

Indiana University

BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL

March 2nd, 2021

broadcast.iu.edu

2:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M.

Members Present: Jim Ansaldo, Karen Banks, Jon Brauer, Daniel Bullock, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, John Carini, Barb Cherry, Dakota Coates, Paul Coats, Rachael Cohen, David Daleke, Allen Davis, Dee Degner, Constantine Deliyannis, J Duncan, Ann Elsner, Kelly Eskew, Pnina Fichman, Jackie Fleming, Linda Gales, Brian Gill, Anthony Giordano, Jason Gold, Lucia Guerra-Reyes, Diane Henshel, Israel Herrera, Justin Hodgson, Larissa Jennings Mayo-Wilson, Colin Johnson, Kari Johnson, Peter Kloosterman, Ben Kravitz, Shanker Krishnan, Sally Letsinger, Bradley Levinson, Scott Libson, Margaret Lion, Annette Loring, Heather Milam, Ted Miller, Jill Nicholson-Crotty, Sameer Patil, Eliza Pavalko, Chuck Peters, Linda Pisano, Angie Raymond, Cate Reck, Steve Sanders, Elizabeth Shea, Marietta Simpson, Lisa Thomassen, John Walbridge, Steve Wyrzynski, Jeffery Zaleski, Kurt Zorn

Members Absent: Rachel Aranyi, Hussein Banai, Annette Champion, Lessie Frazier, Nandini Gupta, Blair Johnston, Robert Kunzman, Jessica Lester, Pedro Machado, Courtney Olcott, Ruhan Syed, Samantha Tirey, Erik Willis

Guests: Jessica Calarco, Dominick DiOrio, Denvil Duncan, Taylor-Page Guba (alternate), Wen Qi

AGENDA:

- 1. Approval of the [minutes of February 2, 2021](#)**
- 2. [Memorial Resolution for Gerald Larson](#)**
- 3. Overview of findings from the IU Work and Care Work Survey (15 minutes)**
Jessica Calarco, Associate Professor of Sociology
[Discussion Item]
- 4. Questions/comments on the overview of findings from the IU Work and Care Work Survey (15 minutes)**
- 5. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)**
John Walbridge, Faculty President

[B28-2021: Center of Excellence for Women in Technology Summer 2017 Faculty Equity](#)

Assessment

6. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)

Lauren Robel, Provost

7. Question/Comment Period

Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to Provost Robel or President Walbridge by emailing bfcoff@indiana.edu

8. Findings from a longitudinal analysis of academic salaries by race and gender (15 minutes)

Dominick DiOrio, Co-chair of the Budgetary Affairs Committee

Pnina Fichman, Co-chair of the Budgetary Affairs Committee

Denvil Duncan, Member of the Budgetary Affairs Committee

[Discussion Item]

9. Questions/comments on the findings from a longitudinal analysis of academic salaries by race and gender (15 minutes)

10. Overview of major findings from the 2019 Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey (15 minutes)

Eliza Pavalko, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs

Wen Qi, Research Analyst, Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs

[Discussion Item]

[2019 Executive Summary of IU Bloomington Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education \(COACHE\) Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey](#)

11. Questions/comments on the overview of major findings from the 2019 Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey (15 minutes)

TRANSCRIPT:

ROBEL: All right. Welcome everybody. Great to have you all with us and to be together and to see that the weather is shifting, and the crocuses are coming up. So, we're looking forward to today and to the days to come.

AGENDA ITEM ONE: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 2ND, 2021

ROBEL: May I ask for the approval of the minutes of our February 2nd, 2021, meeting?

THOMASSEN: I'll approve.

ROBEL: Okay. And a second, please? Great. All in favor?

BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

ROBEL: Fantastic. I take that as approved.

AGENDA ITEM TWO: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR GERALD LARSON

ROBEL: I turn now to Vice Provost Eliza Pavalko for a memorial resolution for Gerald Larson.

PAVALKO: Thank you Provost Robel. The Dhar India Studies Program founding director and first Rabindranath Tagore Professor of Indiana Cultures and Civilizations, Gerald Larson passed away in April 2019.

Gerry came to IU in 1995 after retiring from a long career in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of California-Santa Barbara. He traveled relentlessly around the state of Indiana to ensure that IU could continue to host India Studies for many years to come. He worked tirelessly with Indiana's Indian community, university leadership, faculty, and students to create the foundation of what we now enjoy today as Dhar India Studies, creating a Ph.D. minor and undergraduate major and minor, as well as a certificate program. He developed the first iteration of the Indian Studies "core course," required for the major and the minor, as well as several other courses to add to the repertoire of Hindi and Sanskrit. Within a few years the program was vibrant enough to separate from a first home in the religious studies department. Gerry retired (again) from IU as professor emeritus of religious studies in 2003.

He was the author of many books from classical Indian philosophy as well as on contemporary Indian religion. He continued his scholarly work through conference papers, lectures, and publications until his death. His specialty was the *Samkhya* philosophical system.

In 2018, Brill published a volume of essays in Larson's honor, *Theory and Practice of Yoga*. In that volume, among many other tokens of respect, Jeffery S. Lidkey described Larson's "extraordinary grasp of the textual sources on yogic practice and philosophy."

Upon his retirement, his friends in the area announced the founding of a scholarship in his, and his wife, Claire Larson's, names for students working in South Asia. Gerry was a great friend to many of us here at IU and India Studies and will be sorely missed. Thank you.

ROBEL: Please take a moment to remember Professor Larson.

Thank you all.

AGENDA ITEM THREE: OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS FROM THE IU WORK AND CARE WORK SURVEY

ROBEL: Well, we're delighted to have with us today, Professor Jessica Calarco. Professor Calarco is from the sociology department. And she has done us an enormous service in working very hard to try to understand the effects of the pandemic on our faculty members and particularly on our ability to do our work. And so, she's here with us today to present her findings from the IU Work and Care Work Survey. So, Jess can I turn it over to you?

CALARCO: Yes. Thank you so much, Provost Robel and thank you all for giving me a chance to chat with you all today and to share these results. And so let me share my screen here so that I can walk you through some of the findings. So, since the beginning of the pandemic, I've been conducting research on the challenges that especially school and childcare closures have created for employed parents and especially employed mothers. Building on those findings and building on evidence coming out of research from other universities, revealing the pandemic's disproportionate impact on the work of caregivers, within university settings, I wanted to understand how this care crisis impacting the work and well-being of caregiver employees, both faculty and staff members and also associate instructors here at IU. And so, the research that I'll share today is from a survey that included 340 Indiana University faculty, staff, and associate instructors conducted in December and January. Because the sample is fairly small, this is sort of the key questions that I'm interested in looking at here. Because the sample is fairly small because men are under-represented in the survey, even though it was open to all faculty and staff

and students. And because IU is primarily white, it's difficult to statistically analyze all of the intersectional inequalities that I'd like to look at with these data. And that I hope that others who are continuing these efforts will be able to look at with a larger number of respondents. Specifically looking at the challenges, for example, faced by women of color with caregiving roles here at IU. Thankfully, though the open-ended responses that many respondents shared at the ends of their surveys do allow me to see evidence of those kinds of intersectional inequalities and I'll share some of those data as well.

So, in the survey I asked about respondents paid work and care work responsibilities during the pandemic. And based on those responses, I divide respondents into three categories. So, people, employees who have care responsibilities for young children. This includes parents with children under the age of 10 and those who spent time caring for those kids on weekdays during the pandemic. There's also other caregivers, those who spent time caring for older children or for the elderly or the sick or disabled adults, as well as those who've taken on disproportionate workplace care responsibilities in the wake of the pandemic, such as informal mentoring and support of colleagues, taking on the work of colleagues who are sick or who are unable to work and those who are involved in initiatives aimed at improving workplace culture, particularly in the wake of events related to the systemic racism that exists in our society during the summer. And so, it's certainly that was in the context of this as well. And so, then that also the third category would be non-caregivers so people who reported that they haven't done any of those types of care work during the pandemic.

So, to briefly summarize that the kind of overall takeaways here, the caregivers, people with caregiving responsibilities here at IU are bending themselves over backwards to get their paid work done. In many cases doing even more work than they were doing pre-pandemic. But of course, there aren't unlimited hours in a day and all the extra paid work and care work that caregivers are doing also appears to be taking a serious toll on their health and on their careers.

