

University Faculty Council Minutes, December 10, 2024

The University Faculty Council held an in-person meeting in the Tower Ballroom that was preceded in the morning by the State of the University address given by President Whitten. For the Council meeting the presiding officer was University President Pamela Whitten and the secretary was Professor Robert Yost. The meeting was convened at 1:30 pm. by UFC cochair DeSawal.

1. **Approval of the Minutes**

Minutes from the October 29, 2024 meeting were approved.

2. **Consent Agenda**

Consent agenda items were approved.

A consent agenda allows approval of several items that can be improved in one action rather than acting on each individually. The consent agenda items were U6-2025: ACA-03 [no changes], U7-2025: ACA-15 (no changes), U8-2025: ACA-65 (no changes), U9-2025: ACA-81 (no changes), U10-2025: ACA-58 (Minor changes from Athletics representatives to represent current practice and alignment with NCAA policy. The name of one office is being updated to reflect current structure.), and U11-2025: ACA-62 (minor operational changes to clarify process, delete repetitions, and delete additional-contacts section [This contact will be moved to the contact field at the top of on the policy web page.]

3. **Executive Committee Business**

Phil Goff, IUI was ill.

Daniel DeSawal, IUB

IUB football is headed to the college playoffs next week.

Bloomington campus schools and the college policy councils are finalizing communication to colleagues regarding the policies and procedures for annual reviews and the five-year review process in response to SEA 202 compliance. It was shared with IUB faculty last week that is important that all faculty are aware of how their annual review will be connected to SEA 202 compliance, prior to the individual faculty member submitting those materials by the due date set by their schools.

I will continue to be meeting with the policy chairs and deans, along with our Provosts throughout the spring to address updates to tenure and promotion processes, and any other issues that will need to be addressed in the spring term. I also wanted to provide an update on the Chancellor search, the committee will be reviewing applications over the next few weeks, and I am encouraged by the candidates that have expressed interest thus far in the process. We anticipate campus visits to take place prior to spring break, and that will include two town halls for each candidate on the Bloomington campus.

While our faculty governance standing committees continue to engage in the charges that they were given at the start of this academic year, we will also be looking to engage in work to address broader issues that are facing the campus. President Witton has asked the BFC leadership and the Provost's Office if we would be interested in working collaboratively to identify recommendations to address a number of broader issues facing our campus to improve the success and experience of our students. I am excited to share that the answer from the BFC executive committee was absolutely. And while these conversations are just beginning, I will be sharing more details at the first BFC meeting in January

on our focus and approach. I view these areas of engagement as excellent examples of how shared governance engages faculty in both our legislative and consultative responsibilities. Engaging in processes that value shared responsibility allows us to view each other as partners as we examine the issues facing the campus related to student success. Additionally in the spring, we will be looking at how we are helping faculty and students understand the intersection of artificial intelligence, also known as AI, and learning on campus. I'm excited by recent conversations with our colleagues and learning technologies about how we can respond to the recommendations that were presented to the UFC by the AI Task Force.

Our student affairs committee has been working collaboratively with our student leaders on campus to identify how to improve syllabus sharing prior to the start of classes, and we look forward to bringing those items to the floor of the BFC in the spring. As we conclude the fall semester and think about our spring 2025, it is important to recognize that we need to not only be responsive to demands that are being placed on our institutions, but we must also be thinking about how IU can be innovative and thinking about the future and President Whitton gave us some ways to think about that today in her address. I look forward to continuing the great work that we have started this fall. I wish all of you the merriest of holidays and the happiest of New Years. Finally, I'm going to turn it over to Provost Shrivastav, to share some words about some changes to our BFC office staff.

Provost Shrivastav

I am here to really say thank you to Lana. Lana has served this office with a lot of dignity and grace in a way that only Lana can. It's like a ship sailing through the ocean, seeming like the waters are calm, but the waters can be as choppy as they are Lana is always calm. Lana before she took this role was in the Provost's office, and when she took this new role, I knew she would be the perfect person for this. She's a creative writer. She's written short stories in fiction. I'd encourage you to take a look sometime. A lot of it comes from her personal experience growing up in Bosnia and Slovenia and just an incredible, compassionate, empathetic individual, which will be really impossible to replace. So Lana, thank you for everything you've done for the UFC, as well as for the Provost office. Appreciate it.

Gregory Dam IU East

I'd like to provide updates on some developments at the regional campuses. The Elements team has visited regional campuses to conduct training sessions for faculty on the new annual reporting system, and so far, there have been two-day training sessions at four regional campuses, and later this week, IU South Bend will host the team for the final training sessions at the Regionals. Faculty at the regional campuses are making significant progress in drafting policy changes to comply with recently enacted state law, SEA 202, and while the campuses are at various stages in this process, several have already presented initial policy drafts. We'd like to extend our gratitude to Andrea Newsome and to Mike Beam for their support and availability in addressing questions throughout this process.

Efforts to identify two new Chancellors for the regional campuses are progressing well. At IU South Bend the Chancellor search, which is led by Chancellor Ford from IU Southeast, is in its final stages with campus visits. I think they've already occurred. Also at IU Northwest is an ongoing search to identify some strong candidates for this vital role.

Spring enrollment, a point in cycle as of yesterday, is up for all regional campuses, except for IU Kokomo. Despite this positive trend, although it is too early to say definitely, some of the regionals are already projecting deficits for the fiscal year 2026. One of the challenges of experiencing deficits on a campus is the uncertainty and concern they create about the future, and understanding the

consequences of a prolonged deficit in both short term and long term is difficult. However, it's important to understand not only their impacts, but their implications within the broader context of the university financial policies and stability. I'd like to review a couple of portions of our IU policy on the faculty role regarding University financial exigency, and try that again, ACA 41, which states that in order to invoke financial exigency as a reason to terminate academic appointments with tenure or prior to the expiration date of a long term academic appointment, Indiana University must be facing a severe and imminent financial crisis that threatens the university survival in its present form. Then later in Section C of the policy, it states that a financial crisis within one unit or one campus does not constitute a university financial exigency, unless it immediately has ramifications that threaten the survival and academic integrity of the university as a whole. So I think it's important to understand that context and even more broadly or another piece to consider is that at the November 15 Board of Trustees meeting, it was noted that IU University's overall financial health is robust with net growth of nearly one quarter of a billion dollars. The regional campuses are far from declaring a financial exigency, a condition that would require their impact to affect the survival of the university as a whole. Although the regional campuses are experiencing fiscal pressures, we remain fiscally stable. We are confident that our finance teams, both locally and centrally, are diligently working to reduce the deficits, and they are also prioritizing the most fiscally vulnerable campuses in their funding decisions. Thank you for your continued dedication and support of the regional campuses, and I'd like to wish you all a wonderful holiday season and a restful start to the new year.

4. Presiding Officer's Report

As many of you know, I delivered the state of the University address this morning and thank you for anyone that attended that I appreciate it. In the address this morning, those of you that participated, you heard that I highlighted the University's strong position and promising future driven by the IU 2030 strategic plan and some of the key achievements of our students and our faculty and our staff, particularly over the last year, including increased enrollment on a number of campuses, an increase in philanthropic support, record research and development expenditures. As I noted, we expect to be making some exciting announcements in the next few days, weeks and months about the university's expanding role in basic research, economic development and the health sciences, which is going to impact all of our campuses, impact the State of Indiana and beyond, as well.

The budget redesign initiative, which began in 2023 with the discovery and planning phase is going to continue into fiscal year 27. An IU working group has developed a new UA assessment, allocation, methodology based on a data driven approach for fiscal year 26 and beyond. The development of UA assessment fiscal year 26 figure is going to allow for earlier budget planning by all the campuses, and the UA assessment requires transparency and alignment regarding unbudgeted financial transactions with campuses to provide a more accurate picture of actual UA costs. We will continue to have Jason Dudich joining us every opportunity we can to make sure everyone's fully apprised of everything going on related to budget redesign, even though it's going to take several years. Phase two will involve engagement at the campus level. Nothing has changed from the current model at the campus level. There have been no changes on any campus at Indiana University at the campus level. If you perhaps hear rumors to the alternative, they are simply not true. There have been no changes. All work has been done on phase one to date.

The campuses are engaging with working groups to assess and develop future budget models that will, of course, be unique and tailored to each campus. Campuses are focused on new budget redesign rollouts for fiscal year 27 at the earliest. So, we have some time, and we will be thoughtful and methodical as each campus addresses this themselves. Allocation of resources, central versus unit

budget control, overall budget management, compensation adjustments, incentives, and other items are areas of discussion within the campuses, each specific campus as well.

