Well, I say we move on to artificial intelligence. Jerry, are you ready to present for us the report from the AI Task Force?

DaDay ([01:48:24](#)):

Sure, thanks President Whitten. Can you all hear me? Okay, so first I want to thank everyone for the opportunity to serve on this task force. Believe it or not, it was a lot of fun. As someone who really doesn't know a lot about generative artificial intelligence, I learned a lot from the other members of the task force, my colleagues, I'm speaking on behalf of my co-chair, Kevin Jones. He's actually at a conference today giving a talk on generative ai, so he sends his regrets. Just a very quick reminder on what our charge was. You all presented us with six questions that you'd like us to answer and in our report that we submitted last month, there's a dedicated section to each of those six questions that we did our best to try and give the UFC and the president some things to think about what we might do as a university moving forward.

([01:49:12](#)):

The report is a product of all 16 members of the task force comprised of faculty, staff and students, and as well as folks from the administration across all IU campuses. We met weekly between January 18th and March 22nd as a task force on Friday mornings at 8:00 AM and then we had a series of subcommittees focused on some specific topics, the general principles of generative ai, which is really a big part of our response to question one in the charge that you all provided to us. We had a faculty development and pedagogical use committee, a student use of generative AI and skills, a research and scholarship committee as well as university administration and service. We did use generative AI to help us generate the report. We gathered lots of data, we gathered lots of meeting notes, we generated a lot of content and we actually used a program that Fawzi in our Luddy school had developed and we used Microsoft copilot as well to summarize our meeting.

([01:50:13](#)):

So we actually used generative AI quite considerably in doing our work. Over that two month period of time, Kevin and I worked with without a Maxwell to compile the final report in a great group of colleagues, step to the plate to write various sections of the report as well. If you've read the report or you still need to look at the report again, I mentioned we respond to the six questions that you poses to us. We offer an executive summary with some recommendations as well as a couple of appendices. The recommendations are just some ideas that the university might think about for some near steps and maybe some long-term steps that we might pursue to get our arms around generative AI moving forward. Basically, I think what our message to all of you and to our colleagues across Indiana University is this is not going away.

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

It's only going to get bigger and it's only going to grow. And it's not just chat GPT. There's a whole plethora of tools out there in terms of generating images, video. It's only going to grow over time. And our graduates, our current students and future students are going to enter the workplace with the expectation that they know how to use these tools. And so we need to help them in learning how to use these tools in responsible and ethical ways. And if you're like me, that's going to require a lot of professional development for me and maybe a lot of you in how to do that. And so one of our core recommendations is we need a lot of professional development across the Indiana University system on how to use these things in constructive and ethical ways. The university really should consider equipping its community with the tools and technologies to maximize the opportunities of generative ai, the knowledge and skills to navigate this rapidly changing technology through training and professional development.

([01:52:08](#)):

We need a structure in place that evolves with technology and the societal shifts that are happening and really leveraging the resources and expertise on our campus. So we think professional development is a big thing, and we also think we need some kind of enterprise solution, enterprise tool where we have confidence that that tool is being used in an ethical and responsible way. When you enter stuff into something like chat GPT, it can become part of the model. Our implementation of copilot that we're using and piloting on our campus, that's not supposed to happen. And so we need to make sure we've got smart people around the table who can ensure that when we enter things into these models to help us do our work, it doesn't ultimately become part of that model.

([01:52:53](#)):

In terms of integration and use objectives, we really believe we can leverage generative AI and do some really great work in the curriculum. There's opportunities to promote personalized learning and high impact learning. What I mean by personalized learning, we know there are students that could benefit from using generative AI in terms of translating. We have international students and how can we use generative AI for that purposes. But if we can do professional development for faculty and thinking about how they teach their courses, use generative AI to help build rubrics, to help build assignments, to help build resources that students can use, maybe that will free up time for us to do more project-based learning with our students, more high impact practices with our students in our classes. We think there's opportunities to ensure equitable outcomes as long as we make sure that there's no digital divide in how these tools are, in terms of how our students can access these tools, we think this is a great opportunity to accelerate scholarship and discovery again, if used responsibly and ethically increasing efficiency of our existing work processes.

([01:54:02](#)):

I've shared this with a couple of colleagues, what copilot can do, if you're in Microsoft Teams and you're transcribing the meeting, you could push a button and copilot summarizes the entire meeting for you responsibly. Ethically, you need to go check those notes. You just can't post them. But these tools can't help us in doing our work at this university in a more efficient way, and I think we can do a better job using these tools to cultivate innovation across all of our communities. We also recognize that these tools post risks and challenges. The elephant in the room is about academic integrity. A lot of our colleagues are thinking, well, how do I know students are cheating using generative ai? One thing we talked about a lot in our task force is that these AI detection tools are not reliable right now. They cannot tell if something was generated with AI by a student or some combination of the two.