So, to get into a couple of details, just briefly in terms of staff, I find that staff member caregivers haven't reduced their time on paid work during the pandemic. Instead, roughly half have actually increased their paid what paid work responsibilities. This graph shows the percent of staff members whose work responsibilities either decrease or stay the same or increased during the pandemic. And as you can see from the dark red bars on the right, roughly half of caregivers for young children and other caregivers have increase their work responsibilities. And that's similar to non-caregiver staff. So, while we might expect staff with caregiving roles do have reduced their work tasks during the pandemic. That that's really not what we see here.

Similarly, I find that just like caregiver staff, caregiver academics, faculty, and AIs are mostly reporting increases in the time that they're spending on core tasks, things like service and teaching and mentoring in the wake of the pandemic. This graph, for example, shows the percent of respondents who are faculty and AIs who are reporting either decreased or unchanged or increased time on service during the pandemic, broken down by those different roles that I talked about at the beginning. And as we see here, a huge proportion of the respondents, more than half say that they've increased their service work during the pandemic. And that includes both people with service, caregiving responsibilities who've increase their service just as much as other employees during the pandemic. This is a similar graph for teaching and mentoring. And we see again that a huge proportion of faculty and associate instructors have increased their teaching and mentoring work during the pandemic, well over half. Once again, we find that essentially caregivers are finding ways to get their core work done, their teaching, and their mentoring, and often doing even more than they would normally do. Despite the added responsibilities that many of them are facing outside of work.

At the same time though and as I mentioned before, there are only so many hours in a day. And is this quote from one assistant professor and a mother of young children said, "I've had to re-frame

expectations for my own work as I'm home with small children, one school age, the other preschool age. I'm working to maintain my research, teaching, and service by working odd hours. It's not a pace I will be able to maintain forever, but I'm trying to keep it up for this year. Also, I realized that overall, I will not be as productive across the board, and I just had to accept that reality. For example, I may delay my tenure by a year, something I would not like to do, but the reality is I'm providing caregiving during the day (shared with my spouse who also holds full-time employment at IU) which includes helping with online school. Meanwhile, I'm keeping my work going the best that I can." And so, as this quote suggests, overwork, it isn't sustainable in the long-term that these high levels of overwork that we're seeing and eventually something has to give. And along those lines, and turning to the question of research, I find that many faculty members and associate instructors have reduced their time on research during the pandemic. And those reductions are particularly pronounced among people with caregiving roles.

So, this graph, for example, shows that a huge proportion of respondents said that the light red bars on the left here are the proportion of respondents who are reporting reduced research time during the pandemic. Well over half of all respondents said that they reduce their research time during the pandemic. And we also see that those reductions, the light red bars are significantly greater and more common among academics with care responsibilities, the two at the top, those caring for young children and at the top, and then those with other care work responsibilities as well, compared to those academics who don't have, who reported that they don't have any care work responsibilities who are much less likely, only about a third of respondents without caregiving responsibilities reported a reduction research time compared to roughly 60-65% of those with caregiving roles instead. So essentially, this graph gets at those reductions being more common among and to understand where these reductions are coming from, if it's helpful to look at a couple of quotes that illustrates this point. This is from an associate professor who has an elementary age, children and also workplace care responsibilities. She wrote, "the stress of the pandemic itself, in addition to rapid pivoting uncertainty for family members' health abroad, and the need to care for students, both graduate mentees and those in my classes has frayed my mental health. Making it difficult to concentrate. In the early months of the pandemic there were days I just could not focus, my brain felt like mush. All I could do were shorter, immediate tasks related to my work, and no deep thinking or writing. That feeling has returned in waves and in the middle and later moments of the pandemic. Colleagues with little to no care responsibilities seem to cruise through and take advantage of this time to write and work as normal. Seeing how little they understand the other side of the pandemic effects, and how unwilling they are to reduce service burdens is further demoralizing, increases my stress levels and makes me feel unwelcome in this institution." So, this professor was sort of implying here that non-corrupt caregiver faculty may at least in some cases, have an easier time getting work done, getting research done during the pandemic. And that's actually what we heard in some quotes from faculty as well.

So, this quote, for example is from an associate professor who reported that she does not have any care work roles, at least of those that were listed on the survey, and she wrote, "COVID impacts us in such different ways. I've had more time for writing and research. I'm putting this in so that the results will show the spectrum of experiences, knowing that so many of my colleagues have found their lives negatively impacted in ways that I hoped do not escape notice." And so, as this professor suggesting caregivers are experiencing a disproportionate amount of stress. And that stress is apparent in the quantitative survey results as well. I find that caregivers are facing substantially insignificantly higher levels of stress at work than their non-caregiving peers. For example, as we see in this graph, almost half of respondents said that they faced either a great deal or a lot of stress in their jobs over the past few weeks. And those high levels of stress are particularly common among employees who are caring for young children, 60% of them that they, a lot a great deal. The dark red bars here among those who are

carrying for young children at home, 60% said they're experiencing a lot or a great deal of stress at work. And that's significantly greater than the proportion of non-caregivers who said that they're experiencing high levels of stress almost twice as many. And turning to the open-ended responses again, it really highlights the consequences of these caregiving related impacts on work in great detail. This quote, for example, this associate professor said, "I'm stressed out, I haven't slept more than six hours a night for months, and I'm having problems concentrating and, recently, speaking. I can't find the words when I'm trying to speak. I'm with my child 24 hours a day, seven days a week. I need to have one eye on what he's doing at all times. I rarely have the opportunity to concentrate on a task and finish it." Now, beyond this kind of exhaustion, some caregivers also spoke to the traumas that they'd experienced and the traumas that they were helping others through as well. This, this quote for example, is from an assistant professor who doesn't have young children but does have substantial workplace care responsibilities. And she wrote "the impacts of collective exhaustion and normalization of poor mental health, as well as the lack of breaks and sense of pressure to continue working and maintain a normal level of production (article output, research, project development, grant writing) are visible in my own life as well as that of my colleagues and students. Additionally, the weight of care work for students facing daily traumas (several students lost friends to suicide, had friends or family members ill with COVID or were ill themselves, many had insecure housing or food accessibility, all were battling extreme stress and exhaustion) has been incredibly heavy. I have the financial capacity to pay for external support (therapy, massage, cleaning help, food delivery, secure housing), but many do not, and the lasting impacts of the stress and trauma of this moment are extreme." So, because of these challenges and maybe not surprisingly, I find that IU is at risk of losing caregiver employees and especially women caregivers. This graph, for example, shows the percentage of respondents who considered leaving their current job or taking an extended leave of absence at some point over the past two weeks. And we can see here that a large proportion of respondents have considered leaving more than a third of the people in the sample as a whole. And we can see that caregivers are significantly more likely to report having considered leaving. And these patterns in turn are driven primarily by the responses of women caregivers who are significantly more likely than men caregivers actually almost twice as likely to say that they'd consider leaving in the past few weeks. And the numbers are small, so it's hard to tease out specifically, but these numbers are even higher among women faculty of color than they are even among white women. So, there's a sort of intersexual set of inequalities here in terms of who is particularly frustrated in this moment.

And so, to sum up, essentially caregiver faculty and staff and AIs are by their own accounts, doing an unsustainable and potentially harmful amount of overwork. Overwork that is prevalent across the university as a whole, that seems to be particularly pronounced for caregivers. They're sacrificing their health, their well-being, and their research just to be able to get everything done. And at the same time, and despite all that work, most caregivers aren't, in many cases, at least by their open-ended responses asking for a reprieve from work. Instead, they're often asking for support to be able to get their work done, and also asking for recognition and compensation for the extra paid work that they've been doing to keep the university running through this difficult time. And I'm concerned that unless their interventions, I mean, the care crisis is going to exacerbate inequalities between caregivers and non-caregivers in terms of their access to opportunities within institutions like IU as well as within academia and more broadly. Delaying access to tenure, for example, delays access to power within the university structure. And so, we have to be concerned about the possibility of many, especially caregiver faculty members and AIs kind of delaying, delaying their, their opportunities to go up or things like tenure. And so, without interventions, we risked jeopardizing IU's status as a research institution and especially one committed to equity and inclusion in the work that we do. So, thank you for letting me share these results with you. I will stop sharing my screen here. And if there's any questions, I'm happy to take them.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS FROM THE IU WORK AND CARE WORK SURVEY

ROBEL: Great. Let's open it up for questions and see if we can, let's see the best way to deal with them. And I'll start, I see a couple of hands. So let me start with Linda Pisano.

