

Bloomington Faculty Council, Student Appointee Affairs Committee Meeting

No 7th 2023

2:00-3:00PM

Charter Room, IMU

Attendees:

Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Joshua Paschal, Elijah Beaton, David Daleke, Allen Davis, Amanda Diekman, Jodi Kutzner, Jon Macy, Deborah Snaddon, Sara Stefani, David Taylor

1. Approval of minutes
 - a. Minutes approved (latest version available on teams)
2. Updates from David Daleke:
 - a. Request to this committee suggestion for discussion: provost asked him to report on SAA stipends based upon discipline every 2 years. There are # of entities he suggests including: the vice provost for academic affairs and an appropriate group of students and faculty.
 - i. Is now going to be a part of this committee (whether or not it will be from the committee as a whole or a sub of this subcommittee). **The ask:** can we do it as this committee?
 - b. Question: how do we get the correct data?
 - i. # of ways to get the data, some have more fidelity than others
 1. Finding the basic info w/o any modifications—SAA stipends are complicated because it is typically just a starting point. Thus, getting total compensation #s are very difficult. So, getting the basic stipend data to start. AAU data from schools in the Big 10 is located in their data warehouse. Collected by CIP code: a standard classification from IPEDS.
 - a. Other options: data could be collected from faculty/student communication (cons: may be difficult to put all this data together, takes much time, possible holes; pros: shareable data) OR Web-scraping (i.e., what data is online, but may not be accurate or up-to-date)
 2. Agreements w/ AAU: cannot harvest the data from the warehouse. Strategy on how to deliver the report: We can aggregate and share amongst governance body (BFC). Can't take data and make it public. Presents an issue. Have to find a compromise w/ the data agreement.
 3. Why this committee to work on it? BFC have all consultative methods / recommendations for the university. This is the logical group for the budgetary faculty.
 4. Institutional analytics will be able to analyze and present this data – possible collaborations. Actually reports to the AAU.
 5. Call & response:

- a. Elijah: curious to know (referring to college of arts and sciences) how we can possibly make this public so other committees can use it?
 - i. If we go to the trouble to collect public data, we can make it public. Or, we can use methods that restrict data presentation and are better (AAU).
- b. Amanada: Why can't we make public a department's stipend level?
 - i. We can do this for our own data if we collect it (IU Bloomington) BUT if we request data from our peers as a comparison, we cannot make it public (data from the warehouse). We ask the data group to present this data for our committee, but cannot make it public. We may not even be able to obtain rankings. But, could possibly get some averages. This may satisfy the provost's request. But, remember, it needs to be useable.
- c. Carolyn: So what's the issue with making public?
 - i. The AAU asks that we follow limitations on the data. They are protective of the data.
- d. Sarah: Reminder, not all schools in the big 10 are public institutions. They don't have the same reporting requirements as public schools. At the the IU Bloomington library there is the Bloomington Library Faculty Council. Currently, the Chair of their committee presented and was charged to get faculty staff and benefits to compare to other libraries. Ask this committee where *they* got their information (they're a copyright librarian). "Among the Big 10 IU ranks..."perhaps we can present it this way so then it does not give away other university information.
 - i. May just be a library connection, but we can further investigate. The difficulty is getting it from the entire Big Ten and using the correct codes, but avoiding making this data public. We can get data by individual departments ourselves and make it public, but it will be less robust. Rankings are possible, but in data use agreement for AAU they have ways to do that.
- e. Sarah: Second Eli's comment about making this data as accessible as possible as priority. We just give it to the provost and then what? How is that useful? Could raise a lot of questions if we have this data but can't be told anything about the data. Could cause negative consequences.
 - i. If we use AAU data, we are limited to sharing. But we could also be creative about presentation.
- f. Carolyn: Can't you just go to the website to see this type of information?