We have launched an IU budget redesign website as part of the Vice President for the CFO's office website and are engaging with external partners to understand best practices and benchmarking. So there'll be a place for you to go at all times if you wish to be updated or at least to see the current status of that initiative.

Regarding the policy taskforce, I hope many of you are aware that our three UFC co-chairs are leading a policy task force. I charged them with evaluating UA-08, the policy on establishing university policies. Several of our peer institutions have completed comprehensive policy reviews and redesigns in recent years, and in their experience, have significantly reduced the number of policies and the complexity of their policy approach. And of course, we're confident that the first step being taken by this policy committee of just addressing and cleaning up and clarifying the policy on policies, how policies happen will be the right first step, but there will be much work to do, of course, after that, as well. I ask the members of this task force to consider when a policy should be university wide, when a campus or school policy is appropriate as a supplement, what constitutes a policy as opposed to a procedure or a standard or a guideline, and how we can clarify policy ownership and the approval authority for policies at the university as well. Then after the task force completes this evaluation and makes recommendations, we will bring them to the Trustees who will make their own decision, of course, whether to accept the recommendation or pieces of the recommendation, et cetera. But once that is done, then we'll move to the next phase of looking at current policies under kind of the new framework on Hierarchy. I'm grateful to our co-chairs and the other faculty on the task force for undertaking this important work. I know they're very busy between now and basically the middle of February, getting this work done.

In terms of ensuring student success. The rollout of our comprehensive online student success tools in partnership with Stellic is underway. This fall, we launched features of the platform at IU Fort Wayne, IU East and IU Columbus that will allow students to actually track their progress, plan coursework, and register for classes all in one space. These features are going to be rolled out on the remaining regional campuses in spring 2025, and then in Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses in the fall of 2025. We're also seeing continued progress on our goal of improving undergraduate academic advising, which is just such an important step for the success of our students. All of our advisors are now trained in coaching foundations, which teaches skills to advisors about how to ask students the right questions and create strong relationships with them. 85.5% of students are now assigned an advisor. Actually, I think we've topped 90% now up from 72.1% in the spring of 24. Issues with advisor assignments are being identified and now being addressed campus by campus on an individual basis.

And then finally, I just want to speak to an announcement that was released, related to an ad hoc DEI task force that's been launched. IU remains committed to fostering an inclusive and equitable environment amidst ever changing potential legislative pressures, oversight, and regulations that are potentially going to happen at the state level and/or at the national level. We're still very committed to our value set related to quality and equity and diversity, and everything within that sphere of values will continue to be very important to us moving forward. And so we have the opportunity to assess how the principles of diversity equity inclusion are impacting outcomes at the university and even explore ways to achieve even better results. I think that we would all agree in almost every space, we would like to see further advancement and improvement across all of our campuses. So last week, I delivered a charge to a recently appointed Ad hoc Committee on Diversity Equity Inclusion. This

university-wide committee is co-chaired by representatives from each of our three areas. Vice President for Regional Campuses and Online Education, Ken Iwama, Dean of the McKinney School of Law, Karen Bravo, and President Elect of the Bloomington faculty Council, Bill Ramos. I charge the committee with examining our university's goals and determining what outcomes we want to see moving forward as an institution, that is really the first step for this committee is to identify the outcomes that we want to achieve as an institution related to diversity equity and inclusion. So the ad hoc committee is tasked with engaging key constituents, lots of people, including the Office of the Vice President for Diversity Equity Inclusion, a large range of students, and faculty and staff in various capacities to understand our current state to help guide us and understand and define the outcomes that we wish to pursue moving forward. I look forward to receiving the committee's report in the spring. March 30 or April 1. This concludes my report for today.

5. President Whitten: Question and Answer Period

Is there any discussion to take down the monorail and return it back to the environment?
[this line currently connects University and Methodist Hospitals, *insert*]

From what I have heard, there is not a move to take it down because it's cost prohibitive. But that would not be us, but would be, I think, it was IU Health. So that would be their decision. I have heard interesting conversations, though, and I'm not quite sure how they would pull it off, and I'm just totally spreading rumor at this point. If you have been in New York, you may know the Green Line, where you walk along up top. Well, there's been a little bit of talk about, Hey, how about something like that? That would be a lovely thing to pursue as well. So perhaps they would consider pursuing something that we would all consider beneficial for the community as well, but I don't believe there's any discussion of having the opportunity to be removed at this point from IU Health.

Can you tell a little bit about with the policy task force and the DEI Task Force, a little bit more about what student involvement looks like, especially from the three areas being regionals, IU Indy and IU Bloomington?

Well, the DEI Task Force has a student representative on the task force itself, it's a student from IU East, and they are just starting their work. I mean, they're literally planning how they're going to do their work. I don't know if anyone leading that task force wants to speak to that? Sure. So the charge came to us fairly quickly, and the chairs met actually this morning, and we came together around a process, and again, our committee does include a student. As we head into break, we are going to have some mini charges for the committee to get them moving with any time they might have over break, but we'll really kick in when we get back from the break. And part of the charge that we're going to be giving out is also to identify those groups that we have to meet with as well. Student groups will be apprised of that as well.

The policy group for the review of policies on policies does not have a student representative because it's Phase one, which is the internal structure of how it functions. So we're working with all the units across the campus to figure out just kind of a general structure of it's working. When we hit phase two, which is then to look at What will be the recommendations from that committee about consolidating those policies is when we're going to bring in the students in order to start to look at those more consistently about student impact, where that student voice needs to be included and where it's important that we make sure we check with all of our constituencies and stakeholders.

Could you elaborate a little more what was the motivation for this committee to review the policies of the university?

I have no data in front of me, but certainly be happy to share that with you. We have an extraordinary number of policies at this institution well beyond the norm, and we also have them at many levels. We have university level policies. We have canvas level policies, unit level policies, UA level policies, and department level policies. They in many places contradict each other: One will say one thing, and then another will say no, you can't. And there's also just great confusion about how they get adjusted or changed across the institution. So this is our opportunity as a first step to just kind of come up with a baseline for the Trustees to approve: This is how policy action happens here. Right? And that's literally all that's going to happen in this first round. Daniel can respond further.

Daniel

One of the reasons is because as we looked at this, what has happened too, as President Whitten indicated, is we have some duplication that is occurring as well. At the university level, we have over 360 plus policies. Throughout all our campuses, there are over a thousand plus policies. One of the things that happens is that when we update something at the university level, on all of our campuses and then sometimes at our schools or at the unit levels, that language is then duplicated in all those spaces, which then requires action by all of the entities in order to update that, which is not necessarily always the best use of our time, especially when we're feeling lots of pressure and stress around our service loads to begin with. So part of this is to stop to say, let's take a look at all of this, see what it is that can exist at the university level that is shared which is common language that we all utilize that would rest as policy, where it's appropriate that we also think about what policy needs to exist at a campus level or a unit level, or where it is appropriate that those are more policies or guidelines that then those institutions follow. So that will also help to clarify just the general process of how one we create policy, or we edit policy in this process. As President Whitten indicated and Phil Goff, our wonderful colleague also regularly articulates, we've always known, those of us who have been here for decades, that it's been a little messy on the policy side of things. Until we started to see the numbers, we didn't really understand how messy it was. This is really an attempt to help to clarify it, become more transparent with it because all of us have hit those kinds of roadblocks where it's like, who's in charge of this or how does this fit into this and what if they're in conflict with each other, and some things have been updated, other things don't get updated. We want some consistency and really a lot more transparency with it so that we can operate more efficiently with each other.

6. Rashad Nelms, Interim Vice President for Diversity Equity and Inclusion

I wanted to provide an update on the SEA 202 formation of the Diversity Committee. So to begin, SEA 202 became effective on July 1, 2024. Among other directives, SEA 202 imposed requirements for both home, as well as regional campus diversity committees. SEA 202 mandated an expansion in the areas of responsibility of diversity committees by including matters related to cultural and intellectual diversity issues, the promotion and recruitment and retention of underrepresented students. On September 13, 2024, IU Board of Trustees approved a resolution, authorizing the creation of diversity committees consistent with SEA 202 on the Bloomington and Indianapolis core campuses and at each regional campus of IU, including IU Kokomo, IU Northwest, IU South Bend, IU Southeast, and IU East.