PISANO: Hi thank you so much for that presentation. That was fantastic. And I have two questions. The first one, I know that this puts additional work on you, but your presentation was so clear and concise with the information you've gathered. I wonder about providing it to chairs and divisional leaders who are the ones assigning service, as a short term, it would. I just as a chair myself, I was really, really struck by what the information you were sharing. The second thing I ask is, what can we do at this point with that information? How can, what is the intervention?

CALARCO: I mean, I think we have to think about in terms of your first I mean, I would be more than happy to share this either as a recorded talk with department chairs or others who benefit from it or kind of giving talks if that's helpful. I think in terms of support, I think one potential possibility, one of the places where work could be most easily supported is through the hiring of additional staff. I think moving to and hiring freezes and making sure that we have staff members who are able to provide support and departments and in units that are being that kind of overtaxed right now can not only take the burden off of staff in this moment, but it can also reduce the burden on faculty, essentially by redistributing workloads and making sure that everyone is able to get their core work done.

I think also another key thing to consider here is reducing expectations, especially expectations for things like tenure and promotion. And thinking about what is reasonable and what is kind of rational given the current constraints that we're facing and the pressures toward overwork and how damaging that has the potential to be so that we're not over penalizing faculty members, especially junior faculty members, when it comes to the kinds of extra work that many of them are taking on right now.

ROBEL: The next person I saw was Margaret Lion.

LION: Yeah. Thank you. Wonderful presentation. Thank you so much. One thing that I wanted to add was I wondered if and I don't know if you said this and I just didn't hear it more about because they're just people who are teaching faculty who don't do research, but who have been doing teaching and trying to kind of hold hands of students sometimes through all of this. And I was, maybe you had information about that, or if you looked at that, people who are just focused on the teaching. And then I just noticed in the comments that Linda Gales, I hope it's okay if I say this, she's from CWA and it might be really good to also look at because of course you don't have enough to do. Also, just the staff. I mean, you talk about staff, yes, staff who also have that pressure. So, thank you so much for this and it might be more to do, hey great, more to do just what we all need it.

CALARCO: Thank you, Margaret. Yes, I said the survey does include teaching faculty and so they were included in the graphs about teaching and mentoring. They weren't included in the graphs about research because essentially, I only included folks who reported that part of their work as being part of their job. Staff, they were included in this first set of graphs looking at sort of the impact on their work and how they've increased in many cases, their work responsibilities during the pandemic because your right that many staff reported high amounts of overwork during the pandemic, particularly and many talked in their open-ended responses about the hiring freeze, um, and how that's led many of them to do, to take on work of the colleagues that normally be doing in the wake of the pandemic as well absolutely. Thank you.

ROBEL: I think the next person in line is Steve Sanders.

SANDERS: Yeah. Jess thank you for doing this. I'm really happy to know that we are using resources to sort of make our own institution better and that we're using our expertise in that way. So, thank you for doing that. I just wanted to, so I am not a social scientist, but I know you are. I think I understood you to say this was self-reported. People went online and if they wanted to login and complete the survey, they did, to what extent do you fear or do you have reason to think that might mean that essentially people who have had particularly negative experiences due to the pandemic are over-represented in the sample? That if we had been able to do a scientific random sample, would the number of people who say they have not been negatively affected likely have been higher as a proportion of the overall responses? I don't want to minimize the extent to which these are serious and concerning results. But I also want to keep in perspective the fact that this is self-reporting and that tends to skew a sample.

CALARCO: Absolutely, no, I think I think I see these as preliminary data that can help to inform further efforts to work that is happening with the gender equity task force right now to inform some of the surveys that they are taking. And also, I think to encourage more folks to take, to participate in surveys like these, because I think we will only have a solid sense, for example, of the overall proportions if we do have widespread participation as I mentioned men are substantially underrepresented in this voluntary survey. And so, to the extent that we can encourage high levels of participation in these kinds of efforts that can give us a better sense of what these actual results are. And I see the results being most useful in the comparisons between those who report caregiving responsibilities and those who don't purport caregiving responsibilities. I think we can get a better sense of where we see differences than in sort of the overall numbers sorted the percentage of folks who are reporting particular experiences. And so, I think that's where the data from a social science perspective become especially useful as thinking about the differences. And so, among those who were willing to take a survey, where do we see differences? Where do we see those different experiences leading to different outcomes?

ROBEL: I'm not sure how we're identifying people right now.

SIMPSON: There are no other hands raised at this time

ROBEL: Jess, I really do want to thank you. You've presented these findings in a lot of different forms. I had the opportunity to see them pretty early on. And you did capture, I think, a particularly difficult time in people's lives when we the schools were at their lowest. And I, I do appreciate how much work you've put into this yourself. And also, the, the fact that you have made these results available to so many people during the course of the last month or so. Thank you for presenting them today.

CALARCO: Thank you for inviting me and thank you all for listening.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

ROBEL: Great. Alright. Thank you. I think our next piece is John Walbridge, Executive Committee business.

WALBRIDGE: Well, thank you, everybody. I have one piece of very nice news. One of our own, Israel Herrera, is the 2021 IU W. George Pinnell awardee for outstanding service. I will share in his reflective glory. I wrote one of the letters of recommendation for him. It's thoroughly well-deserved, so congratulations to him for this honor.

Second thing. I wanted to say something about voting, as Elizabeth will correct me if I get any of the details wrong. But the in the next couple of weeks, the process for voting for the BFC for next year, will be starting. The procedures have changed. The main effect being that instead of having to go around and get your friends to nominate you, you can volunteer and actually run like any normal election. So, by all means do so if you're eligible to run again or if they're people you think ought to run, encourage them. If no one, and just as a warning, if no one runs for an empty seat, the current holder will remain

there for better or for worse. I think this is a very positive development and hopefully we will get some, as it were, sort of real electioneering for the BFC. And the more engagement we get, the better it's for all of us as I'm sure you are aware.

One final thing, just to clarify something on the agenda. There is a circular from the Center for Excellence for Women in Technology Summer 2017 Faculty Equity assessment, which was something done somewhat in parallel with the last COACHE survey. So, while, this is not being presented here, there is thought on the Executive Committee that this would be a useful supplement to the various reports on the well-being of faculty that we are getting today. So that explains that. So that is what I have to say to you all.

ROBEL: Thank you so much, John.

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER SIX: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

ROBEL: I don't have much to report today. I can report that the COVID news continues to be very, very good. We are still working quite carefully with the county on opening a mass vaccination site. The state has not had the vaccine to be able to do that, but the county really wants us to be able to do it. We're prepared to move forward the minute that we get vaccine. And we are in active conversations, with the state, with the support of the county to be able to do that. So, the only other thing I have is, I did get one question which was, will travel restrictions continue this summer for research purposes, either to travel elsewhere or to pay for others to travel here? They were last updated June 1st, and the travel guidelines are going to stay in effect probably through about August 1st. But the current guidance is essential travel is possible plus, various approvals and I think that gives plenty of flexibility to get research work done. The language on the travel page says only essential travel is permitted. Essential means necessary for an individual to perform his or her core IU responsibilities, which would certainly include research, or necessary for the core functions of the university to include recruitment and development necessary that the travel or event occurred during pandemic health and safety conditions and that there is no effective alternative. This includes faculty, staff and visitors and students. And there's a route to get travel approved, and I'm quite confident it would be approved if it was for purposes of doing research. So, with that, I know that there are a ton of questions about the more granular details about the fall after President McRobbie's announcement that we're moving towards normal, post-pandemic, as close to normal as we can get post-pandemic in fall of 2021. And I can tell you that it is a constant set of discussions right now with the Restart Committee and the Medical Response Team, what would be possible in fall of 2021. Our goal right now is to get as close to fall of 2019 as it's possible for us to get and back off from that as well as pandemic conditions require. And so, I'll work, I'll just keep working on it and working with the Executive Committee around those issues as much as I possibly can. Yes. Margaret and Margaret notes, the new normal. So, all right.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD:

SIMPSON: We have two hands raised. Linda Pisano first and then Dan Bullock and then Israel.

ROBEL: Okay. Thank you.

PISANO: Thanks. I have a question about both study abroad and students. And I see someone noticed as someone also said something about student groups. But I was wondering if there's a timeline in terms of study abroad, whether that's individual students or classes, whether it's through the Office of Study Abroad, International Studies, or even the embedded courses.

ROBEL: So that's a great question and everybody is anxious to get back to study abroad as quickly as possible. I believe we have some students on study abroad even this semester in places that have permitted us to, you know, there's still a lot of travel restrictions in place but in places that have

permitted the travel. The hope is to continue to open that up as fast as we possibly can, given restrictions on our ability to go to other countries on the one hand, and the pandemic prevalence in those countries on the other. But yeah, we're all, we all want it. We all want to be able to have our students participate as quickly as possible.