([01:54:56](#)):

So if you're going to accuse a student, you use generative ai, and I have this tool that told me you use generative ai, you're standing on very weak ground, you're standing on quicksand because there are no reliable tools. We might recommend any university, explore some tools, should faculty wish to use them, but ultimately we need to have conversations with our students in our classes about what is the good use of generative ai, what's the misuse and what's the abuse? There are obviously privacy and data security risks. We can't take student papers and throw them into chat GPT and say, did you write this? That just became part of chat GPT's model and you've taken student data and dumped it in there. We shouldn't be doing that. And this comes back to, again, the need for professional. And in terms of risks and challenges, we know generative AI is going to impact employment in our society.

([01:55:51](01:55:51)):

It's going to create social inequities. How do we deal with that as a university? How do we prepare our students with the digital competencies they're going to need to be successful upon graduation? Our near term recommendations are to establish generative AI ethical use guidelines right off the bat. What is good use, misuse, abuse? What are ethical violations for faculty, staff, students in the multiple publics that we engage with, maybe explore the efficacy and the procurement and use of an AI detection software tool? My understanding from my colleagues who are all smarter about me than this on the task force is that this doesn't exist yet. Maybe it will in a year or two. We're throwing it in here. We know this is a concern of faculty and the university should continue to look at it. We really should think about developing and procuring an appropriate enterprise level AI tool that could be available to all IU employees and students.

([01:56:43](01:56:43)):

Right now, there's groups of folks piloting Microsoft Copilot. It's part of the 365 suite. Everyone doesn't have access to that yet. And there's specific implementations of co-pilot that are being implemented and piloted throughout the university, but there is no university-wide enterprise tool. There is the Adobe Creative Cloud suite. There are some generative AI tools within that, but nothing like a chat GPT kind of tool. We need more professional development and ideally that would be more centralized, leveraging the relationships, the teaching and learning centers have. We need a webpage that just has great resources. teaching.iu.edu has some good resources out there. I don't think many people know that. So we need to do a better job of getting that out to our faculty. Supporting faculty and assessment innovation. What are some ways we can give faculty professional development so they can assess student learning in their classes beyond papers?

([01:57:46](01:57:46)):

How can we scaffold assignments? How can we do project-based learning? For my own classes, I'm thinking oral exams. You can't do it in a lecture class with 500 students, but if you've got 20, 25 students, I'm actually thinking good old fashioned universities of the 16, 17 hundreds come in and tell me what you know versus a written exam. And if I have generative AI helping me with grading, not so much grading, but helping me build assignments, helping me build rubrics, then it could free up some time for me to do more oral examinations. And we really need to comprehensively review university policies and practices. We list some policies that we think we need to look at in the report. We don't offer language of what those policies should say because that's clearly a faculty governance process, but we've identified some policies that we should look at longer term.

([01:58:37](01:58:37)):

It would be great to have a dedicated gen AI office that's coordinating a lot of this stuff. These are, I know, long-term dreamy kind of things. Establish a dedicated infrastructure and support for professional development, a dedicated universitywide general artificial intelligence website. And then really there's

great opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration. Just the task force members. We had historians, we had folks from Luddy, we had folks who were computer engineering sociologists. We all can see how this could be relevant for our disciplines and we can learn from each other. An immediate need is, Kevin and I really wanted to emphasize that this can't wait till fall. I know this is the last meeting of the UFC, but it would be great if we could just do a couple of things more immediately. And I have the list here. You all can take a look at it after. But just some things that we can maybe move the ball a little bit quickly leveraging the existing task force members with maybe some other folks. So I'm happy to answer any questions folks have.

Whitten ([01:59:42](#)):

Your Freudian slip was not lost on me about AI to do your grading. Yeah,

DaDay ([01:59:45](#)):

No, it's not. No, no, no, no, no, no, no. I think that's what you start thinking, well, if it could it help with my grading. We don't want that.

Whitten ([01:59:53](#)):

I get it.

DaDay ([01:59:54](#)):

Thank you for catching the Freudian slip.

Perez ([02:00:04](#)):

I'd like to ask if you could justify the recommendation of exploring the availability of AI detection software. Because the impression that I have with this technology advancing so quickly is that next year the AI will actually catch up on that and this detection tool will become unreliable. Plus we also have the fact, as you mentioned, that if we are relying on this kind of software to decide if there's dishonesty going on, then for that very same reason, we're going to be in very thin ground.

