

Indiana University

BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL

February 7, 2023 | 2:30 – 4:30 p.m. Presidents Hall – Franklin Hall

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ahlbrand, Ashley; Asher, Sofiya; Brinda, Chelsea; Cavar, Damir; Cohen, Rachael; Cole, Shu; Daleke, David; Dau-Schmidt, Kenneth; Davis, Allen; Deeds, Anna; Deliyannis, Constantine; Desawal, Danielle; Eaton, Kristine; Eskew, Kelly; Freedman, Seth; Furey, Constance; Gahl-Mills, Karen; Gibson, John; Gupta, Nandini; Herrera, Israel; Housworth, Elizabeth; Huntoon, Ann; Johnson, Colin; Kravitz, Ben; Kubow, Patricia; Lalwani, Ashok; Lammers, Sabine; Lanosga, Gerry; Lion, Margaret; Loring, Annette; McCoy, Chase; Pavalko, Eliza; Sapp, Christopher; Seibert, Kyle; Sela, Ron; Sherman, Jim, Shrivastav, Rahul; Siek, Jeremy; Silvester, Katie; Sinadinos, Alison; Singh, Kashika; Svetina, Dubravka; Walton, Christi; Whitworth, Cale; Wu, Jianmei

MEMBERS ABSENT: Arcuri, Toni; Bala, Hillol; Bielasiak, Jack; Frazier, Lessie; Giordano, Anthony; Green, Hank; Groth, Dennis; Kalentzidou, Olga; Kollbaum, Pete; Michaelson, Jonathan; Northcutt-Bohmert, Miriam; Olcott, Courtney; Ossi, Massimo; Pastore, Bell; Perry, Brea; Peters, Chuck; Raymond, Angie; Shy, Katie; Simpson, Marietta; Smith, Wyatt; Sterling, Thomas; Tanford, Alex; Tracey, Dan; Wyrzynski, Stephen

GUESTS: Carini, John; Miles, Emily; Waller, Matt; Docherty, Carrie; Cohen, Judah; Berry, Sharon; Belardinelli, Paolo; Buxbaum, Hannah; Ryan, Katherine; Romashov, Dimitry

AGENDA:

1. Approval of the minutes of January 17, 2023
2. Memorial Resolution for Robert Agranoff
3. Memorial Resolution for Mona Tobin Houston
4. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)
Cate Reck, Faculty President
5. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)
Rahul Shrivastav, Provost
6. Question/Comment Period
Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to Provost Shrivastav or President Reck by emailing bfcoff@indiana.edu. Questions should be submitted no less than two business days before the meeting.
7. Report from the Office of the Vice President for International Affairs (15 minutes)
Hannah Buxbaum, Vice President for International Affairs
8. Questions/Comments on the Report from the Office of the Vice President for International Affairs (10 minutes)

9. Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-D22: Grievance and Review Procedures of the Bloomington Faculty (15 minutes)
Shu Cole, Co-chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee
Katherine Ryan, Co-chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee
John Carini, Member of the Faculty Affairs Committee
Dmitry Romashov, Member of the Faculty Affairs Committee
[Action Item]
10. Questions/Comments on Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-D22: Grievance and Review Procedures of the Bloomington Faculty (10 minutes)
11. Strategic Plan IUB 2030 Next Steps (15 minutes)
Carrie Docherty, Interim Vice Provost for Strategy and Innovation
Cate Reck, President of the Bloomington Faculty Council
Questions about Strategic Plan IUB 2030 Next Steps (10 minutes)
12. Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-D6: Review Procedures for Administrators on the Bloomington Campus (10 minutes)
Colin Johnson, President-elect of the Bloomington Faculty Council
Cate Reck, President of the Bloomington Faculty Council
Marietta Simpson, Past President of the Bloomington Faculty Council
[Discussion Item]
13. Questions/Comments on the Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-D6: Review Procedures for Administrators on the Bloomington Campus (10 minutes)

COHEN: We will get started soon, but we are not anywhere near quorum yet. And so we're just going to wait a minute or two to see if we get some more people.