SIMPSON: Israel, Dan said if your question is on the same topic, you should go next.

HERRERA: Well, okay. Thank you, John, first of all for the recognition. I also need to thank Eliza and Paul for working on the letters. My question my question, Lauren, is related to events during summer national events. If you're planning to organize, for example, a language event for teachers from other states. Do we still have the restriction for doing this duty during mid-summer? Is it something that we should plan? One other question is related to the out-of-state students. I read on the IDS that out-of-state students are eligible for the vaccine. And I wonder if we had mentioned here that out-of-state students, includes the international students and also the DACA students. And one last question is about the BFC scholarship with students in need, if we are going to give this scholarship, this grant this year?

ROBEL: Okay, so let me work through it. Summer events are under the same restrictions as last summer. And so, there's a university events committee that you can go through. If you have an event that you'd like to you'd like to try to put on. There's the University Events Committee that includes our public health people, including Graham McCain. So that the idea is you need to be able to describe the event and it has to fit within our event guidelines. If you have an event, you'd like to do this summer, I will tell you that the event guidelines from last summer still apply. So, we are not doing a lot of stuff this summer that we would otherwise have done. We're not doing a lot of camps, were not doing a lot of programming but if you have an academic event that you would like to sponsor, you can bring it to the university events review committee, and they will analyze it from a public health perspective.

The state of Indiana, your second question was about the state of Indiana's position on students from outside the state of Indiana, who are full-time students are here being able to get the vaccine and Indiana, and that's correct. They are able to get the vaccine in Indiana when they become eligible to get it. And it doesn't matter whether they are domestic, out-of-state international or DACA students.

The third question was about the BFC scholarship, and we award any scholarship dollars we have. So, if they are a dollar in the BFC scholarship account, we will be awarding those dollars according to the criteria that the BFC setup when they set up the scholarship account. This is a good time to ask all of you if you would be thinking about donating to the BFC scholarship account? We set it up, you'll remember a few years ago when the state of Indiana forbade and I think the federal government for DACA students from participating in scholarship programs that were related to it, that were government programs. We have awarded the scholarship consistently to students who meet the requirements, but we never got to a very large amount in that fund. And of course, it needs constant donations if we're going to award that particular scholarship funds. So, if you are attracted to the idea of being able to provide scholarship support for DACA students. I invite you to make a contribution to the BFC scholarship account. Great. And who was next in line?

SIMPSON: Dan Bullock and then after Dan, one more hand, Dakota.

BULLOCK: If Dakota's question is on topic, I defer to him as well.

SIMPSON: Dan you're reserving your time.

BULLOCK: I suppose.

COATES: Yeah. So, I just had a real quick question on that. So, I know that one thing that's come up is as our students move over the summer and in some states, start to open up vaccination to students. I was

wondering if you could maybe talk a little bit about maybe some of the considerations or things to watch for if you're in, say in between phase 1, phase 2 of a vaccine, if you're traveling from summer to fall.

ROBEL: You need to get your complete vaccine in the state where you started. You can't count on getting the second dose of a two-dose vaccine in another state. So that's it. That's a big consideration and I would think it would be a determinant of one for students who are trying to plan their travel over the summer. With luck, I mean, the emergency use authorization for Johnson and Johnson is fantastic news, particularly for students. And I hope that that will mean that we will be able to have students vaccinated. You know because we'll have vaccine supply. Indiana is actually moving pretty quickly. I believe, I believe they announced this morning that they had opened it up to people 55 and above. We expect them to open it up to people 50 and above perhaps as early as the end of this week. I have siblings in states that are nowhere near that. So, kudos to Indiana for what they're doing.

COATES: Thank you.

ROBEL: Yep. Dan?

BULLOCK: Sure. I was wondering if you could provide a brief bit of contexts with regards to the recent communication with the Graduate Workers Coalition just on that message and letter.

ROBEL: Sure, the Graduate Workers Coalition has for some time been advocating for a strike on mandatory fees. There are several arguments in back of that argument in favor of graduate students not paying their fees. I wanted to be respectful to the graduate students who were making the argument. And so, I took it as seriously as I knew how to take it, and I responded to it in a fairly lengthy document that I also shared with people who had initiated a, I shared it first, of course with the graduate students in the GWC. And then I shared it with people who had initiated a request that our colleagues joined the graduate students and supporting the proposed fee strike. And I shared it with the chairs of the departments who, with the deans, of course, and the chairs of the departments that were supporting the fee strike as departments. I am happy to share that and my communications with the GWC to anyone who would like to read it. It's not a secret. And if you'd like it, I'm happy to send it to you by e-mail.

SIMPSON: We have another question and if there's time, Dakota would like to swing back, okay.

ROBEL: Okay. Great. Who?

SIMPSON: Shanker. I'm sorry. Shanker.

KRISHNAN: I'm sorry. Sorry. Sorry. I thought I heard Dakota.

SIMPSON: You did. But he's going to swing back after you.

KRISHNAN: Okay. Okay. Mine is a very short question. It is, I know you talked about vaccines and students a little earlier. And there has been talk at a previous BFC about IU potentially requiring faculty and students, when vaccines are available, that there may be a requirement. So is there any progress on whether such a policy has been discussed in anything, any decisions have been made.

ROBEL: We continue to discuss whether we can require a vaccine for any a number of things, either as a blanket requirement, as we do for a number of other vaccines for students to come to school or as an employment requirement. There are different considerations for each. And at this point, the Restart Committee is not recommending that we require the vaccine for anyone. I will tell you my own personal view is that we should require the vaccine for students to live in congregate settings, at a minimum. I think getting the vaccine is a terrific thing to do. And that it's the right thing to do. And people should do

it. But it continues to be under discussion with the Restart Committee. They are working their way through the various considerations. I think at this point when we have many, many, many millions of doses with very few adverse effects noted, we should be able to get to a decision about that sometime later in the semester.

One other complicating fact, Shanker, is the one that Dakota raised, which was depending on the timing, students may be in other places this summer and the availability of vaccine state-by-state is pretty spotty. They are very different from state to state. And so, requiring the vaccine of students who are out-of-state to come back to IU, we'd need to have a sense that we could provide the vaccine here and that we could deal with students who were returning in an expeditious way. So, trending well. Great.

SIMPSON: Dakota, and Dakota is the last person.

COATES: This is just a quick comment and that was actually set up quite nicely from the provost's answer. I just wanted to say that we did survey the graduate professional students on their thoughts on the vaccine. And we'll be sharing that with the provost as well as Dr. Carroll and his team. We also have a current survey that's out that'll run through the month of March to kind of get student feedback on what their classroom experience, what their research experience was and if they plan on traveling out of the state of Indiana over their summer. And we have a note with that question that advises students that if they do travel it might interrupt their vaccination process. But we'll be more than happy to share the results of that survey with this body and with the provost and anyone who might find that helpful.

ROBEL: Great. Thank you. And we also are doing vaccine hesitancy surveys. They have been really useful so far in helping us to understand the messaging that would help our students get over hesitancy and get vaccinated. We've been doing these surveys weekly through Communications for the last month, I think. And I'm quite hopeful. We started out with students, about half of students who had no qualms about getting vaccines. That may seem like a low number, but I actually don't think it is. I have a lot of faith in our ability to work through the issues that are causing hesitancy for our students. So great. Thank you so much. Well, we did a little switch in the agenda because Denvil has some childcare issues that he's going to have to deal with first. So, Eliza has graciously agreed to move up her agenda item, which is an overview of major findings from the COACHE survey. So, with that, let me turn it over to Eliza.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT: OVERVIEW OF MAJOR FINDINGS FROM THE 2019 COLLABORATIVE ON ACADEMIC CAREERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION (COACHE) FACULTY JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

PAVALKO: Wonderful. Thank you. And I'm going to share my screen here. Okay. And hopefully you all can see that. Well, thank you very much. I think this is something that we planned to present last spring before the world fell off a cliff so I'm glad to present it now. I also want to mention, Wen Qui, who is here with us today. Wen is a senior scientist or I'm sorry, an assistant scientist in our office and our expert on COACHE survey as well. She's done quite a bit of work with the COACHE survey.

Now in terms of the overview, to give you an idea, those of you who are not familiar with the COACHE. Hopefully many, if not all of you who filled it out. But the survey is one that's developed by a group in higher-ed at Harvard. And though we've been working with the COACHE survey since 2005, and they periodically run the survey and they've come into a three-year cycle. So, starting in 2013, we started every three years, is when we do the survey for our faculty. It include tenure track and non-tenure track faculty and also librarians. The survey does not include administrators.