DaDay ([02:00:46](#)):

The technology is changing so quickly, it's going to look different in three months or six months or next year. One thing I didn't mention, and I think you all probably know this, these systems hallucinate, they generate bad information. And so that's why in terms of good use, whatever it generates, you need to check it. If you think it's generating a bibliography for you, it's pulling words and putting together a bibliography that might not actually reflect actual citations. So you really, this is a digital assistant tool as it exists right now, and they are unreliable. So I mentioned we used it to help generate the report. Some of the stuff that it generated, I can't put this in a report and share it with the university. This doesn't make any sense, but it might've been a starting point and then we went through and edited it. But it is a really interesting way to synthesize a lot of data and help you make sense of it. But as a sociologist who does some qualitative research, you just can't throw your qualitative interview notes into these platforms and say, summarize this for me. Then it ultimately becomes part of the model. And we don't want that because that's a violation of privacy.

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

Very interesting report. I went through it and I was part of the committee to support it. I have used generative AI to at least give four of my keynote addresses by cleaning it up. And I tell them upfront, I have not cheated, but I have used the generative AI. But do you feel that you have cheated in writing the report following your own guidelines?

DaDay (02:02:27):

No. No. So I think back to my mentor in graduate school, she went through a card catalog and she went through social science abstracts written out, and I had Google Scholar, I had jstor, I had the internet, I had a word processor. One of my mentors had a typewriter. This is just what's happening. And so you all gave us six weeks to generate a report. And so I was happy to use some of these tools and they're all different. Like the Microsoft copilot gives you some different results than Gemini, ChatGPT, the public version would give you some different results. This is evolving so quickly. I think the key thing is, and it's in our report, we have to be transparent when we do use it. And so we have been transparent. We say in the report, I've said in the presentation, we use generative AI to synthesize some of the information, and we're not hiding that fact, but I don't feel like I was cheating.

Kini (02:03:27):

Okay.

Whitten (02:03:31):

I think it's interesting that there's not a turnitin yet, right? That's the equivalent to catch AI generated stuff. There will be.

DaDay (02:03:38):

But in Turnitin, we had to provide education to faculty on how best to use it in a positive way. And so now the student on Turnitin at least can see what their Turnitin score is and go back and make changes before they submit it. So we'll have to be thoughtful about whatever the implementation is if we do identify a tool.

McCoy (02:04:00):

Yeah. Thank you. I'm really impressed with this report and I was, yeah, so thank you for all the work that you put in and thank you chatt PT for helping you as well.

DaDay (02:04:11):

Microsoft copilot, which

McCoy (02:04:12):

Copilot, got it. Which chat

DaDay (02:04:13):

Feedback in. Yeah.

McCoy (02:04:14):

So one of the things that is in here is a couple of, you mentioned a couple of times the procurement of tools. And so is the idea that you were looking for one sort of AI suite, like a copilot, or would it be thinking about procuring a variety of tools? And I ask that because there's a section on guidance for staff and administrators, especially looking for administrative functions. And there are tools that exist outside of, say, copilot that could help in a lot of administrative functions on campus that are across our campuses. So what's

DaDay (02:04:51):

We mean tools, because we already have access to some through the Adobe Creative Cloud suite, there are some generative AI tools in there. Microsoft copilot isn't widely distributed yet. You all can go out and use an older version of chat GPT online. We really talked a lot about how we don't want for our students to be a digital divide, where some students have access to tools because they're paying for it and other students don't. And we want to make sure students know how to use them ethically and responsibly in a good use way, and in providing that professional development to faculty and how to use them in classrooms and to our staff so they can use them efficiently and effectively in a good way in their jobs, we'll likely need more tools and professional development on them. I'm thinking of the presentation previously, the 350 million to 309 million, if those were the right numbers, looking for efficiencies. These tools can offer some efficiencies that, I think I know can be scary, but if we balance the potential of them, they also can be exciting.

Stucky (02:05:59):

I had one question. The recommendation for the generative AI office at the UA level, will that be AI itself or you're talking about administrative savings? My suspicion is we could actually have an AI version of an administrator, but in all seriousness, so it strikes me that this is this generation's version of the need for information literacy. We as an educational institution, I think did a relatively poor job when the internet became widely available because we were way behind where we needed to be. And I don't know that we've really caught up, and frankly it's a little scary to me thinking about how AI could be used in a variety of nefarious ways for individuals who are not information literate. So I would advocate that we think about those two things in concert, and admittedly, I think obviously in six weeks you really don't have time to do a lot of the deep dive into some of these things, but I think there are ways that we can think about that using that framework. The other thing that I would recommend would be that sooner rather than later that we have a very quick set of recommendations and actually I should say do's and don'ts. So for example, the scenario that Jerry described of dumping your students anything or your research anything into a model then makes it part of that model and that's a problem. I am confident that there is a non-trivial number of folks out there that don't understand that piece of it and will use it unknowingly and potentially create some liability for the university in that regard.

DaDay (02:07:48):

In terms of research, in that example, we know National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, they expect PIs to have some data management policy and we don't really have one at the IU level that we might need to create. And if we created one, it could be focused on generative AI or which can be focused on, but generative AI could be a part of that, and that could give guidance for researchers on what to do with their data and the appropriate use of data and storage of data.