SHRIVASTAV: Good afternoon, everyone. Let's call this meeting to order. And I'm going to break protocol today and begin with a acknowledgement about the heartbreaking loss we've had for our dear friend and colleague Kim Geeslin. I know many of us continue to grieve her rather untimely and sudden passing. And she's deeply missed in this room today. She brought so much light to campus in all her life and her work. And I know there are very few people on campus who have not been touched by her loss. I had gotten to know Kim fairly well over my time at IU. And I must say I was inspired by her strong support, her innovative thinking, her unique insights, and her strong tireless advocacy for faculty across the board. Her impact at IU and beyond will clearly endure. And I know each and every one of us feel a sense of loss with her passing away. Before we do anything further in our meeting today, I want us to hold a moment of silence in her recognition before we move on with routine business. So if you don't, if you are able please stand for a minute. Thank you.

Our campus mourns deeply anytime we lose a member of our community. Please know that resources continue to be available for all employees and students who are in need of support. As you may recall, I have charged a group, it's called the Honoring Hoosiers Working Group to create efforts and traditions for us to pay tribute to all members of the community who have passed away this year. And it's something I hope we can do as a regular tradition on campus

moving forward. You can learn more about this group on the resources section on the Provost's website. It's provost at indiana dot edu. And I will keep you updated with their progress and recommendations which I expect to come later this Spring. I hope we can do some sort of a event in some smaller scale this year given the timing of things. But then we'll try and enact those recommendations on its, in its entirety for next year. I also want this moment to very, very give my heartfelt thanks to Eliza, who had extremely short notice, agreed to return back to take over her position. You may or may not know, she was on a sabbatical what, five time zones away. And basically, she and I were on the phone and texts about midnight our time that evening. And before I woke up the next morning, she had already booked her flights back and was able to return. So, Eliza, thank you very much. I know on behalf of everybody, we greatly appreciate your dedication, and we are grateful for everything you continue to do for IU. I anticipate Eliza will continue in this role until another vice provost has been appointed. And I will share with you a long-term transition plan for this role again, in the coming weeks as we sort of gather everything that we are doing and figure out a path forward. With that, let me go back to our routine business.

AGENDA ITEM ONE

SHRIVASTAV: And the first order of business, as in every meeting, is the approval of minutes for the January 27th, uh January 17th meeting. I need a motion for approval of the minutes. So moved. Second and seconded. All in favor? Please raise your hands. It looks near unanimous. Thank you very much. The minutes are approved. The next order of business is a memorial resolution for two of our colleagues, Robert Agranoff and Mona Tobin Houston and Eliza will be reading those for us.

AGENDA ITEM TWO

PAVALKO: Thank you. I just wanted to start off by saying how honored I am to read the reflections of our colleagues about, about those who have passed on. So our first memorial resolution is Robert Agranoff. For more than 50 years, Professor Emeritus Robert Agranoff was a leading scholar and practitioner of politics, providing groundbreaking intellectual bridge between political science and public administration to ensure good governance for leaders and citizens. Research and practice are intertwined and the ultimate measure of one's work in academia is the extent to which positive and productive change in society is informed by that work. The theme of Bob's work and life reflected in his words, a sensitivity to the world of theoretical understanding linked to practice. Bob joined the faculty of SPEA now O'Neill in 1980, after spending 14 years in the Public Administration Division of the Department of Political Science at Northern Illinois. From his pre-college years in the US, in the US Navy to his final year at SPEA in 2001 as the school's Associate Dean. Bob was a keen observer of human behavior and organizations. He understood that there was a lot going on in politics and governance not revealed in the New York Times or in popular press books on government. He made it his life's work to learn how politics and governance operate in practice.

While studying political science as an undergraduate student at the University of Wisconsin, Bob became involved in student government and political campaigns. He gained practical experience when he took a leave from Northern Illinois during his third year on the faculty and became the full-time Legislative Affairs Director of the State headquarters, and then served as the party's lobbyist the state legislative session. Early in his career, Bob published two major books on campaign management: an edited volume, *The New Style in Election Campaigns*, in 1972 on the technical, organizational, and communications changes that had transformed

political parties and *The Management of Election Campaigns* in 1976. Bob's research on campaigning convinced him that legislators had great ideas for new legislation, but little sense of the vast implementation chain involving many different entities that new programs required.

Bob was seemingly always ahead of scholarly curve. He nearly single-handedly created a major new sub-field in public administration. Public administration as an intergovernmental and inter-organizational administrative phenomenon. His most important and recognize contributions or the study of intergovernmental and intersectoral collaboration and networks now known as “collaborative public management”. The culmination of this work, *Collaborative Public Management: New Strategies for Local Governments*, was honored with both the 2003 Louis Brownlow Book Award and the National Academy of Public Administration and the 2014 Martha Derthick Book Award from the American Political Science Association.