In 2019, our response rate was 43%, which was up a little bit that's about where other universities are as well, and we were up a little bit from prior years. Of course, all the responses are anonymous and

confidential. And in fact, Wen, is the only person who can analyze individual level data so that I can't go and look at, see what an individual faculty member responds to.

Just overviews, some of the things that we see is an advantages of the COACHE survey and the reason we keep working with them is probably most importantly it gives us comparable data over time. And since 2005, but especially 2013, when similar questions have been asked pretty much every survey way. It also gives us really valuable comparison to peer schools and that is actually what I'm going to mostly talk about today is the comparison to our peers. It provides us the ability to compare within groups within IU, rank, gender, race, ethnicity, and broad disciplinary area. Also, an advantage of this is that we have the benefit of the, of the COACHE project and they're experts in higher education survey method. So, they've tested the validity, reliability of the item quite a bit. And we have options to add a few items. I'm going to present a lot of data today and it's always mind boggling when people are throwing a bunch of data on the screen. I want you to know, I will put all of these slides on the VPFA website and that's also where the report that COACHE produced, you all had that at the link in the agenda and that's there as well. We put all the COACHE reports up there and I'll put these slides up there as well, in addition to what all should you today, we've added some additional slides so that people can see as much data as possible.

So, in terms of what we use COACHE for broadly, so for example, in 2013 when the strategic plan was being used widely for that. So, information on what we need to invest in and particularly in that case, prioritizing support for faculty and what's useful for faculty. So, things like, you know, basically making the case for things like writing groups and faculty success program that support faculty. It's really, really useful for that. Certainly, also highlighted is the need to prioritize the building and retaining of diverse faculty and so it has had concrete implications, certainly coming out of that strategic plan.

From the 2016 COACHE survey, I just listed a couple of specific examples of very specific information that we saw in the COACHE data that led to some changes. So, for example, it was very clear from that survey that, that there was a need for more institutional leadership in diversity and inclusion. And so hence that resulting in part from that to greet the increased in leadership and diversity inclusion in schools and the college, campus level, and university level.

Another very concrete thing was very clear that we need to provide more support for associate professors and so our offices worked closely with Institute for Advanced Study to revamp and expand the program for that. And I'm very happy to say in 2019 we saw some effects from that and some movement on some of that support. So certainly, BFC and our office we've worked on clarity and tenure and promotion procedures. Again, that's coming out of getting really strong indication from COACHE where we need to put our effort. And something I'll return to at the end, you know, some kind of indication where faculty may not be equally recognized for their work. And so again, from action to reduce barriers. So, there are a number of ways the survey really shapes where we put our energy and where we put our investment.

So let me tell you a little bit about the COACHE 2019 survey, in particular. Always with COACHE, we have the ability to identify five peer institutions. I'm going to talk, again today, about our comparison to our peers and it's really the five institutions. We try and pick any that are in the Big 10 but also other R1 research universities for the state universities as our comparison. There is also a little bit of comparison I'll show you today. But throughout the survey, there's comparison to the overall cohort. Overall, there are a 149 institutions within the COACHE survey and a 104 research universities. So, the overall cohort comparison is a little less direct to what kind of institution we are, but still useful to see. And in 2019, 968 of you responded, and again with a 43% response rate.

Let me describe the structure of COACHE. There's probably about 250 variables in the data. It's quite large. And I know those of you who have filled it out are probably aware of that. But it's organized around a series of global satisfaction questions and then the rest of surveys about what they call benchmark. So, for broad categories of questions. So, for example, the first one like the nature of work, there is a whole series of questions on satisfaction, with research and research support and service and service support. And so, each one of the benchmarks is really a set of variables that are categorized together, and we can look at, and a lot of what I'll talk about are comparisons across these broad benchmarks for a little bit of information for a few items.

So first of all, looking at global satisfaction, when we see several items, well this shows four items that we often look at the global satisfaction and comparing over time. Not a terribly interesting graph because it doesn't change very much which is good. One other thing that we do, the with the COACHE is on, whether it's these broad item or even individual items, we don't see a lot of change. But I think that tells us, that tells us something. And also, when we do see change, then we pay a lot of attention to it because for the most part we see more stability than change. But in general, you know if we look at the first item, I would again choose to work at IUB. We see generally between 70, 73, 74% of our faculty are saying they would, they would choose, again, choose to work at IUB. And in general, the item to the far right, that they would recommend the department to a candidate tends to be much higher. That tends to be more between 90-95% that they would recommend or strongly recommend their department to a candidate. So not a lot of change on those, but still useful to see.

This comparison same item but shows how we compared to our peers. So, the red diamond is IU, the blue is those five peer institutions and then the yellow are they full set of 149 institutions. So again, we don't see a lot of variation across institutions, but we see that IU is really fairly comparable, particularly to our peers, whereas the broader set of institutions, there's a little bit lower satisfaction.

So, turning to the benchmarks, we group these in really three categories. Where are the benchmarks, where we are a little too strong compared to our peers? Where are we about average with our peers? And then where are we at the low end? And today I'm going to talk, just give you a little bit of information about a couple where we have strengths. I think in some ways these diverge from the kinds of things Jess was talking about, but I think in other ways it really triangulates a difference in data. But particularly what I want to spend most of our time on and talk about is appreciation and recognition, which is an area where we really look like we need some work to do, certainly compared to our peers and that certainly converges with, I think we've already talked about today.

So, to give you a little bit of data of where our strengths are, the blue is IU, and the orange is the five peer institutions. What I do see, I know we have a number of librarians in the BFC, and we should all pat you all on the back. And certainly, this is something we see year after year in the COACHE surveys that certainly not only our library resources across all of our institutions good but IU's are particularly good and really quite extraordinary. One of the other things that I think will be really interesting to see in the next COACHE survey is what things look like in terms of support for improving teaching, certainly IU is strong compared to our peers on that, but I suspect all of us have come to realize just how much we rely on that support for teaching from other resources. So, certainly those are a number of our strengths.

Another area of strengths, compared to our peers, are our work for personal, family, and health benefits. IU faculty, certainly more than our peers, feel like our institution supports their career and family compatibility. We have quite more satisfaction with the family medical and parental leave certainly, also a number of health benefits for ourselves and our families. So, these are a number of strengths, and traditionally been strengths on the COACHE survey over the years.

Like I said, I want to spend most of our time thinking about what are the areas where we can think about improvement. And one of the things that really stood out was when we look at the survey, is where our faculty are talking about in terms of satisfaction with how much they feel appreciated and recognized. And these numbers look pretty flat, but these are actually substantial differences. So, the yellow bar on the right is our comparison to our peers. And when you'll see, if you look at the report, the COACHE report, that was linked to the agenda, you'll see that we are really quite far down compared to our peers. So that even though that's not a huge difference in numbers that's relative to our peers. But also, it concerns me because we've declined a little bit since 2013. And so, we've really been trying to give a lot of thought and I welcome a lot of people with ideas on what are the, what are the ways that we need to be doing more and how can we do more in terms of appreciation and recognition.

So, one of the things when we look across with this data, we look at rank, the groups that are least satisfied with recognition and appreciation are our tenured faculty and associate professors, in particular associate professors. And so that certainly is a concern our pre-tenure faculty feel relatively more supported as do our non-tenure track faculty. And again, always, we can always have more but particularly seeing the lower levels of support and appreciation by our tenured faculty is certainly notable.

When we think about appreciation and recognition, looking more closely at what kinds of work are we doing that, where we feel maybe more appreciated, more recognized, or less so. One of the things that stands out to me from this is that the areas where faculty both relative to peer institutions but also overall, feel the less recognition are in advising and service and outreach. And I think particularly if we think about BFC and all of us and our commitment to shared governance, if our faculty are dissatisfied with kind of how we view and how we recognize service that has huge implications for shared governance and the work we all do. And so that's certainly a concern and from where we're certainly trying to dig into and understand a little bit more. Also, in terms of looking at some other items, when we look at satisfaction again this is broken out by rank, we looked at what's people levels of satisfaction with time spent on service, and the equitability of committee assignment. And one of the things we see is that particularly the, I guess, dissatisfaction is more of an issue for the equitability a committee assignments. And I'm trying to think through, I think particularly when we think about department level and faculty to faculty interaction, you know, what are the things that we can do to increase that sense of equity.