- i. The institution has individuals chosen that can look at this information from the AAU.
 - g. Carolyn: What will the provost DO with the data?
 - i. Unsure of how he will use the data.
 - h. Carolyn: It may be better if we do this in the quickest, most efficient way using AAU data. But, if we do it, Daleke will still consult with this body. We must have transparency.
 - i. Joshua: 1) if we establish a subcommittee out of our committee what do they do? 2) what does THIS committee as a whole do for this project? Would be interested in seeing the data as a peer group.
 - i. Daleke could do the data request himself, but if we do it as a group it engages our group. Have to request and put together your peer group to look at the numbers. And we are talking about averages, not minimums. Note, there's some disciplines that weren't impacted because they were already paid well. But, we want to look at inequities across departments as well.
 - j. Joshua/Eli: The provost office wants to "keep pace" with the stipends given at other universities. We are not entirely sure how to proceed – We recommend that we should form a working group to look at this.
 - k. Daleke: Reminder, data will be almost 2 years old/behind. It's hard to get more up-to-date data. Has to leave at 2:45 for another meeting.
 - l. Jon: Is it by FTE%, can we compare the data by amount of FTE?
 - i. CIP codes, rather than work hours are how they're compared. Different departments are going to have different workloads. That's why aggregate may be the way to go.
 - m. Sarah: can we break it down by STEM vs arts / humanities. There's probably differences?
 - i. Compare BY disciplines (chem and chem) in the Big 10.
 - ii. BUT there's also a push to have solidarity across wages, but there will always be ranges.
 - iii. We could also aggregate to broad fields instead of by departments. This is typical amongst AAU data in general and what we do at IU.
 - n. Josh: Good discussion, let's continue next time. Onto next things.
3. Email from GPSG w/ note sheet and IGWC handout.
 - a. Email from GPSG: dated earlier Feb.

- i. An email expressing the skepticism with the IU 2030 plan via the GPSG newsletter sent to almost all grad students. And also, attached notes/recs from GPSG executive committee on the back.
- b. IGWC handout: Created by IGWC organizers in response to 2030 plan, handout given at Whitten lunch in March.
 - i. Responses from IGWC to show that general grad student response to IU 2030 was not positive
- c. Why showing these today in our meeting?
 - i. This is evidence that GPSG / IGWC do not support IU 2030.
 - 1. IGWC: biggest frustration w/ lack of concentration on SAAs in the IU 2030 plans.
 - 2. GPSG Represents all of grad students (including not workers): feel they are missing key issues like housing/benefits/dependents.
 - ii. Carolyn quoting from GPSG letter: quoting 3rd paragraph, listing of the recommendations that are left out from the IU 2030 plans.
 - 1. Josh/Daleke response: Yes there were a lot of things left out, and the leaders of the strategic plan talked about this as well since a lot was left out of the final version. For example, housing had a working group and some recommendations were made. Unfortunate that it wasn't in the plan. So, it is an issue.
 - 2. David will put task force recommendations into the Teams Folder
 - 3. IGWC/GPSG hand out and email will be put into the Teams Folder also
 - 4. Josh did not write these documents, these are just credible examples of how the strategic plan did not cover the necessities.
 - 5. Daleke about IGWC handout: Their response was very quick and we did not have time to thoroughly go through these things after.
 - a. Josh response: there was never a "formal" release from the IGWC (a press release) this was just a flyer that IGWC organizers put together for the lunch
 - 6. Carolyn about GPSG email: What are these suggestions on the back here? Is it a call to action from the GPSG executive committee specifically? To what extent has the university, or has the university already, addressed this?
 - a. Unsure if there was ever a charge from the GPSG to make these changes, but again these are just suggestions from the group as summarized by the executive committee of GPSG.
 - 7. Sarah about IUB strategic plan: there's a lot of grandiose w/o step by step actions on how to accomplish these lofty goals. Ok sure let's do that, but HOW do we do it? This is really what the students want to know. That's what really is missing.
 - a. Carolyn response: There are documents that addressed this, there are singular departments that are addressing these ideas (in-house solutions) as well.