The Diversity Committee would be constituted as follows. The Bloomington and Indianapolis Diversity Committee will consist of seven members. There will be three faculty, two staff, one administrator, and one student, identified by the Chancellor or the designee in consultation with campus leadership. For the regional campus diversity committees, each will consist of five members, two faculty, one staff, one administrator, and one student, identified by the Chancellor or the designee in consultation with campus leadership. The selection of committee members will reflect the respective shared governance practices on each campus. The Chancellor or designee will collaborate with campus leadership to identify one member of the Bloomington Core Campus Diversity Committee to serve as the chair. The Bloomington Core Campus Diversity Committee will also meet quarterly to perform its duties as required by SEA 202. Consistent with SEA 202, each diversity committee created at the IU core and regional campuses is charged with the following duties as laid out by the statute. I want to stress that there are separate bodies conducting the actual reviews of complaints under SES 202. With that said, each of the individual diversity committees will issue an annual report stating the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the committee to the Board of Trustees. The statutory language creating the committees lists their functions as reviewing, recommending and issuing an annual report. They are charged with a duty to review employment policies, concerning cultural and intellectual diversity issues, reviewing faculty and administration personnel complaints concerning cultural and intellectual diversity issues, making recommendations to promote and to maintain cultural and intellectual diversity amongst faculty members and making recommendations to promote recruitment and the retention of minority and underrepresented students. Prior to issuing the annual report to the Board of Trustees, each diversity committee will submit a draft report to the Campus Chancellor or Provost for review by May 1 of each year. No later than June 1 of each year, the Bloomington Core Campus Diversity Committee, the Indianapolis Core Campus Committee and all regional campus diversity Committees, will submit their findings and recommendations individually and separately to the Board of Trustees.

There have been since this came into force, several clarification requests and questions that have been expressed about the impact of these new diversity committee requirements. The purpose then of why I'm ready to share with you is to clarify the new statutory requirements and to ease concerns about the roles of the diversity committees.

Questions that have come to Interim V.P Nelms

One of the most common questions that have come up includes, what role did the new diversity Committees play?

The role of the new Diversity Committees is advisory in nature. The Diversity Committee collects observations from reviews of various matters and memorialize their advisory recommendations in an annual report to the Board of Trustees.

Do the diversity Committees only share recommendations with the Board of Trustees in the spring?

Diversity committees may share their recommendations at any time with campus faculty governance and campus leadership as may be appropriate, including but not limited to deans, faculty affairs, and human resources personnel, and Chancellors. However, sharing with appropriate entities on the home campus does not relieve a diversity committee of the responsibility to make a report to the Board of Trustees.

Do the diversity Committees consult or collaborate with any parties?

Diversity committees are strongly encouraged to work in consultation and collaboration with campus faculty governance and leadership in carrying out the key duties as outlined in SEA 202. Diversity Committees are strongly encouraged to consult and to collaborate with the Chancellor or their designee, as well as faculty governance leadership, to make recommendations regarding culture and intellectual diversity, recruitment and retention of underrepresented students, and the development of an annual report.

Do these diversity committees replace existing committees or roles of existing staff?

The Diversity Committees mandated by Indiana law and approved by the Board of Trustees, will not replace any existing committees or individuals providing similar functions or having similar job responsibilities? The role of the new Diversity Committees in reviewing faculty and administration personnel complaints concerning cultural and intellectual diversity amongst faculty members, does not supplant the role of individual campus administrators and supervisors and HR personnel in reviewing SEA 202 complaints concerning cultural and intellectual diversity issues. SEA 202 complaints will continue to be handled by the appropriate parties at each campus, including faculty affairs, representatives, deans, and HR representatives, as per guidance already provided in SEA 202 implementation discussions.

We'll open the floor if anyone has any questions for Rashad. But just as a reminder, what he is outlining is the diversity committee requirement per the new legislation, and that's why this is being implemented to be in compliance with the law. This is separate from activities and work and efforts on our campuses as well.

Council Questions

Does your office provide, like an Uber committee for these campus committees or are you advisory only to the campus committee?

On the Bloomington Campus, we have a core Diversity Committee as well as Indianapolis, and so as those reports on the regional campuses are produced, we'll also play a role in making sure it's reviewed, right before they go to the Board of Trustees.

Follow up

Judging by what you mentioned, basically, this committee will only be advisory in nature in addition to the IU, Indianapolis and the Bloomington campuses. But the actual implementation or recruitment and retention policies and etc. will be by department heads, unit heads, or whatever that's currently in place. So it's only advisory only. Only advisory per SEA 202. My only concern is, what is the role of it beyond advisory? So if department heads and everybody else is already having power to go ahead and do retention or recruitment or all those policies in place or regulations. So what is the role of this committee, then? Because I think the current current program heads and the current committees are already doing that work, right? So I know SEA 202 kind of assigned this overarching advisory board, but then If no actions are being taken or no implementation is being done, then what would be the role? We have to do it to be a compliance.

7. Updates on Stellic

President Whitten introduction

Stellic is an enterprise solution designed to revolutionize how our students plan their academic journeys and track their progress toward graduation. Traditionally, at IU, the implementation of such technological tools would actually have been managed by our University Information

Technology Services. However, recognizing the critical goal of this particular solution, this tool, to the success of our students, we've appointed a dedicated project manager within the Office of the Vice President for Strategic Operations to actually oversee the rollout. We feel this shift actually ensures focused leadership and broad accountability aligning with our strategic priorities under the I U 2030 plan. This afternoon, Sean Kilpatrick, Associate Vice President of University Enrollment Services, Matt Rust, Associate Vice President for Student Navigation and Support, and Katie Palin, project manager leader with University strategic initiatives who have been deeply involved in the implementation of Stella, are going to present the update for us.

Thank you very much, President Whitten. We actually got to hit the button last Thursday to go live on three of the campuses, and it hasn't broken. So that's a really good sign right now. We're monitoring adoption at this point, and we're really excited about the future.

Stellic Development Team

Sean Kilpatrick, Associate Vice President for University Enrollment Services.

Our team supports campus-based operations with their efforts around admission, registrar, military veteran services, and also financial aid.

Matt Rust, Associate Vice President for Student Navigation and Support in the IU Office of the Vice President for Student success

My work is really focused on the great work happening on the campuses with academic advising and career development.

Katie Palin, project management leader within University Strategic Initiatives, which is an office that falls under the leadership of the Vice President for Strategic Operations

I'm serving as the project manager for the Stellic implementation.

Today, we're going to speak to you a little bit about the background of why Stellic was chosen as the platform for the future, how we're doing in terms of the implementation, and what is the plan going forward? We want to show you a little demo of the system itself to see what the student experience is actually going to look like and talk to you about some next steps before we open up for questions. So why Stellic? Well, the whole idea around Stellic and our move to Stellic is really based on three main principles. The first one being that students need tools that help them clearly navigate their academic requirements to pursue their academic interests. We really needed a platform that allowed students to easily view their progress toward their degree so that they can understand how close they are to completing it, but also a platform that allows students to create their own tailored graduation plan within it. The second need or principle was that students need technology that enhances a student experience, removes barriers, and helps make the business of being a student easier. Essentially, we talk a lot as administration about how do we not let students know that we're here and not be a barrier to their progress or their success? How can we eliminate the administrative burden on students to free them up, reduce friction so that they can focus on the things that are important for their future? How do they get involved in research? How do they go into internships and plan for graduate school? They shouldn't be focused on just navigating tools to understand their degree requirements. And that's really a key principle of this new initiative. The third one being that both students and IU, need connected technology that provides data driven insights on course demand and allows for additional student support. This new tool will actually allow us to run reports and understand how many students have X, Y, or Z courses planned for the future. How many courses do we need to offer and when do we need to offer them? Perhaps in what modalities. It could also allow for us to run degree completion simulations, that can allow us to know how close our students are to

graduation or not. For those who are not, can we paint a pathway for them that might allow them to take advantage of other interests and still allow them to graduate on time? I think the reporting functionality is going to be a great one with us to be proactive and allow students to really take advantage of their academic and social interests.

We're rolling this out in three phases, and some of the phases are across multiple terms. But the first phase, we're really focused on that audit, that pathway, which is that degree graduation plan, enrollment as well in the reporting function. As we go forward in this, students will see their audit, understand their degree requirements. They can take those degree requirements and map them into a semester by semester grid, which becomes their plan from their pathway. They will be able to actually register directly from that plan without hopping to another system. Then for administration on the backside, we'll be able to do some reporting and course demand projections.