Another way to look and think about appreciating and recognition, not too much kind of what we do, but who's doing the recognizing? And I think one of the couple things that are so striking here are that where particularly, and it's not huge amounts, but compared to our peers where we're a little bit lower is recognition from colleagues. So certainly, there's recognition and appreciation we feel from our immediate colleagues, you know, our chairs or our unit heads and then Chief Academic Officer. And it's not surprising that the closer people are closer in proximity people work together the more they're going to have those interactions and feel that. But particularly to see that those are a little bit below what we see with our peers, is something to note as well.

So overall, and this is just a few glimpses of the data, but what does that tell us about appreciation and recognition? That first of all, I think what we're seeing is that attention appreciation and recognition is important at all levels from all the interactions we do with our colleagues, both junior and senior to us, all the way up to certainly senior leadership and the boards and those kind of things. Also, it's telling us that our colleagues feel least recognized and appreciated for advising, outreach and service work. And, and we also see that it's associate and full professors either rank that, that are reporting the least satisfaction with appreciation and recognition. I think, particularly as I said before, given the centrality of service to shared governance, I think broad thought is really needed about how we knowledge and how

we think about that work. And maybe even discussion about the importance of shared governance to what we do and why the service and work that we do is important.

So, I also wanted to say a little bit about some of the continuing work that's going on, not just with COACHE, that certainly in a kind of using the data and other kinds of discussions. As part of the COACHE survey, there was also some additional questions in 2019 on climate. John Nieto-Phillips and I'm working with him, but primarily John is really looking, and I think also with Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee at closer assessment of faculty climate and faculty retention. And so certainly that is a piece of the puzzle. We've also been working to highlight the importance of appreciating, recognition and really evaluating the way we do that with chairs and deans. And then I want to talk about something that's really does triangulate with what Jess was talking about earlier, is really starting to think about how we tackle the intersection of service and recognition. Particularly, Kim Geeslin, in our office, also the Director of the Initiative for the Advancement of Women Faculty, has been thinking about this in conversation with the care caucus and several other groups and this gives a really good example of the kind of thing that we can think about and that we might be able to do. For example, in all of this data coming out and conversations, realizing that certainly faculty feel that work goes unrecognized and it's more pronounced for some group. But oftentimes, there can be a number of barriers to nomination for some group. So how many times have we all been thinking about nominating somebody, and we just don't have the time to do it. And certainly, recognizing that service burdens maybe inequitable and certainly trying to recognize people and doing that is a service, and that can be something that you love doing, but it can also be quite a, quite a bit of work. And also, then realizing that service request and the work that we're all doing has increased. So, what they've been working on is a campus wide award audit and have a couple of goals in mind. One is certainly looking to see are there any barriers to nomination, in particular, there's always information the committee needs to be able to make a good decision on awards. But are we asking for too much information? Because all that information takes time to be compiled together. So, looking and seeing what's the information we need, can we reduce that in some way? Can we reduce those barriers? And also looking to see, particularly, you know, are we as broad as we should be in terms of the nominees? Some people are very good at putting their work out there and kind of people know about it. Other people may be doing really phenomenal work, but they're kinda keeping their head down and doing the work. And also thinking about ways that we can identify people who maybe aren't being recognized as much as they should be and so she's working with a committee, a broad committee to look at both of those things and in particularly seeing that as the intersection because the service work and service demand certainly also intersect with the need for recognition. So that's just one effort. But I think, you know, ideas that people have about other ways and concrete things that we can do to both recognize people more and also thinking about the service demands as well.

I wanted to again say, you're welcome to look at more, we try and put all the reports, slideshows, everything we do that has information on COACHE on our website. This just shows the bottom page of our homepage, of our website. But the blue arrow points to where you can find the button that'll take you right to all the COACHE information. I thank you all for the time to give you this quick overview, and I welcome your questions.

AGENDA ITEM NINE: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE OVERVIEW OF MAJOR FINDINGS FROM THE 2019 COLLABORATIVE ON ACADEMIC CAREERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION (COACHE) FACULTY JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

ROBEL: Thank you so much Eliza. That was terrific. Let me take a moment to look at the chat and see if I can really get a sense of the questions. There's one from Dominic. Do we have data that separates out which associate professors started as assistant professors at IU and which were hired as associate

professors? And if so, if there's a difference in the satisfaction response and the same question for full professors? That's an interesting way to think about things. And we also have a response.

PAVALKO: As Wen said, we don't have the ability to drill down in very small groups but certainly that is the kind of thing we want to look and see what are the differences for people who start in different places versus people have been here a long time. That's a really good question.

ROBEL: Are there other questions for Eliza about these data?

SIMPSON: There are no hands raised in chat in the participants list.

ROBEL: Okay.

HENSHEL: Eliza, can I ask a question?

PAVALKO: Sure.

HENSHEL: You made a comment about differences between women and minorities on some of the satisfactions. And yet you didn't present any data on that. Could you discuss that some more?

ROBEL: Right and today I focused the broad peer differences and in general that's the work, particularly in terms of climate and those kinds of things, that John Nieto-Phillips has been working on that quite a bit. So, I'd be happy to come, and or John, either one of us could do a presentation at another time. But certainly, we can look at that. I know, hopefully you all have seen, sorry to keep pointing to the website, but from the 2016 data, for example, there was a committee that worked on looking at gender issues, for example and went into quite depth, not just a COACHE survey, but looked for a lot of other data. We have been going through and updating that information they looked at before to see how things look in 2019. So, there'll be kind of a supplemental report to that. And then certainly John, I know John's talking with the Diversity Equity and Inclusion Committee as well to kind of talk about some of those issues.

HENSHEL: Thank you.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Well, I would like to follow up on that question. And Eliza, could you give us a preview, any nugget from there that you could share with us?

ROBEL: So, I have not been looking at depth in terms of that because I've been mostly trying to see what the broad patterns are and in particular focusing on this issue of the appreciation and recognition. So, I would be happy to put that together for you all if that is what you want, but I have not dug into in-depth on it.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you.

HERRERA: Yeah, I have a question.

SIMPSON: Can I just say something really quickly? Everybody, if you want to ask a question, it would be really great if everybody uses the raise hand function in the participant list because there are three pages of people in the Zoom chat and then everybody can just get a chance. So, if you can just do that, that would be really great. Israel. Go ahead please.

HERRERA: Right. So, regarding the recognition, we have the Distinguished Professor, the Provost Professor, there are like five recognitions for full professors and tenure track. I wonder if there might be any possibility to create some kind of parallel recognition for NTTs because we have the opportunity. We are eligible for the distinguished teaching awards and obviously the trustees teaching awards. But I wonder if something parallel to the distinguished be created for NTT faculty.

PAVALKO: And I'll defer to Lauren on that. I mean, as you all probably know those rewards generally come from an endowment, from foundation funds, a variety of different funds. And so, I think it'd be

really exciting to work on if they're interested or the ability to raise some funds, where we could have another award. That'd be wonderful.

SIMPSON: Lauren, Dominic has his hand raised.

ROBEL: Dominic?

DIORIO: Hi there. Yes. Thank you for indulging me as I'm not a normal member of the committee but as the BFC co-chair of the Budget Committee this feels like the appropriate time to ask a question and thank you for answering my other question as well. I am curious when we think of appreciation and recognition, of course, compensation is a big part of that. And my question earlier is sort of drilling in on the fact do we see that over time, people become less and less satisfied? Are we able to pull that out? Is it not just about rank, but the longer you're here, the less satisfied you become? Or do we know anything more about that? Because of course, when we consider salary compression, of course, if you're hired as a full professor, you're more likely to make more money than if you are starting as an assistant, making your way through the ranks. So, do we know anything about how over time satisfaction has changed for faculty the longer they are here?

PAVALKO: So, this is a series of cross-sections, so we don't have the ability to follow individuals over time in terms of their responses now. Although if somebody wants to do an analysis, I would be thrilled to be able to do that. So, then we get into difficulty separating out that rank or is it how long they've been here. One of the things that we see, and this is not unique to IU, I mentioned before, frustrations and lower satisfaction among the associate professors. So, one of the things we do see in terms of the patterns is that that associate professor rank is where people feel the most burdened, right? And particularly in service, but in all kinds of ways. But you know we do a really good job of protecting our junior faculty here so that they can be successful getting tenure. But that means a couple of things for associate professors. That means that they no longer have that protection, but it also means they're taking on extra service because we're protecting the other junior faculty. So that's always a point that hits people really hard and it's also a point where, you know, people as they should after tenure, kind of evaluating direction of their research and those kinds of things. So, I think you know certainly we still see some lower levels at full professor, but it's that associate professor rank where things are clearly challenging for people on multiple levels. And I think that corresponds to the thing we heard from Jess today too, where people have a lot going on and there are a lot of challenges. And I think you know certainly the more we can do to recognize it, but also support associate professors was really useful and important.