Whitten (02:08:20):

I'm sorry, did you volunteer to run that for the institution? Very impressive. A lot of important work to do and we will and all seriousness have to talk about how does it move forward, right? Because it's easy to talk about what needs to happen and then go off and have nice summers.

DaDay (02:08:37):

I think our colleagues are craving guidance and so I think if we can give them some guidance, I think that would be helpful. Preferably before the start of the next academic year.

Whitten (02:08:48):

Very good. Well it was tremendous work that you did. You had a six-week deadline and you did not gulp, you rolled your sleeves up and did it and that's a great example for all the rest of us, that important work can be done in a timely way.

DaDay (02:09:04):

Team effort.

Whitten (02:09:05):

Team effort. Thank you. I get

DaDay (02:09:06):

That. And Lana and David, thank you for your help too. Appreciate it.

Whitten (02:09:08):

Thank you. Okay, we're going to move to the next item on the agenda, which is proposed changes to ACA-05, bylaws of the University Faculty Council of IU. This is an action item and we will endorse it by a vote at the end of the discussion. So I call on the UFC CO-chairs to present these proposed changes. However you guys have coordinated it.

Goff (02:09:31):

I think I'm going to be the mouthpiece for this, but I invite my co-chairs to jump in if I'm flailing or forget something. Is that a thing to advance the slides? I think we've got one. Yep, that is it. It always looks like this clue.

Whitten (02:09:48):

Yeah, I know.

Goff (02:09:49):

Alright, this is something you've seen before. This is the second reading, so I hope you will recall where we are on this. We need to create two UFC committees. This is really in an effort to modernize the UFC to keep up with how things are modernizing in higher ed generally, but specifically how things have modernized over the last several years within iu, across the administration and how the university runs. We need to have venues to have conversations where the administration can share central concerns and we can as well. So in a sense, it's part of the centralization efforts to modernize IU, but in doing so in such a way that we continue to create these venues for having cultures of conversation in the bylaws

right now we currently have these six committees, the Honorary Degrees committee. Budgetary advisory committee, which we heard from a while ago.

([02:10:50](#)):

The Policy Review committee, Faculty Affairs Committee, Technology Policy Committee, and the Research Affairs Committee. In fact, the research affairs committee you might recall was created at this meeting exactly two years ago. It was the April meeting two years ago, and it was out of the concern that centralization, more money was going to stay central with ICR, and it had come as a surprise. So what we wanted to do was create a venue to have more conversation between the vice president of research's office and the UFC, these things that govern all across IU, all the campuses, and it has worked very well. Russ Mumper meets on a regular basis with the RAC, as we've heard with the budgetary affairs committee meeting with Dwayne Pinkney and others. Keeping that conversation open I think is integral to helping the university continue to move forward in the smoothest way.

([02:11:52](#)):

So we're looking at proposing here. We are proposing two additional committees, a student affairs committee, especially in light of the fact that now we have a vice president for student success, which is a great idea. We need to have someone we can talk, we can be in contact with her and also an academic affairs committee. When you think about at a university this large and sprawling to have not had an academic affairs committee at the UFC level, now it looks a little odd in hindsight. So these are the two sort of glaring holes that we think will cover issues that cut across the campuses generally. The first would be the Student Affairs Committee.

([02:12:33](#)):

I will admit I didn't use chat GPT, but I did take Marietta Simpson's writing of the research affairs committee two years ago and just sort of cribbed from her notes. The Student Affairs Committee oversee matters pertaining to or connected with policies and practices related to students throughout Indiana University. The committee will communicate with IUB, IUI and regional campuses' student affairs committees, and with the office of the Vice President for Student Success. 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. Also cribbed how the committee would be constituted. The committee, the executive committee here of the campus faculty, I'm sorry, the executive committees of the various faculty council governing organizations shall appoint nine members to this committee.

([02:13:44](#)):

Two from IU Bloomington, two from IU Indianapolis, 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 all three of the IUB, IUI and the regional campuses just as the RAC currently runs. And as the UFC runs. Members should serve as liaisons to their campuses' relevant faculty committees and terms will be for two years staggered, so we don't have everybody roll off at the same time. I'll go ahead and talk about both of these and then open it up for discussion. The Academic Affairs Committee oversees matters pertaining to or connected with policies and practices related to the academic enterprise throughout Indiana University. It will communicate again with all of the same people except in this case also the IU President's Academic Leadership Council. The committee should advise the Academic Leadership Council and the University Faculty Council on Academic Matters, collaborate on university-wide plans for strengthening the academic curriculum and where appropriate develop university-wide policies on procedures that aim to improve academics at IU.