Phase two in this endeavor includes the advising software component, and that will be the new advising platform that would replace AdRecs and a couple of other items that would allow advisors to document their interactions with students, formulate appointments, do case management, communicate, et cetera.

Phase three is something we're really excited about where it will leverage the technology implemented in Phase one, the audits and pathways and allow prospective students and prospective transfer students to upload their requirements they've taken in the past. It'll show them how they would apply toward IU coursework with our articulations and show them different degree programs that they're close to. It will then allow us to capture their information and reach out to recruit them and actually join us in our academic pursuits here at IU. So we're really excited about these three different phases.

Matt will talk a little bit about the current student experience. The current experience is not ideal for students. We do have tools that do this, but they are three separate disconnected tools, and they look very different, they behave differently, and they have to be maintained separately, and so they very quickly become out of sync with one another. It creates much like the policies issues we heard. It creates inconsistencies and does not help students progress. The first of the tools, the audit is the PeopleSoft academic advisement report. That has been in place since 2004. Some of you might remember when that was implemented in 2004. The second tool is the pathway that we have today. That's the IU IGPS degree maps. That was actually brought about in response to state law. It was an IU developed tool, and it served a purpose, but again, it's always suffered from that problem of being disconnected from the other tools, that's the four-year semester by semester display. Finally, we've been using high point for the enrollment management or the scheduling tool, the Student Center since about 2021. That was largely a band aid, a fix that was put in place as the PeopleSoft Student Center was becoming increasingly problematic.

We're focused on phase one right now, and that's those three tools, the degree audit, essentially telling me how do my courses that I've taken or that I'm enrolled in or that I've planned for count toward my degree. You might think of it as the categorical listing of degree requirements. The second tool, then, of course, is the pathway, the plan. What should I take each semester, and then finally registration. I'm ready to register. I'm ready to enroll. And it's all in one tool. And you can see the display here, we'll have a little more in the video, a little bit of a screenshot there as well. But again, the huge advantage is that this is all in one tool. So as we're rolling out Phase one, Sean mentioned that we just went completely live on the East, Columbus, and Fort Wayne campuses. This phased

rollout has allowed us to learn from what went well, what did not go so well. We even included a thirty-six student pilot to actually do the full experience of planning and registering for the spring semester. We learned a lot. In fact, we just heard a new release come out today on closing some of the gaps that were identified in the functionality with that experience. The students that were just invited in the tool last week, which is the rest of all of those campuses, are being invited to a survey tomorrow, Wednesday. They're being invited to that survey to give us more feedback that will continue to inform how we adjust the tool as we launch with the remaining regional campuses in the spring, and really appreciate the hard work they've been doing to have the audits and the pathways ready to roll for these students and exceptions. We have a lot of exceptions, thousands upon thousands of exceptions that have been baked into the old system. So those have been ported over, but we've also found fixes to the audits themselves so that we will not have to do exceptions as frequently in the future. The audits will work more correctly. And then, of course, our Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses are not just hanging out waiting for this to go live next fall. They're very busy with developing those audits and pathways as we look ahead to that launch next fall.

Phase one by the numbers gives you a sense of our progress as of, I believe this is last week. And this is the chart that Katie really lives by and keeps us all accountable to. This is working with our colleagues on each of the campuses, largely in the registrar recorder type spaces as they're building those audits, and we're setting some goals and now providing some monthly updates to our colleagues in Indianapolis and Bloomington to stay on track for the very large lift they have with over 1,000 audits for those two campuses combined.

Katie's going to tell you about project management. I'm excited to point out as President Witten shared that this implementation is one of the first large scale initiatives that our project management team has been assigned to. So, I know you all are aware that any enterprise software implementation is extremely complex, and Stellic is certainly no exception, and this implementation is really relying on the talent and the skills and the dedication of many individuals from throughout our university. As you can see on the slide, hundreds of colleagues across our nine campuses coming from many different units within the university, all working together to reach our goals. Project management, the role is critical to ensuring that our technical and our functional team members are really working in lockstep together to move things forward while also liaising with our partners at Stellic as they continue to refine and add new development to the tool. Clear and consistent communication is key both within our implementation team, which is quite large, and also with key stakeholders throughout our campuses. We continue to focus on making progress on our implementation timeline, identifying blockers to our forward movement and then working to clear those blockers as they arise. As we move forward, we are really ensuring that the software meets our functional and process needs as intended when we originally made the decision to move forward with Stellic. In summary, I'm just very honored to be involved in this initiative that will have such a big impact on our student experience. Back to Matt.

Alright, so we did want you to hear from someone representing our most important stakeholders in this process, our students. We've got a nice little video, thanks to our colleagues in university communications for producing this. We do plan on sharing that, of course, with students as a way of building excitement about this tool as we move forward. Students are, of course, our primary stakeholders here, but the advising community is an important stakeholder group in this mix as well. You heard President Witton mention earlier that we just recently completed getting all of our academic advisors trained on coaching foundations techniques. And that was really part of a strategic effort to have more of our advising conversations focused on students' holistic well-being, their career

development. Looking ahead, rather than hunting and pecking through complicated disconnected systems to find degree requirements. And so we've got a quote here from our colleague, Susan Moat, the Director of Advising at IU East, emphasizing that this tool really helps make things quicker, more efficient.

Next step, we're also building training and working on the communications planning for the next two semesters of go live for the audits and the pathways. Those timelines will be sent out here very soon. We are working very closely with those campuses to talk about monthly metrics so that we can meet our goal, and we can implement this on time. The last one is that development and planning are underway for Phase two and three, and we mentioned that Phase two is related directly to the advised functionality. Phase three is that transfer perspective student module that I mentioned. For phase three we must wait for the audits and pathways to be built for us before launching that. We're weighing our decisions now if we can launch several aspects of that over time, or if we need to wait until all the audits pathways are done. With Phase two, there were some specific feedback we had recently on that, and I do want to emphasize, this is just an exploratory part of Phase two. It's not necessarily an explicitly planned portion right now. But Stellic does offer essentially an early alert tool similar to the student engagement roster. We know that there are significant gaps between what it can do today versus what the IU developed Student Engagement Roster can do, but we're going to be reaching out to the campuses to get names of a couple of faculty, and then working with Ann Leftwich, and my understanding is each of the faculty counsels has a tech committee to engage those groups for some feedback, to essentially see a demo and help us explicitly identify what those gaps look like, how broad they are, and then see what Stellic can or cannot do to address those. I do want to emphasize this is just exploring that aspect of the tool. We are not currently planning to move away from the Student Engagement Roster. We just want to see if that's a possibility that would make sense and might make it a more efficient experience for everyone in the future when those gaps are closed.

UCM has been working very closely with us on all things communication and putting a tool kit together that each campus will receive so that they can communicate out effectively without having to design their own communication plan. We are a development partner with Stellic, which means that we are giving very open and honest feedback to them along the way. They're working very closely with us to develop the tool that we need for our students to be successful in such a large organization like IU. And they've been incredibly responsive, and we're really excited about where this continues to develop in the future.

Questions for the Stellic Team

I wonder if in future work, that this tool could align with helping students track things like micro credentials or alternative credentials, some of those things that cross the line between pure academic credit hours and other kinds of activities.

We should have explicitly mentioned one of the big changes we're making as we move to Stellic is that we are explicitly doing audits and pathways for not just majors, but also minors, certificates and graduate programs. That's a big shift from the tools we have today where they're almost entirely focused on undergraduate bachelor's programs. It does certainly offer that flexibility, and it can be a mixture of course based and non-course based milestones that are built into the requirements to track.

For programs that are aligned with IU collaborative graduate programs, when are we going to be able to encourage our students to explore Stellic?

We're launching collaborative programs at the same time we're launching that campus. So, in terms of Kokomo, that'll be spring of 25. But every campus is launching together. We do have the audit builders who are also building the pathways. There's, I believe, a dedicated person or two specifically to the collaborative programs to try to create some of that symmetry and consistency across the campuses in the look and feel of those audits and pathways, which will help the student experience across the way, but also help the administrators work closely with them.

I'm curious about what access faculty will have to Stellic. I feel like I am like my students. I will have the IG GPS pulled up. I will have a variety of tabs when I'm meeting with them and kind of helping them try to think about what courses they can take. So we have access to the pathways part? And then also our directors of undergraduate studies or graduate studies would probably need access to other functionalities, too.