DIORIO: Thank you so much.

SIMPSON: Israel has his hand raised, Lauren.

ROBEL: Israel?

HERRERA: Yes. So just going back to my question. So, if there is a proposal or request for creating a recognition for NTTs that would be through Lauren's office or your office, Eliza?

PAVALKO: Well, we'd have to talk. I think probably Lauren's office and we'd have to think through where that might, you know, how that might do or whether it be a campus or even the university level? I would think. I'm looking at Lauren because I don't actually know how that works to get those things in place.

ROBEL: We haven't done that very much. I mean, the one thing we, that I can remember, we've worked very hard on making sure that if we have an endowment that could be used to support the appreciation of faculty members, we are consistently making that award. So, the Wells Professorship, for instance,

we have focused very hard in the last several years on ensuring not only that it's awarded, but it's also that we have the most diverse pool we possibly can have in order to allow it to award it. The only award that I know of that has been created outside of that structure. That is, we you know, there's a funding source for it through endowment, is the BFC's diversity award that we just created. And we did that through a recommendation from a BFC committee to my office. And I have provided some cash funding for that for a couple of years, for the first three, I'd have to go back and look at the agreement button for that for several years. So, I would actually recommend you go through a BFC committee, start with maybe faculty affairs, figure out what kinds of recognition you'd like to see and maybe work it up from there to my office.

HERRERA: Thank you Lauren.

ROBEL: You bet. All right. If we have no other questions and Denvil Duncan is here. Is he actually here?

D. DUNCAN: Yes.

AGENDA ITEM TEN: FINDINGS FROM A LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS OF ACADEMIC SALARIES BY RACE AND GENDER

ROBEL: Great. Thank you Denvil. Denvil has been working for some time. Well, let me back up just a little bit. Eliza and her office did a study of salaries. I wanted to say was it two years ago, Eliza?

PAVALKO: 2017. Yeah.

ROBEL: Yep. So more than two years, three years ago now, that tried to answer what I think is a critically important question for any institution and that is, are there inequities in salaries that are attributable to invidious discrimination, you know, either on the basis of race and ethnicity or on the basis of gender or some other status like that. Eliza's study was completed, and we did not find pervasive gender effects, for instance. I don't want to really characterize Eliza's study because the point is Denvil has since done a different study and he is here today to present the results of that study. So, with that, I'll turn it over to Denvil and have him walk through it. Denvil?

DIORIO: Lauren, I also have an introduction to the process as well that we prepared, Pnina, Denvil and I.

ROBEL: Oh okay. Well go right ahead, Dominick.

DIORIO: Thank you so much and I appreciate it. This is actually my nine years as a faculty member, this is my first BFC meeting, so I'm just thrilled to be here today to see you all. So dear colleagues, my name is Dominic DiOrio. I'm an associate professor of choral conducting at the Jacobs School. And I'm delighted to currently serve as co-chair of the Budgetary Affairs Committee with Pnina Fichman, Professor of Information Science and Director of the Rob Kling Center for Social Informatics.

Denvil and I though, began as co-chairs of the Budgetary Affairs Committee in fall 2019, and we succeeded long time co-chairs Don Jernigan and Rob Kravchuk. And at the time we reviewed the charge for our committee as set forth in the bylaws of the BFC, which includes that the committee's responsibilities shall include, quote, considering the setting of general faculty salary policies.

So, after conversations with then BFC president Diane Henshel, Denvil and I embarked on a longitudinal study of faculty base salaries from 2004 to 2019. And when I say that we embarked, I truly mean that Denvil used his vast knowledge and expertise as an economist and an associate professor in the O'Neill school to undertake this extensive analysis. And he shared those with me as his co-chair. Denvil was named as the faculty chair of the Hudson and Holland Scholars Program in December 2019. And when that happened, he stepped away from the co-chair position on this committee, but he's remained a

member and he continued his work on that analysis in consultation with staff and administrators from Eliza's office, the VPFAA, including Beth Gazley and Wen, who's here today.

And so, the information Denvil will share is the results of that research and analysis. And while I've been humbled to have been his co-chair during that process and to have supported his work. The statistical and analytical work described today is entirely his own, done in collaboration with the officers and staff members already mentioned. Denvil shared this information with the BFC Executive Committee a few months ago, and then also presented it to the Budgetary Affairs Committee for the first time in a meeting on February 8th, a few weeks ago. The committee affirmed his work with gratitude and encouraged that it be shared with the BFC at large which the Executive Committee saw would be a right and fit thing to do. And so, with all of this preamble out of the way for some context, and with the gratitude of myself and Pnina, my co-chair and the entire Budgetary Affairs Committee. I'm honored to formally introduce to this body, Associate Professor Denvil Duncan, who will present the fruits of his research.

ROBEL: Thank you, Dominick.

D. DUNCAN: Thank you, Dominick. That was well said. I think that's a very accurate description of how we got into this and kind of where things are today. I'm going to share my screen in a second. But I just wanted to point out that given the time constraint, that I will be giving a just a brief overview of the results and then I can discuss more results if questions merit further discussion of those ideas. So let me show you. So hopefully you are seeing this PDF document. Can I just get confirmation from someone that you are in fact seeing these?

SIMPSON: Yes, we are.

D. DUNCAN: Awesome, awesome. So let me just try to get through this very quickly and then leave as much time as possible for questions. As Dominic already mentioned, the goal was to basically check to see if there's any systemic differences in salary across faculty based on race or sex. So, in this analysis, it's kinda important to point out that we're looking at academic salary. And my understanding is that definition excludes the items you see listed on the screen here. So, contracts, grants, teaching overload and that kind of stuff. That's not included in our analysis. T

The other thing I wanted to do very quickly is to just highlight three very important things. The first is what we would call an empirical analysis omitted variable bias. And the idea here is that while we do have quite a bit of information that we're able to use in the analysis. We do not have all of the variables that one would want to include in this type of analysis. And I've included two examples here. So, we don't have any measures of productivity and we do not have any information on pre-IU experience. So, these are two important variables because we know that they are correlated with salary and are in fact correlated with race or sex. And so, it means that those things are not included in the analysis. The results that we find might not be the full picture. So, it's worth keeping that in mind as we go through the results.

The second thing is that the analysis that we did was not designed to detect isolated cases of bias. So, we're looking at the campus as a whole. And so, we're able to detect in this type of analysis systemic bias against faculty of a certain type. But if there is an isolated instance in a particular school, for example, at a particular point in time that would not register in this type of analysis.

And then the third and final is that the analysis is not suitable for trying to detect non-salary forms of bias. So just to give an example, let's say we do find that there is some suggestive evidence of bias through this analysis. Or rather, if we find that there's no suggestive evidence of bias and analysis, it doesn't mean that there aren't other forms of bias taking place on campus. So that's going to work

keeping all of those factors in mind. We're only able to look at academic salary and the extent to which various systemic differences between sex or race.

Okay, so where do we get the data? All of the data came from the faculty affairs census, as Dominick already mentioned, I worked closely with Eliza's office to get access to those data. And in that dataset, we're able to observe the salary, academic salary for each individual. So, this either ten month or twelve-month salary. We know your rank, we know the academic unit, we know the years at least we know the year of your highest degree, so we can calculate and measure your experience, so to speak. We know administrative status, whether you're an administrator or not. We also know starting salary and we're able to calculate some measure of post IU experience.

The analysis excludes everyone who is, well right, I should say it excludes faculty years where someone is a dean or above, or an administrators in a dean's office. So, someone can transition into the dean's office position and then transitions out. As of the time when they're in that position, that would be excluded. For example, an associate dean or executive associate dean would not be included and then deans would not be included either. But we do include chair, the chair of a department that could be included in here, the director of a program or an institute that could be included here as well. So, if people have questions later, we can get into this, but this chart just kind of shows you the existence of the schools that are included and the ranks of faculty included, we tried to include everyone as best as we could.