(02:15:00):

This is a little different. A standing online education subcommittee appointed by the UFC Executive Committee will report to the Academic Affairs committee. The idea here is, and we've talked about this before, Sue and her group have gone around to the various campuses hitting this reset button really on IU online. It needs to be tied to our academic enterprise more closely and have faculty representation and faculty governance in some ways involved here. And this is our way to do that. I think it moves IU online further along a track for success and it also embeds IU online in the UFC and our academic enterprise. Again, the same people will be involved how the committee will be constituted except for this online subcommittee and the chair will have one person on the committee that is the idea here. So we'd like to open it up for questions or comments.

Palmer (02:16:07):

Hi Phil, Megan Palmer. I'm an IUPUI representative with the School of Medicine. I'm wondering if the group might entertain a friendly amendment, which is to follow the research affairs committee, which two years ago we agreed would be 10 members and one would be from the School of Medicine, so it would read the same as the makeup as the research committee. So one each from IU School of Medicine, IU East and so on. I suggest this because of the unique nature of medical education and academic affairs and the student experience in medicine and I think it would be a useful addition to the committees.

Goff (02:16:47):

Just for full disclosure, we've talked behind the scenes about this. I think it's a very good idea. I think it was good to do this two years ago. When I say that I sort of cribbed from the one from two years ago, I cribbed from the one that was proposed and not the one that was amended later. So I'm very happy I see this as a friendly amendment. I don't know how others, if everyone's okay with that. Okay, good. Other questions or comments? Thank you. Yes.

Perez (02:17:19):

Just a minor question. Trying to understand the language. When the proposal says that the committees will be co-chaired by IUI and regional campuses, can you clarify what the meaning? It sounds like there will be three co-chairs from those three different entities.

Goff (02:17:43):

There would be three co-chairs, one from Bloomington, one from Indianapolis, and one from the regionals. Exactly. Yes. We'll go to Susan first.

Speaker 14 (02:17:58):

Would all of the members be faculty members or would there to appoint someone, say from student services to the Student Affairs Committee.

Goff (02:18:11):

To my mind and others might have different ideas since they would already be reporting through the vice president for student success, and this is the university faculty council, I would think it'd be faculty.

Baer (02:18:28):

Each of the proposed committees, student affairs and Academic Affairs has an implied ex-officio or a written ex-officio from the administration. The IU online committee is proposed as a subcommittee. Is it also appropriate to include a ex-officio member from IU online leadership there so that the faculty there are working with good collaboration with the administration?

Goff (02:19:00):

I can see the wisdom of that. If anyone wanted to make the amendment that the subcommittee would have a liaison to IU online.

Baer (02:19:11):

Yeah. Can I propose a friendly amendment that we add an ex-officio member from IU online leadership to the IU online committee?

Goff (02:19:21):

Is that a friendly amendment

Johnson (02:19:23):

Qualification I would make is I don't know what the structure of IU Online is. It would be helpful to actually identify who that person is because it could be to say somebody from membership of IU online could be lots of different people, ranging from Sue's position to somebody picked up. So I'm a little, if we could figure out who that would be and include that, that could always be changed. But I would personally prefer that it be identified rather than.

Sciame-Giesecke (02:19:54):

I would suggest that we're going to put into place an interim assistant vice president of academic affairs at IU online. So I would suggest it would be that person. It'll be a faculty person, so that's why it would work so well. So that would be the role, the assistant vice president of academic affairs for IU online.

Cohen (02:20:17):

Can I clarify if this is a voting ex officio and non-voting ex-officio?

Baer (02:20:23):

Right.

Cohen (02:20:27):

That's what I'm trying to clarify. Are you proposing an voting or non-voting?

Baer (02:20:30):

It would be an ex-officio member because

Cohen (02:20:32):

It's Right, but voting ex officios can be voting or non-voting. And so I'm trying to clarify which one you want

Baer (02:20:37):

A non-voting member. Thank you.

Stucky (02:20:40):

A friendly amendment to the friendly amendment. So I would recommend that for each of these that you identify the highest level administrator or their designee. So in this instance it would be Sue's position or their designee, and that way you've always got it sort of built in there because those sub positions can change and all of that ends up getting to be a headache. The other thing that it does is potentially sort of identifies that there may be times where Sue currently is positioned as the one that you really need at the meeting versus the other person. So if that's, and we actually have that in a couple of situations,

Sciame-Giesecke (02:21:19):

I'm happy with that.

Goff (02:21:20):

Okay.

Whitten (02:21:27):

Do you want to summarize what the new?

Goff (02:21:29):

Yeah, let's see if I can do that. On both of the proposed committees, we will be adding a member from the IU School of Medicine and on the Academic Affairs Committee, we would also delineate that the subcommittee, the IU online subcommittee would have, if we're following the same language as with all the others, it's more a liaison with that office. And we do usually list the highest office, I will say. And so maybe we just say liaison with them and that would be the point of contact and let the chips fall where they will. We can always come back and alter this if we see and we need to.