We're working to develop out some public views of the pathways. Today we have public views of our degree maps. We want to have the same thing with the pathways. Once that happens, of course, everyone would of course be able to have those. The larger question is around access to student level data, and that is something that is controlled by policies much more local to not just the campus, but the unit that you're a part of. So that's something that would flow through your local data access coordinator. So I would say if you have access to student level data today in Address based on your role, nothing about the Stellic implementation would change that. That's a process at your unit level.

What is the user experience like from the students, some of the feedback you've received? Because I ask, I've been a little surprised and shocked when I meet with some students where they struggle even with systems like Canvas. And we just assume that because they're digital natives, that they have a level of proficiency, and so what is the training going to be? And will you roll that into like NSO or even some of the FYE things in their first couple of weeks on campus?

You just named the two most likely suspects of where we will be embedding the training. So certainly, new student orientation, and as students are coming in, we've got a series of five, soon to be six videos that are specific to different parts of the student journey that help them think about what they should do next in Stellic. Certainly NSO, I would imagine that's where you'll be introducing the pathways, much in the same way that today we introduce the IGPS degree maps there. The videos are no more than two to 3 minutes each, so they're very easy to embed into those experiences. And then first year seminars are, of course, another really popular place for training on these tools today, and I expect that to continue. We're going to be focused on training advisors and training advisors on how to train students with our work. We also to add on to that. I already have a website that is launched and available, which has those videos on demand. And we're also monitoring adoption as we speak and are ready to pivot from a communication standpoint whenever necessary to ensure adoption.

8 Proposed changes to UA-03, which is IU's policy on Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Misconduct. [action item]

Jenni Kade, Associate Vice President of Institutional Equity and Title IX/University Title IX Coordinator/University ADA Coordinator

The UA-03 policy replaced the old policy against sexual harassment in 2015. Since that time, we've largely retained the same policy and structure, which has held up well for us in sort of after-action reviews and litigation, mostly because of the many talented and committed people that work on these issues every day across the university. With the issuance of new 2024 Title IX regulations last spring,

as we've done in the past, we convened a group of faculty and staff to review the proposed revisions. We also sort of keep a list constantly of items that we think we need to revise in the policy, and then when we get the opportunity, we just include those as updates. Those are incorporated in the draft as well. On June 17, the implementation of the 2024 Title IX final rule was enjoined for the state of Indiana through a federal district court decision in Kentucky. And as of today, that new Title nine rule is enjoined in 26 states. The revisions today comply with the 2020 Title IX regulations, and as I mentioned, are items that we believe are needed to improve the policy. You have the full red line and background in your materials, and I'll highlight some revisions today. And I'll also mention that we do include and get student feedback on this policy as we go along. We did not do that because there's very little that has changed in terms of the student procedures and process, because we did not go forward with any of the 2024 regs. The plan is really to complete the culture of respect initiative, the two-year process that we're doing at IU Bloomington, that will wind up January, February, and then to work with the student government representatives in the spring on an update on sort of both those areas.

A few highlights, I think of the changes that are sort of just more than alignment. Under jurisdiction, a provision that clarifies a situation that's come up for us numerous times where we don't have jurisdiction over a person in terms of their employment or student status, but we want to address complaints and change or end that person's role without doing a full and lengthy investigation. And that second provision is to clarify that we only defer to other university processes to address behavior, for example, where we would terminate someone sort of immediately if that behavior poses a serious security threat. This is something that is almost never used. I think the incidents where it has come up are in child pornography cases. And again, we just wanted to clarify that we're only going to be moving to say ACA 52 under those very sort of dire circumstances.

Under reporting obligations. First, we have, hopefully, you all take it. A new online training for all employees. So references to that training are updated in the policy. Second, we wanted to be able to address situation where employees who have obligations to report have not done so or have affirmatively covered up or discouraged reporting. This is infrequent, but it does happen and right now there's nothing really applicable to that in the policy.

And finally, we've really had a proliferation of roles across the universities such as peer navigators or ombuds in schools and departments, and we want to clarify that people in those roles still have to make the report to our office if they receive information about potential policy violations.

For employee cases, since 2020, we added an initial assessment process, and that has really worked well for us. And what that does is if we get a complaint and we are not going to move forward with that person's concern, we will complete an initial assessment. They will get a letter or memo back that says what we looked at and that we are not moving forward, but I think it establishes that we are really looking at every concern and looking into it. They get an appeal right at the end of that if we are not moving forward to their decisional official. And that was just sort of a general reference in the policy, so we've expanded that to be a little bit more explanatory.

A second piece that was added in 2020, was discrimination against a unit or department. That process also has been very useful for us when perhaps there's not one individual responsible for discriminatory behavior, but the processes of the unit need to be looked at, need some recommendations. So, we added a line there that when we do that, that final report will go back to the department or campus as appropriate.

We did not have an appeal for an interim step like a suspension in employee cases, and we needed to add that. So if someone's suspended at the outset of an investigation or perhaps their duties have been changed, perhaps they are not permitted to be in a certain location, there is the ability to appeal that measure, as there has been on the student side.

Lastly, on this section, we added in the information about who the decisional official is or the appellate official is, the School of Medicine role. This is what we've been doing all along as a designee that goes through their head of academic affairs with the Dean and Vice President being an appellate official, so that language was added.

And then this mostly applies to the student side, but it's just a clarification that we will not put student disciplinary holds on someone who has been asked to meet as a witness. That really, we haven't been doing that for a long time. It was recommended that that not be done under Title IX cases. But we do expect that someone will not interfere with an investigation or witness participation. And then we've also had multiple cases where respondents, that's the person that's alleged to be responsible for the behavior doesn't fully participate, doesn't provide information, and then tries to show up at a hearing with all kinds of information at the end. And that just really delays the process. It impacts the other party's ability to look at the information. So, we wanted to clarify that aspect. So that's what I had highlighted.

Question on changes to UA-03

In the red line in several places, it looks like we've added ten calendar days as a deadline for things like saying a report or filing an appeal. As a single mom, I'm wondering on behalf of people who are pressed for time or potentially have a disability, whether it is possible to request an extension of ten days. In addition, anyone who seeks legal representation to help with the investigative process is not going to be able to turn that around in ten days, absent extraordinary circumstances. And so, I'm just wondering if you could speak a little bit more about the ten-day calendar day deadline and how it was chosen.

I think that's just that's a very common time period in this and other policies, and I think we routinely grant exceptions. We routinely have disability accommodations. We very much schedule around someone's external counsel, things like that. There is no timing on that initial period to retain counsel and respond and meet with us. So that happens all the time that we are waiting for someone's lawyer to be available to meet with them. It really has not been an issue, but we need to have some consistency in order to move the process forward and to fulfill that obligation to try to be timely and to sort of keep things going. And the addition of those in the red line is just where we didn't have that on certain sections. So, we've now tried to go through and put that all the way through. If there is a case where, for instance, someone felt that they were not granted the time or it was unfair? That's an appeal basis, so would be that procedural error bias in the process. So but that's something that we deal with all the time

Is there a mention in the policy of the ability to request an extension of the deadline so that folks who aren't represented or aren't familiar with this kind of procedure aren't prejudiced by simply reading the policy and assuming they only have ten days.

Yeah, I'll go back and look through that, and honestly, I don't know the answer for sure. But another thing is that our investigators are communicating with parties and informing them of that all along. And as students, our victim advocates, our student advocates on the respondent side. So it's such a common thing that I mean, really we do it a lot. And so I will go back and double

check if it's in there, but it has not really come up. I will say we have parties that try to abuse that sometimes. Again, where we've gone a few times. We're like, No, this is going to be the day, it's going to be due, you know, we're going to set a hearing date, something like that. So it's more common that we're on that end of it and not the case where someone would be, I think, prejudiced by not being able to get their information in..