Okay, so then the method. And this is another place where I wanted to spend a few minutes. We're trying to determine if in this particular example, women are paid less than men. And one way to do that is to estimate the equation you see labeled as equation one. And this Beta coefficient is going to tell us if there's a difference between these two types of individuals and if that difference is positive or negative. It is also to say if this difference is statistically different from zero or not. The problem with this approach though, is that it gives us what is known as an unadjusted salary gap. And you can explain what that means. You can look at these two pictures that you see here. So, one is a pentagon and the blue pentagon that represents the men. And then we have a yellow triangle that represents the women. And what this approach does is basically takes the average among the men and the average among the women, and it takes the difference between those two. The problem is that one is a yellow triangle, and one is a blue pentagon. So is the difference because one is women, and one is men because one is blue, and one is yellow or because one is a triangle, and one is pentagon. And so, it's not as informative as you might think if we just take this raw difference.

So, what we tried to do is to kinda just throw the kitchen sink at this regression. So, we include everything we know about the individual and the model and that gives us equation two. And as I indicated before, we know the sex, we know race, you know, we know your rank, your department, and so on. So, we throw all of that stuff in here. And what you can see is that the shapes kind of change. Now we have a yellow circle and the blue decagon, and the decagon looks more closely and more similar to the circle than a triangle versus a pentagon, but, you know, this gives us a more accurate sense of the difference between the two groups. But of course, there are still differences, right? One is still yellow, one is still blue, one is the decagon, and one is a circle. And that kind of goes back to the point I made earlier that we don't know everything about faculty that might explain wages. And that's why you see here we have these two shapes that are not exactly the same. Nonetheless, this is a much better approach than the one you see here. And so, what I'll try to do now is give you a flavor for what we found when we look at the unadjusted results as well as what we found when we look at the adjusted results. And if we're interested in knowing whether or not there is in the systemic differences in wages across faculty types then they adjusted as the one we want to focus on. Again, keeping in mind that we are missing some important things when we tried to look at the statements.

So, the race, yeah, this is kind of the main result. And just to kinda explain what's going on here. On the vertical axis, we have log points. These log points represent the data from the regression issue earlier. And so, this is just telling us the difference between in the case of race and particularly on this panel where we have Asian. The dots that you see here basically they tell us the difference in the average wage for an Asian faculty versus a white faculty. If this difference is positive, that means that Asians are earning more than white faculty. If it's negative, it means they're earning less than white faculty. And then the same on the right side where you have BHOs that is for Black, Hispanic, or other. So, we had to group those faculty types because the individual groups were not large enough to support empirical analysis. Then looking at the dots, this red dot is the unadjusted gap in and since these are log points you just multiply by 100 to get a rough approximation of the difference. So, this red dot would tell us that in an unadjusted sense, Asian faculty are earning about 18 percent less than white faculty. But it turns out that once you account for rank and department, that gap basically disappears. And so that takes us from this red dot all the way to this, what I'm going to call pink. Maybe others will think it's not pink and I'm going to leave that pink. And sorry, just 1 second. I was trying to make this bigger, but it's not working. Anyway, the bottom line along the Asian faculty group is that there is no meaningful difference in salary between average Asian faculty, the average white faculty. And if anything, you will see later on that differences is actually positive.

If we look at the BHO group, the unadjusted gap is smaller, it's about 8% or 9%. But again, once you control for academic rank and department, that largely goes away. And then the full model where you're looking at this green dot, it's actually not statistically different from 0. And the estimate itself is really tiny, so it's 7%. So, yeah, not economically meaningful. If we go to a time analysis, so in this result I'm showing you the estimate, you're using all of the data for 2004 to 2019.

DIORIO: I'm sorry, Denvil. I don't know if this is just my screen, but your slide has frozen. Have you gone onto the next page?

D. DUNCAN: Yes, I transitioned to the table.

ROBEL: I think it might help to close the view. I'm seeing your tools up at the top.

DIORIO: Yeah, Denvil, if you were to just to end share and then start share again it should fix itself. Okay.

D. DUNCAN: Okay I'll do that. Is that better? No?

ROBEL: It hasn't come back yet.

DIORIO: I see only a black screen.

D. DUNCAN: Okay. Well, give me a second. I'll have to switch the way I show this information on. Okay just give me one moment here. Technical difficulties. Thankfully this period of our life is probably coming to an end. Let's see if this works. Oh, yes. Okay. So that probably should work now and then if you don't mind, if you want to see this larger, you just pin my screen and kind of make it full or you set your Zoom second to speaker view. And that should make the whole thing look a lot larger. Okay, So I was explaining that the gap in the full sample of 2004 to 2019 shows no effect. And then we can also look at this by time period. And so, when we look at this by time period, what we find is that the gap is getting bigger over time for Asian faculty. And by that, I mean, it starts with negative 1.3% in 2004 to 2007 period. And by the time we get to this red box over here, we're looking at the last four years in the data, 2016-2019 you can see that Asian faculty are earning about 1.6% more than white faculty. And then the gap for the Black, Hispanic, and other group is practically 0 crossing the period.

When we look at sex, the results are kind of following a somewhat similar pattern, except that the gap for men is fairly large and persistent over time. So first we start with this red dot, which is the

unadjusted gap of about 22%. And again, once we account for rank and department, that gap falls to 4%. And then it doesn't matter what else we throw in here, at least among the set of variables that we have so if we included administrative status, experience measured as years since degree, or race the gap purveys flat at basically the 4%. Then if we throw your starting salary in there, that gap falls to 2%. If we look at this over time, we'll see that the gap for sex is more persistent, than it is for race. So, the blue box, that's the result for the entire sample period 4% gap. If we look at this by period, you can see it's roughly 4% in every four-year period since 2004. And in the last period, this red box says 4.2%. So, we find that this gap, again, in aggregate, looking across the entire campus is 4%.

The other thing we did is to look at starting salaries. So, we ran the same model that I showed you before, except that in this case we have starting salary as the outcome variable. And what you find again, is a gap, unadjusted gap of those 16, 17%. But then once you account for rank and the department that falls to about 4% and it remains at 4% over this period. I'm sorry, over the sample period. When we look at starting salary for on the race gap for starting salary, we find no difference. And so again, you start with an unadjusted gap. But once you conquer rank and the department, that gap is statistically 0 both for Asian faculty as well as the Black, Hispanic, other group.

So just to quickly summarize, we have, I would say, largely no systemic difference among the race margins. In the last year we do find a positive effect for the Asian group. And then when we look at RAs, we find that Asian RAs have a negative gap relative to their white counterparts. When we look at the sex gap, we find that there is a negative gap, but it kind of bears in size. I didn't show you these results. Again, I suspect by the end of end of the day, I'll end up showing you. I do have them prepared. But when we look at the sex gap across faculty type, we do find that it is smallest among professors and lecturers and largest among the other non-tenure track groups. The gap does seem to persist across time. As I think an interesting question at this point is kind of what explains this remaining gap? And this is where my initial comment about omitted variables becomes very important because as I indicated before, we have no measures of productivity. We have no information about your pre-IU experience. And both of these things we know to be correlated with both salary and individual characteristics, particular sex, and race. And then another possibility, systemic bias. But I would caution here because like I said, unless you can rule out those first two, we really don't know what's going on. And then of course there could be something else outside of these three that contributes to these findings. So, I will stop there again. There's a lot more, you can see there that there are forty-three slides. So as questions come if they are relevant, I will skip to some of those results and show you what is going on.

AGENDA ITEM ELEVEN: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE FINDINGS FROM A LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS OF ACADEMIC SALARIES BY RACE AND GENDER

ROBEL: Thank you so much Denvil for incredible amount of work that went into that. Are there questions?

SIMPSON: No hands raised at this at this moment.

ROBEL: All right. If there are no questions, I think the next step for us at the campus is to see if we can, we'd been talking, Eliza and I have been talking to Carol Burnett, who is our employment expert in the counsel's office and the Office of Institutional Equity about trying to engage somebody who does this kind of analysis for a living and see if we can't get to the conclusions that Denvil, has been careful about not drawing, just to ensure that we're in a position to be able to say that we've, we feel completely comfortable with the analysis that we've done as a campus around these issues.

All right. Well, if there are no.

HERRERA: Lauren?

ROBEL: Yes.

HERRERA: Yeah. I find I don't know if I can ask something about elections.

ROBEL: About what now?

HERRERA: The president elect results.

ROBEL: I don't believe.

SIMPSON: Not yet. I don't believe, Israel.

HERRERA: Not yet?

ROBEL: Not yet.

HERRERA: Perfect.

ROBEL: Thank you. All right. Well, with great thanks to Denvil and knowing that I'm going to see members of the Budgetary Affairs Committee a lot in the next several weeks. I think at this point, if we have no other business, we probably can adjourn into usual in the usual way.