Whitten (02:22:25):

I think we've come to time to vote. All those in favor of the proposed changes to ACA-05 with those friendly amendments, the bylaws of the University Faculty Council, will all of you please signify by saying Aye.

Multiple (02:22:37):

Aye.

Whitten (02:22:37):

Those opposed please signify by saying nay. Okay, it passes. Thank you. We'll move on to the next item then. A proposed change to UA 17 conflicts of interest and commitment. This is an action item and so we're going to vote at the end of this discussion as well to present this proposed change. I will ask Ben Kravitz, assistant Professor of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences and co-chair of the Research Affairs Committee. Ben.

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

Alright, thank you. So this is a little bit unusual in a couple of ways because this is an action item, but unless I'm very mistaken, we did not have a first reading. The reason being that we just have to move quickly on this. Also, the research affairs committee saw this and we're happy with it, but it doesn't actually come from us. It comes from the Office of General Counsel, specifically Mike Jensen. So I just want to clarify all of that for procedural issues. And the background is there's been some recent changes to federal law that require IU changes in policy. So here are the revisions. There's an update to nepotism, including referencing public health service grants as required by NIH. And for all of these, insofar as we were able, we borrowed language from the federal agencies in the policy. We used to have language in there about relationships with students that's now governed by UA 22. So we don't need to repeat it here. The CHIPS Act about maligned foreign talent recruitment programs requires us to say something in policy about it. And we used to have a policy item that says if you have a potential nepotism case, you have to inform the funding agency. The funding agencies didn't actually require this. So now neither will we.

([02:24:28](#)):

The reason we are proposing this is because it's required if we want federal grants. So NIH grants require a policy on nepotism. DOD grants require a policy on maligned foreign talent recruitment programs. And they require these by July 9th and August 9th respectively. So we're not going to have another UFC meeting until after those. So it probably makes sense to do it today. Here are the changes. If you're in a situation where nepotism could apply, disclose it. That's always been the case. It's still the case. And don't participate in a maligned foreign talent recruitment program. That's pretty much it.

Whitten ([02:25:14](#)):

Thank you. Who has questions for Ben or wonders what the maligned foreign talent recruitment program is?

Kini ([02:25:30](#)):

Will the training that is pushed forward to all the faculty members, will that include this part in the training? I did not see either of them. So will that be included annually? You need to do conflict of interest form and certify yourself. Will this, because there has to be some questions about training them.

Kravitz ([02:25:51](#)):

I don't know. I want to say it might already be in there, but I've taken a lot of different trainings from a lot of different federal agencies, so I've seen it somewhere. I don't remember whether that was,

Speaker 16 ([02:26:05](#)):

I definitely am not sure. Malign is not there.

Kravitz ([02:26:07](#)):

Okay.

Kini ([02:26:09](#)):

I'm sure of that because I have taken it recently.

Kravitz (02:26:11):

I will bring that up with research affairs.

Kini (02:26:13):

Yes. Needs to be updated.

Whitten (02:26:19):

Other comments or questions? Okay. All those in favor of the proposed changes to UA 17 conflicts of interest and commitment, please.

Cohen (02:26:31):

Sorry, this needs a second. Oh, I'm sorry. It's not coming from committee.

Whitten (02:26:34):

Oh, I'm sorry. Sometimes I can't figure out where you're speaking from. Sorry. You're right across from me. Got it. Sorry. I apologize.

Cohen (02:26:39):

Sorry, I'm the parliamentarian. Because it's not coming from committee. It needs a second, which we have, but just for procedure.

Whitten (02:26:47):

I appreciate that, but it's not in my notes, so can't be true. Apologize. Okay.

Sciame-Giesecke (02:26:53):

We have a second.

Whitten (02:26:54):

Oh, I'm sorry. Did you raise? Okay, so we're seconded. We're good to go. Okay. All right. All those in favor of the proposed changes, please signify by saying aye. Okay. All opposed say nay. Great. All right. Thank you Ben. Thanks. Thank you for making sure that we are not out of compliance with the required law for federal funding. That's wonderful. Okay, so we'll move on to the next item, proposed amendments to ACA 33, academic appointee responsibilities and consuct. Danielle DeSawal, master's program. Did I say that right? Dee. DDD. Sowell D Sowell. Okay. Thank you. Danielle, Master's program coordinator, clinical professor for higher ed and student affairs and President-elect of the Bloomington Faculty Council will present these proposed amendments.