Vote taken and motion passed

9. Report from the UFC Research Affairs Committee

Ben Ben Kravitz, Assistant Professor of Earth and Atmosphere Sciences, and Chair of the Research Affairs Committee

First, I wanted to just discuss how much I've enjoyed the collaborative nature of this committee. Russ and his team have made working with our committee a priority, and I think what IU research is doing is a lot stronger for it. So, I'll start with a couple of policy initiatives that we're working on. The first is UA 17, which deals with conflicts of interest and commitment. To put it bluntly, IU's current policy is not great. It basically says, if you're engaging in an outside activity, which means something that could conflict with your job, you have 30 days to report it. And this is out of step with our peers, out of step with just about everyone else I can think of. And more importantly, it puts IU and its employees at risk. So, if there's a problematic engagement that has less than a 30-day window, in principle, you could engage in it and complete it and then let IU know after it's over, and you would not have violated the policy. And then nobody could do anything about it. So, this is a gap that we need to close. I've been working with several people in IU research, and we are essentially looking at overhauling the policy to get it in line with appropriate standards and the law. We're not just going to unilaterally do this. We want comments. So as soon as it's in a good enough shape to share, everyone here will see it. And the goal is to have this brought before UFC formally by the end of the academic year.

The other major policy item we're working on is discussions with the Innovation and Commercialization Office. The new policies state that there are faculty councils to review intellectual property and copyright. Research and creative activity vary widely across IU, and we want to make sure that the councils reviewing these activities understand the activities, because ultimately we do want people to be able to commercialize appropriately. That's how everybody wins. So, it's a question of figuring out who's going to be on those committees. I've been in discussions with UFC leadership, and that sort of stuff is moving forward.

I'm not going to name everything else we've been doing, but I did want to bring up a few important items, especially so that I can get comments and feedback and take those back to the committee so that we know what to pay attention to going forward. Russ is going to talk about how well IU is doing with honors and research expenditures. I do want to emphasize is we want to make sure this applies to everybody in the IU system. For example, if there are faculty at regional campuses who want to be grant active, we want to make sure they have the access to the resources they need to do that. It's been really enlightening in conversations with our committee to realize that different campuses have different access to software, interlibrary loan, grant support. And there have also been some growing pains under all of the reorganization. Staff gets overworked. So, there's a difference between bringing in grants and then keeping them. If we don't invoice our sponsors appropriately, then, you know, that's a problem, too. There are a lot of issues that we've been made aware of that we are interested in hearing from across the IU system. So during the Q&A session, I'd really like to hear your feedback on all of those.

Another item we've discussed is undergraduate research opportunities. This is a major point of importance for just about everybody I've talked to. In one of the first conversations, I ever had with Russ, we talked about the layered learner model of mentoring. So you'd have a faculty PI or a team of faculty members, underneath them, a set of post docs or graduate students and underneath them, a cohort of undergraduates. And so everybody can learn from each other, everybody can talk to each other, and the work can be more than just the sum of the groups parts. On the Bloomington campus, we already do something like this in the form of the Assure program. We want to make sure that everybody has access to that. There's a goal to explicitly fund these sorts of programs under a competitive proposal process. There's also the undergraduate research conference, which is IU wide. My previous co-chair, Tom Stuckey has been very involved in this. There's a lot we can do and a lot we're trying to do. But basically, the ultimate goal is to make sure that every undergraduate who wants to, has the opportunity to engage in research and creative activity. We've got a long way to go, but we are trying, and we are interested in trying more.

Another point of discussion that's come up that has come up today, but it's also come up in our committee is SEA 202. This does have research implications. Let's say there are undergrads who are working with a faculty member in an independent study course or graduate students who are working with faculty members under research. The complaint button works for everyone and given various opinions on how well the law is written, this is a gray area that we need to keep an eye on. As of right now, we've just sort of been scrambling to catch up and get pieces together. But I wanted to flag that this has come up in our committee as an additional item that needs to be addressed. So, those are some very brief updates. I deliberately wanted to end my remarks early because I raised a lot of issues that I want to hear from all of you.

Questions for the Research Committee

I wanted to talk about two particular things. One is the undergraduate research. Part of it, I know that, you know, we have to pay the undergraduate researchers to work in labs most times, unless they have a scholarship or a work study program. And sometimes I think even the faculty across campus, and we've talked even amongst our departmental people, is that it becomes a problem because sometimes a PI may not have the funds to have more than one or two undergraduates. So it does a disservice to the undergraduate researcher, because even when I was training, it really helps to have research on your applications. And to be dependent on payment, I think there should be a policy in place that as long as the undergraduate researcher, has the capacity and is okay with not being paid, and is doing in volunteering services, we do volunteer services in the hospitals in different places and venues. So why in research is this disservice being done to an undergraduate researcher who needs to be paid to actually perform research?

Ultimately, we want to be fair to the undergrads. There are various mechanisms that this can go forward with. So, the layered learner model that I mentioned, we're talking about explicit funding from IU research to cover that, which would pay people. So that's one way to do it. Another way, I have personally worked with undergraduates who was registered for a research course, which was their choice as part of an honors track in our department. And so that's another mechanism. I think as we move forward on this, there are going to be some interesting problems with scaling up that look like what you just mentioned. I would say that's a good problem to have. And so we might have to solve those as we go.

Follow up

just to comment on that. I think even when they register for courses, sometimes even on the School of Medicine side, there may be clinical faculty or other faculty that are not registered. And

so it becomes really a problematic situation to have a course registered where you're not unless you're applying, and sometimes faculty don't want to take that extra mile. And so I think that's another disservice that could be happening to these undergraduate students because I feel like undergraduate researcher is so important to become competitive for grad school or for other application processes or for academia in general, you know, in the future.

And then the other point I wanted to make is, if the financial for grants and budgeting, if the financials were more transparent for PIs, because sometimes we have to go through administration that is looking at our financials, and then we get reports every month. And so sometimes it becomes hard as PIs when you're tracking research reports, because then you have to be dependent on if there's a platform out there that PIs could have access to the grant funding.

Response

So there is GMT, and I will just say GMT exists. That's a separate conversation that I'm very interested in.

Building on that comment, I really appreciate that, and I absolutely agree. I'm very excited to hear that your committee is also thinking about involving students in research. I'll say in the Student Affairs Committee, this also came up as in the context that not just finances, but also just sort of heterogeneity of the whole student research experience, and also faculty's access. I keep learning each year about new opportunities for funds that can potentially fund students. And what this ends up resulting in is students with inequitable access to research. They end up sort of coming into it happenstance, and there's nothing systematic. So I guess my comment here is maybe we could consider forming a subcommittee between our two committees to actually talk about this.

The loss of the clinical resource of evidence-based practice of up to date has been a huge impact on regional campuses, especially for our graduate programs, and specifically, I'm talking about our graduate nursing programs. Up to date was something that we've had available to our students to do evidence-based research and apply in a clinical setting. We lost that earlier this year. We were told that there were no longer funds for that in the regional campuses, and there's nothing else even similar that students nor faculty have access to now that that has been taken away. I don't know if that falls, as I said under your purview, but if anyone, you or anyone else would be able to speak to maybe an alternative or if there's a way that we can seek out some funding to have that reestablished within our campuses.

I don't know a lot about that, but I wrote it down and I will look into it.

I participated in undergraduate research for a few years. And I think one thing just to be cautious of similar to the requirement for pay is when it so, I don't really understand the requirement to pay because I certainly wasn't paid. But it was, like, a requirement for like to take it for credit. And the issue became when I was approaching my credit limit. And so, like going past, like the 18-hour limit for research was also an additional barrier. And so just being mindful of that, I think is something I guess, yeah, just to be mindful of.

I think, to me, one of the biggest barriers for undergraduate research is simply finding the opportunity. I'm also transfer students, so there's just a whole bunch of layers here, I guess. But when I was transferring here and looking for undergraduate research opportunities, I remember

scrolling through the Chemistry Departments website, the Biology Department website, all of these things trying to find individual faculty members labs for hours, for hours. And so, I think has there been any discussion on, you know, like, maybe a central platform or something that makes it like lowers that barrier for students to be able to just even simply search for those opportunities in the first place?

Yes, there has. That's something that the committee is very interested in. The barrier to that is the only thing worse than the current system is a one stop shop that's completely out of date. It needs to be constantly maintained and that requires effort. And so figuring out where that fits given the to do list has been a challenge, but it is on the list.

Russ Mumper, Vice President for Research

I want to thank all of you for your contributions to Indiana University and for your time here today. I did want to just touch on four topics. The mission of IU research, what I call building on Excellence, Areas of Opportunity, and then supporting pillar two of the IU 2030 strategic plan. I'll just comment briefly on undergraduate research, and I'll touch on in a minute. I We've been very engaged, particularly working with Ben and his colleagues on the Research Affairs Committee talking about undergraduate research.