DeSawal (02:27:41):

Excellent. Thank you President Whitten. Alright, so ACA 33 is back for another appearance here on the UFC floor. And we have a few specific things that we're going to look at. So summary of changes that are being requested as with things that were in the consent agenda as well as what was in the research piece, update the policy to reflect UA 22 employee relationships involving students so that we remove any duplicative language. And then we are suggesting main changes in procedures under sanctions to clarify what is intended by common and severe sanctions. Clarify the point in which a campus faculty

advisory board should be utilized. Add language to include explicitly stating whether a sanction is common or severe. And then the last thing is to add faculty to the list of constituents on campus that should be treated with respect and courtesy. Small little, small little addition.

([02:28:36](#)):

So review and comment. So recommendations and the motion come from the UFC executive committee. We sent this off to each campus governance organization to ask to review the suggested changes. There were no recommendations for changes. One of the things that you'll hear me say later is that what was suggested was when we get to the definitions is providing a kind of side procedure list that would not be in the policy. So we didn't have to vote on it of examples of common and severe so that we didn't have them in the policy and we're kind of fighting with some of that language. But we did provide some guidance to all the campuses about what that would look like. The A LC, the academic leadership committee provided comments about the suggested edits and so there were some concerns that were addressed and I will address those in each of the content changes that are being recommended.

([02:29:28](#)):

So overview of changes. So the first piece is pretty straightforward. So update policy to reflect UA two, employee relationships involving students. So remove the scope, which is listed as scope C that you can see written there. Removal of all of E, which is just duplicative language. So we're just taking that out. And then we're adding five B under academic appointees with instructional responsibilities to be familiar with and abide by UA 22 employee relationships involving students. The next piece is changes to procedures for scope. So the removal of scope listed as Scope D. This policy supersedes any provisions in campus personal misconduct policies that are inconsistent with it. So we had removed that. One of the comments was to make sure that there, from the ALC, is to have a safeguard in reference to UA 08. So what we would propose is the language that you see on the screen.

([02:30:28](#)):

And then addition to that, one of the things that's noticed is that this is not referenced in all of our UA level policies. So I think it would be good practice for us to add something very similar to this, to all of our UA policies so that we're consistent with a connection point to understanding that the university policies that are governed by UA 08 or establishing university policies, they relate to the relationships with our local policies. So that kind of safeguard of UA policy takes precedent is present and everyone recognizes that in all of our policies.

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

Changes to procedures, sanctions. So this is where it gets fun. So change to five B. So what we did here is specifically to think about rather to move away from examples in the policy and focus more on the behavioral aspect of what is a severe or a common sanction.

([02:31:25](#)):

One of the things that we have learned in the last year is that the examples themselves that were in both common and severe sanctions, the language gets a little sticky when you start to use it in a letter and it starts to sound a little bit too familiar to one, either one or the other. And so one of the things that we thought and we'll also transparently say is that this is not perfect language. We recognize that we don't think that it is. What we think is that it helps us to move forward so that both the administration of the academic officers who need to employ these sanctions and also the faculty have a little bit of a clearer understanding of what is the difference between common and severe. So what you'll see is that we've changed that to say sanctions intended as proportional corrective disciplinary

responses to discrete policy violations. The primary aim should be to clarify the real or potential costs to the university community of non-compliance with the policy that was violated and to deincentivize future violations of it.

([02:32:35](#)):

The next one is for severe sanctions. Same component applies. What we added was the decision to impose a severe sanction may involve taking into consideration prior complaints, findings of responsibilities and sanctions that were issued by the campus of the respondent. This piece is important because there's actually a gap in the policy when you look at increasing or repetitive behavior by a faculty member in misconduct. It refers specifically to the same misconduct that can be treated as something that is repetitive versus if somebody is doing misconduct in various different places and it has different implications. So adding this line actually helps to ensure that we're recognizing that repeat cases of any misconduct require then an escalation in what that sanction could be placing it into the severe piece. If a sanction significantly alters the terms or conditions of respondent's employment or infringes upon their ability to conduct forms of work previously assigned and entrusted to them by virtue virtue of their position classification, it is considered a severe sanction.

([02:33:55](#)):

Alright, procedures changes to five E. So in the black is what currently exists. And so one of the things that we also learned this year is that there was some tension that existed between just this statement and the supersedes campus level policy. So one of the things that we wanted to do is provide some clarification on two different points. One, to clarify the existing sentence that applied of where it may connect with a campus level policy. And then two, to provide then some opportunity for the campus to ensure that what we're not dealing with is a repeat of an investigation of the case, but rather the point at which a campus level faculty committee is going to be asked to become part of the process. So there were some concerns about the language, so we changed the edit so that it's in cases where a campus has a policy that indicates involvement with the faculty advisory body prior to the severe sanction being imposed, the local policy will apply and notification of that process will be included in the written notification.

([02:35:18](#)):

The last thing that we did was we added a section because this also wasn't clearly in there to indicate that respondents have a right to be notified in writing. And that notification should also clearly state whether or not it is a common or a severe sanction based on the characteristics that are up there. And again, this is where the feedback that we had about thinking about how do we provide those examples but not build them into the policy, is to have something on the side that allows us to kind of look at what those may look like. And final edits is to add to C3 that instead of just students and staff with respect and courtesy, that academic appointees shall treat all faculty, students and staff with respect and courtesy. Questions.

Shrivastav ([02:36:17](#)):

Sorry to bring this up, I don't want to belabor this. First of all, I think you're doing all the right things to clarify the confusions there are, but I want to just make sure some downstream effects that may need to be resolved. I think a lot of it is when you do the examples, will get clarified, but there are two or three things that concern me. One is in the severe sanction, currently the current version of the policy, the sanction is applied and then if there is an appeal, the appeal comes to the chief academic officer. In the current version, the sanction is applied by the chief academic officer. So in concept, there isn't an independent review of the appeal right now. They're separate. Now you're bringing them together, it

works. I've seen other places that does it, but it's a change from how we are set up today. So make sure you think it through so we don't create another problem. The second issue is that if you think about operationalizing it, if there is a complaint, there has to be an investigation. The investigation leads to a decision by somebody about whether it's a common sanction or a severe sanction. If a decision is made that it should be a severe sanction, it effectively starts a new review process unless you change the other policy. So that will need to be addressed here or later separately.

DeSawal ([02:37:56](#)):

Yep, absolutely. And part of why we wanted to make sure we can get this through is this also needs to go ACA 33 has to go to the board of trustees for approval. And so if we can clarify this, at least on the Bloomington campus, they've been working to address our problems with our local campus. And I also know from my colleagues around the table that not all campuses have a campus level policy about this, but allowing this to be clarified allows us to clean up the campus piece so that we don't have some of those problems. At least on Bloomington, the faculty academic affairs committee is working.

Shrivastav ([02:38:34](#)):

The third thing for the group to hear about is you don't want to have some of these policies where the same behavior has different outcomes at different campuses. To what extent, to the extent you can keep them consistent, the better it would be. We've seen this in other situations and if we can avoid it, that'd be great.

DeSawal ([02:38:56](#)):

Agreed. We do that with our students, so we should do it with ourselves.

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

I just want to add to this, I know this is sort of a local issue in some regard that we're trying to work at using, but I think one of the issues, one of the things that we learned this year is that the principle has always been in terms of the imposition of severe sanctions. I think there's a recognition that that has to be an option in order to sort of address problems. But I think one of the things that we've learned is that involvement of a faculty committee isn't necessarily always and really isn't if it's done well in opposition to the execution of those kinds of responsibilities. Involvement of a faculty committee review committee before a sanction is imposed is actually a crucial way to legitimate doing the hardest things in terms of dealing with misconduct issues. And I think our policy structure contemplated that as a reality formerly by allowing campus level policies to sort of mandate those, that kind of involvement.

([02:39:59](#)):

But I think it's an important principle for everyone to remember in terms of really the dividends of shared governance, which is involvement of faculty. Serious consideration is exactly the way you avoid the personalization of controversial. This is this sort of attribution of kind of rightly or wrongly suspicion to behavior. If you involve faculty in those decision-making processes, it really makes things much smoother. And I know that's one of the things that we're trying to make sure can happen on the Bloomington campus. I would actually strongly recommend my colleagues on every campus to look at that because it's part one day controversies will arise. And it is important when institutions are doing the hardest thing to involve all of those steps to avoid those kinds of misunderstandings and controversies, et cetera.

Whitten ([02:40:57](#)):

I think we're done. Well, every time I try to bring us to a vote, I miss somebody. Are we good? Great. Thank you, Danielle for presenting that so clearly as well. So, okay. All those in favor of the proposed changes to ACA 33 academic appointee, responsibilities and conduct, please signify by saying aye. All those opposed signify by saying nay. Very good. The item passes. So thank you. We have actually concluded the final item on the agenda and I want to thank everyone for a really thorough and thoughtful and full agenda today that we got through. I especially want to, of course, thank everyone who helped organize today's meeting. I know it's lots that's you and others, but can we say thank you to Lana for a great year?

DeSawal ([02:41:55](#)):

And President Whitten, it happens to be Lana's birthday today.

Whitten ([02:42:00](#)):

Are we going to do it? Are we going to sing? Are you guys game? Okay?

Multiple ([02:42:05](#)):

Happy birthday to you, happy birthday to you, happy birthday dear Lana, happy birthday to you.

Whitten ([02:42:27](#)):

It's a good day for birthday. Happy birthday. Happy birthday. Well, I wish all of you just a wonderful remainder of the semester and a glorious celebration of graduation. I know I'll see you all on the various campuses as well. Do I have a motion to adjourn and a second? Alright, the meeting is adjourned. Thank you everyone.