I was asked by President Whitten a few months to go to kind of give a snapshot of undergraduate research opportunities in front of the Trustees. I made two observations to the Trustees. One is, there's amazing undergraduate research experiences at Indiana University across the campuses, across the schools, across the departments. I had an opportunity, although very short to highlight and profile some of those, and they're really extraordinary in their effort and the outcomes, and the experiences that they provide to students. The other observation is really at the heart of some of the questions here today, that as a comprehensive research-intensive university, AAU, 90,000 students, what would we do if we and when I presented to the Trustees, we invited three undergraduate students to speak about their experiences. As you can imagine, they're very impressionable, and the Trustees were really appreciative because students speak to the heart of what that opportunity meant to them in the paths that it opened up. And so then I asked, if we wanted to offer that opportunity not just for those three students or 100 students or 1,000 or 10,000 or 50,000, how would we do that as a university? How would we come together and kind of scale access and opportunities for students? And we've spent the better part of 18 months, probably on seven or eight occasions asking that question. And I think from the nature of the question here today and over the past several months, it's something that is of great importance to faculty across IU.

We can talk about that more, but I just wanted to make that comment. So really four points. One is the mission. I never speak about IU research without emphasizing our primary mission is to facilitate the research interests of individual, faculty, departments, schools, colleges, centers, campuses, and the university at large. We are at heart a service organization, and we are sincerely interested in continuous quality improvement. We're not perfect. I think we're getting better. And I think we also have the opportunity to grow at scale, because IU is an amazing place and faculty collectively are doing amazing things in terms of being research productive, and we need to accommodate and scale to meet all of those needs.

Another really important responsibility we have, and it's a bar that is and Ben knows this well, constantly being raised that's in the area of research compliance, whether it's use of animals, use of human subjects, research, misconduct, conflict of interest, conflict of commitment. There is no doubt that at a national level, the bar is being defined. It's being raised. And we have obviously a very important responsibility to make sure that Indiana University remains complying with all of those

accrediting bodies, federal policies. But at the same time, we seek each and every day to minimize that administrative burden on faculty, whether it's through communication, workshops, and enhanced ways to disclose. We constantly seek feedback, and I think I'll go to the next thing I'll mention is our leadership, myself. We have many stakeholders we engage with frequently on an ad hoc basis or scheduled basis. But I think our go to kind of committee for dealing with initiatives, policies, problems, challenges, opportunities is Ben and Heather and their committee. And they've been extraordinary partners in being able to identify problems, opportunities, working through policy, initiation, changes.

The other thing that we do is, I think we're looked upon by the university to curate pillar two, transformative research and creative activities. From my perspective, it was really nice because I started in June of 2023. As President Witten said this morning, the IU 2030 plan was launched in April 23, and I looked at it and said, you know, this is our charge. How can we coalesce and build a leadership team, a support staff to help IU execute pillar two of the 2030 strategic plan in terms of people, processes, initiatives, and investments. And a lot of work has been ongoing, and I'm really happy to say, and hopefully you'll see this with the dashboard is I think the university is making very good progress, in some cases amazing progress on reaching highly quantified metrics related to IU 2030. That's kind of the mission, and I'm happy to elaborate that more.

The second area was building on Excellence. From my perspective, there is profound excellence at IU across a very broad and comprehensive research portfolio, and you can measure excellence in many different ways. Many of those are quantitative, some of those are qualitative, and some of those are inputs like getting sponsored awards. Others are outputs, like research publications, and how often publications from IU faculty or research staff are cited, and we're doing that. I think if there's one metric that will really signify the research excellence and potential of a comprehensive research university that is external honorific awards of faculty, national, international. And fortunately, those are easy to track, too. We can look to academic analytics, which lists some 9,000 curated international and national awards. And IU does very well in those metrics. The current inventory is that IU faculty have received over 2,300 national/international awards, which puts IU near the top 30 of all universities in the country. So that's a really, really strong metric that bodes well. There's other ways to look at the research excellence and really ambition of the university. This is also very easy to track, and that is how many proposals are IU faculty and researchers putting out annually. That number is increasing every year. Last fiscal year, it was almost 4,300 proposals. So an amazing number of proposals from all over campus. If you want to look at the dollar amount of those proposals, last fiscal year, it was almost 3.7 billion dollars and the prior year it was 3.1 billion dollars. So more proposals, more complex proposals, which really demonstrates the ambition of the research faculty. Sponsored awards were up, as President Witten mentioned, in last fiscal year, over 3,000 awards to IU faculty from over 840 sponsors with some 1,400 unique PIs. So great excellence and ambition, as I mentioned.

President Witten also mentioned R&D expenditures. This is also very easy to track because it's very visible. National Science Foundation publishes their HERD Survey, higher education, research and development survey, where some nearly 700 universities fill out a very comprehensive survey on sources of research and development expenditures, whether they're from federal, state, philanthropic, or business, but also topical on these broad fields, from social science to arts and humanities to STEM and medicine. The growth in the research and development expenditures by IU for really a research enterprise of this size has been extraordinary, about 28% over the last four fiscal years. That's very quantitative, and it's very visible. Anyone could look. It's publicly accessible. You can go to NSF HERD. But that is also an indication of the excellence of IU, not only because of the dollars it's bringing in and those dollars are expended, but everyone knows that the landscape for securing

funded research today is more competitive than it's ever been in the lifetime of competing for awards. So the growth over this period of time frame really indicates that not only are the faculty ambitious, but they're really good and they're really competitive, and that's really been something to see

President Witten also mentioned the School of Medicine and their kind of proliferation, and their goal to become a top ten public funded, NIH funded School of Medicine. They're currently 13. Nearly two thirds of that increase in R&D expenditures is from the School of Medicine. So they've really been doing extraordinarily well. We're already into the first five months of FY 25, and the growth in sponsored research or sponsored awards, and research and development expenditures are up. It's a fairly good likelihood that at the end of FY 25, total R&D expenditures for IU as a whole will reach one billion dollars, making it the first university in the State of Indiana to reach that. That will put IU further in a point of distinction.

So let me go to the third area areas of opportunity. I really mentioned the focus areas. They're really on these key metrics that are in IU 2030 strategic plan; whether it's increasing sponsored research as defined sponsored research, doubling the number of grants over five million dollars, which is really a sign for enhanced multidisciplinary team based research over any of the comprehensive and broad areas in which we do research. So how do you do that? How do you coalesce faculty across disciplines to go after team based science? Ideally, you position them well before an RFP comes out. So that's something that we've been working on with very great intent in our Office of Research Development. And then there's a lot of what we call translational research activity, which is the reason why we work with Ben and the UFC RAC to revise what was formerly the UA-05, the IP policy and separated out copyright and IP. I would say, from my perspective, we really didn't change the essence of those policies, but we did two things. One is to further incentivize inventions and creativity and to reward creative and inventive faculty, we increased the retained royalty to creators or inventors 35-50%, surpassing standard practice of about 40%. That was to incentivize creative and inventive faculty and research staff. The other thing we did and Ben mentioned this is we created a copyright policy committee and a patent policy committee, which has both faculty and students. We worked very closely with Cooper to make sure that we are involving students to support their interest. So we've really been focused on those key metrics and the investments that we've been making and the initiatives that we've been developing are really tied to those. A lot of focus then on kind of big ideas, multi-disciplinary team science, a lot of attention to space, making sure that we have contemporary space on campus, not only to retain, but also to recruit new faculty and to support the tremendous growth of the university. With space, we also are making big investments in equipment that will go into that space.

I mentioned another very important area, and that is, we're constantly working on the various compliance issues, trying to make sure that the university maintains compliance with state and federal regulations, but in a way that to the best that we can minimize the administrative burden on faculty.

The last area, I'll talk about just very briefly is kind of supporting pillar two. President Witten mentioned the investments that we've made in STEM and life science, bioscience, but also arts and humanities. About a year ago now, we named what I call the Chief Arts and Humanities Research Officer for Indiana University. That's Ed Dallis Comentale. Hopefully, you saw his from the desk article, November 13, talked about all the initiative in arts and humanities. I think there's a lot to be celebrated in that area. I think of equal importance in identifying kind of key strengths in making investments so that we can compete nationally is to continue to make investments and support individual faculty across the breadth of our whole research enterprise. That's something that we aspire to do and think

about every day. We spent a lot of time working on completely reimagining our Office for Research Development. I'm really happy to say, we don't have it perfect yet, we're still growing that out. But from my perspective looking across all of our competitors and higher ed, I think certainly six months from now, a year from now, we will say that IU truly has an asset that many other universities don't have, and that is kind of perpetual access to coalesced faculty around team based science, proposal and development services, pre-awards, internal funding mechanisms we paid a lot of attention to. I think in terms of the multidisciplinary team based science; we're really excited about two new RFPs that we put out in the last few months. One is called the IU 2030 Emerging Frontiers Grant Program. This will be an annual call. This year, we received 20 proposals. We plan to make 12 awards up to \$50,000 of awards. I forgot to mention that with the Reimagining Office of Research Development, one of the things that we did is we made them available to all of IU across any campus. That wasn't fully implemented before. So the IU 2030 Emerging Frontiers Program is really thinking about coalescing teams, like I said, the multi-disciplinary. We got 20 proposals and plan on making 12 awards. I'm not involved in the decision making process. It's still a review process, but I'm really, really excited about the quality and the breadth of those applications. Kind of a complimentary program was the Seed Grant Program, which is to seed early science research, and creative work. That's a big part of our budget. We have set aside 1.7 million dollars annually to make about three dozen awards up to \$50,000 each. We received, just recently after the deadline, 60 proposals and plan on making about three dozen awards. So we're really excited. So I hope you can see that the investments we're making are directly tied to the IU 2030 strategic plan to help us meet those investments.

Ben mentioned the layered learner for undergraduate researchers. We did work on an RFP with a number of stakeholders, including the RAC. We have just launched in the last day or so, a new RFP through Office of Internal Programs or Office of Research Development for the proposals along the lines of what Ben mentioned, kind of this layered learner, faculty member, junior faculty, postdoc, research staff, or graduate student, and undergraduate students. So I would encourage you to look at that. The other thing that we did is we solidified an all internal grant review panel of faculty to review these RFPs that have deadline driven funding programs. So really having faculty continue to be involved in advising us on making selections.

Just a couple more points. I mentioned the really the importance on external honorific awards, national/international. In August, we recruited Andrew McLaren, who some of you may know, to spend his full time on working, identifying faculty with what were called ripe for national/international awards. We really focused on prestigious NRC based, awards, National Research Council, to really identify those faculty and then work with his or her home departments to prepare them for those awards and all of the things you have to do. I think that we're going to be able to track the success of that investment in Andrew working across the university to do that. We have focused a lot, and this is a metric in IU 2030 about enhancing our research partnerships with industry. Of note, we're almost a one billion a year research university, and of that billion dollars, only about 4% are sponsored industry awards. So there's a huge upside potential to work with industry not only because it's a step closer to market, and we can translate our activities, but there is a strong focus to not only work with industry, but to involve opportunities for students to work on those kind of real world problems and perhaps even meet their first boss, their first employer. So a lot of attention to that. We're doing things to kind of move at the speed of business, incentivizing business, and we're solidifying those through new partnership agreements, which are really exciting.

We spent a good part of the last year clarifying, solidifying what we call SIMs, acronym for centers, institutes, museums, and core facilities. There are 20 defined SIMs. You can go to our website and see

those. They're interdisciplinary, they're core research, they're state affiliated organizations or organizations or centers that are focused on state initiatives, but there's 21 on solidifying kind of what they are, why they're important for multi-disciplinary team based award, and then how would the centers and institutes and core facilities work with schools and colleges where a lot of those core faculty and those entities have their academic appointments.

One of the things that we focused in is the allocation of indirect cost dollars and also kind of prioritization and decision of when is or when is it not appropriate for a multidisciplinary team proposal to go up through a center and not the PI's home academic unit. So that allocation formula really helped to solidify that. We spent a lot of time over the last year really implementing, clarifying, trying to be as transparent as possible on our new ICR allocation formula that went into effect July 1. Really, it went into effect three weeks after I started. I'm sorry. I committed at the time that any dollar that IU research collected as part of that retained ICR portion, which is shared with UITS, that I would commit that no less than annually to report out exactly where every dollar was spent. So one year later, I think it was early August. I put out a two or three page memo which detailed for FY 24 across seven defined areas where every dollar was spent that we had collected over that prior year and for FY 25, where every dollar that we planned on collecting would be spent to be as transparent and clear as possible about how those dollars were being used and asking if there were any questions or clarification or feedback that we would be receptive to that. We already talked about the IP and copyright policy.

I guess the last thing I'll mention is one of the opportunities that I saw when I first came here are those faculty across many different disciplines that had already had an external award or contract in hand, but for many reasons, we're not able to find the research staff to execute the award. Often the barrier was that, the faculty had the award in hand, had money in the budget to hire research staff, but could not move quick enough, or when they were able to move quick enough, the university, because of its staff classification for research employees, often lost out to the market where these creative and research professionals had better offers. So we worked with HR to develop and launch the research innovator career track, hopeful you've heard about it because we've been utilizing it now for seven or eight months. Just recently, working with RAC, we put out a two page primer, which really details description of the research innovator career track, the requirements and FAQs. But I think that as we grow in our research enterprise, I think one of the key things we're looking at is how do we move quickly to get a lot of talent to come to IU and want to invest their time, not just for a job, but their career. That was really the motivation of the research innovator career track.

Questions for V.P Mumper

I just wanted to make one comment. I really appreciate the last part as well about hiring research staff, because I think that truly is an impeding factor when research grants are in place and actually money is allocated to it. And sometimes 20 to 30% of those grants are allocated for hires or more than that for salaries, stipends, etc. And so if we have to give that back, would be truly unfair. And we're not allowed to give back more than 20% at any given time or 25%, right? And those awards cannot be redirected. So the faster or efficient hiring processes should really be thought about, especially for research funds.

Thank you. We'll pass that on to HR as well.

Just thinking it through, I appreciate the highlight of some of the new funding opportunities that you had. But even just looking at them, many of the internal roles here within IU in terms of access

to resources and funding and even just release time to do research and creative activity is really focused just on very specific tenure lines, research lines. So I know and maybe this is a product of just the South Bend campus. I don't know if it's across the board for regionals, but if we want to have more undergraduate research, I think expanding the opportunity beyond just tenure lines and research lines to have funding, to have the awards, to have access, to even support services to do research, I think we would see a significant movement. So can you speak to your involvement in any conversations or conversations that are going to be happening in terms of evaluating what's currently in existence within IU and potentially reviewing those for opportunities for others to do research.

Thanks for that question. I think I could address it in a couple of different ways. I think the first thing I'll say is we reimagined our internal awards program, opened it up to all of the university. We did that for a couple of reasons. When I came here, I saw that there was just a plethora of internal awards. And I could argue that they weren't tied to a specific strategy. So now we've tied them to the IU 2030 strategic plan. So we launched them. There's no way that we got them completely right at the first launch. And so one of the things that I've really challenged my team to do is continually assess the effectiveness of the current awards; is it meeting the needs, are there challenges, are there opportunities. We'll do that no less than annually to look at the current portfolio of internal awards. We are completely open to ideas for new types of internal funding programs. That's one example of the layered learner to support undergraduate research was just launched just recently is because we in talking with the RAC, we had opportunities. But if you or your colleagues identify other opportunities that we could collectively and collaboratively think about that would help advance the university, we are very open to this.

10. Proposed changes to ACA 05 bylaws of the University Faculty Council of Indiana University.

[action item]

UFC Co-chairs

Phil Goff, IUI

Danielle DeSawal, IUB

Greg Dam, IU East

We're presenting the red lined of the proposed changes to the bylaws, and these are changes that we discussed in our last meeting, and here in red and also in blue, we'll have some additions that were suggested in our last meeting. So I'll go to go through them again. The red ones we discussed in the last meeting. Suggestions from the floor of additions to the bylaws are in blue. Included from our last meeting is that there be a representative from the IU library system and that the committee shall elect its own chair. Are there any comments about these changes? We'll be voting on these changes as they are written. I will mention that Professor Travis O'Brien had a comment regarding codifying the practices of UFC in terms of how the executive committee assigns charges to the committees, and he made a comment that he thought that it would be great to codify that practice into the bylaws, and that comment was not included in these changes, but I had a brief moment with Travis this morning, and we're going to try to find other ways to codify that practice.

Comments on proposed changes to ACA-05 as presented

None

Vote on proposed changes

Passed

Meeting adjourned

Respectfully submitted
Robert. W. Yost