Bob maintained an active research career even after he retired, publishing six books and dozens of articles during that period. Also during this period, he received multiple lifetime achievement awards, including being elected as a fellow in the National Academy of Public Administration. Professor Agranoff inspired students to take up the call of public service. He chaired and served on scores of dissertation committees. And he also directed the PhD program in public affairs and public policy. His dedication to the nexus of theory and practice is exemplified also by his extraordinary professional service. He served on the editorial boards of no fewer than 15 journals and as chair or member of numerous professional and research Association committees. He also made significant contributions to the Bloomington community over 40 years serving on boards of organizations addressing concerns such as mental health, developmental disabilities, autism rehabilitation, youth in aging. His genuine concern for the successful planning and delivery of government programs was not just the centerpiece of his research. Like the old “pol” that he was, he helped steer these and other organizations towards greater effectiveness. His life is a model for engaged scholars worldwide.

AGENDA ITEM THREE

Our second memorial resolution is for Mona Tobin Houston, Mona Tobin Houston passed away January 15, 2021. She majored in French and Italian at Barnard College and earned her PhD in French literature at Yale University. She came to Bloomington in 1962 to join the faculty of IU’s Department of French and Italian. At IU, she taught courses in seventeenth-century French drama, phonetics, and translation. Many of her students were devoted to her and still cherish their memories of her today. Houston was a member of the American Literary Translators Association and translated several plays as well as a well-received anthology of French Symbolist poetry, translated and co-edited with her husband. She also co-authored an important French grammar textbook with several IU colleagues. She combined her musical training with her knowledge of the French language to develop a course in the French pronunciation for singers in the School of Music, and was a sought after coach for performers in the IU Opera Theater. Houston's passion for theater extended beyond her teaching. She received research funding to study productions at several professional theaters and Paris and Washington DC, which had a huge, huge impact on our work with students and singers, as well as enriching her own performances. She performed with the Early Music Institute and coached the Concord Ensemble. She also translated and produced two plays by Moliere for the John Waldron Arts Center. Houston was known as a compelling teacher and storyteller, inspiring people well beyond

the formal classroom. Her love of beauty and her vibrant personality remained intact into her later years, even as dementia diminished her capacities. Thank you.

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you, Eliza. If you are able please stand for a moment of silence. Thank you. I now invite Cate Reck, Faculty President, to deliver the executive committee report.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR

RECK: Thank you. I'd like to start today echoing the words that our Provost has shared both about Kim and thanking Eliza. In addition to being a valued colleague in Spanish and Portuguese, Kim Geeslin became the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs just this past December. So although she's served with us on this council for just a short while, she was, as most of you saw, present at every meeting with us. And I know most of us were glad to check in with her on policy and process questions. The last week has proven more than ever that the campus has a widely shared sense of respect for Kim as a colleague and a valued member of the IUB community. I'd like to remind everyone that the BFC is collecting cards and memories. And there's a basket at the back where Heather is sitting. If you'd like to contribute something for the family, we encourage you to still do this. Please contact Lana in order to try to get it to her by the end of the week so that we can deliver this information and the cards and memories to the family in a timely manner. Okay.

I believe I speak for all faculty that we appreciate Eliza returning to the position until such time that we can find a new Vice Provost. She and I had been communicating actually a lot this weekend. So I thank you personally because you've jumped back into the fray very quickly. Well, I hope she can get back to your sabbatical as soon as possible. We do. Thank you for being here and your service to you, and thank you for bringing the unseasonably warm weather back from Hawaii. So I don't know how you controlled jet streams too, but thank you. Okay.

We're in the midst of identifying candidates for those who will run as president-elect. Lana will be reaching out soon to the council members who've received the most number of nominations. We hope to have identified the president-elect candidates by the end of next week and have that solidified. Just to remind you, the president-elect elections will be the week of March 20 through the 27th. So people have about a month's time to get a candidate statement together and send it out. And you can then talk to people, right? Communicate with those people running. Please encourage your units and constituents to consider running for BFC counsel position, right? So the self nomination ballot window will be opened February 13th through February 24th.

So faculty shared governance is a really a quite unique feature of US educational system. And it contributes to our reputation as being one of the best systems in higher education in the world. Although it may work slowly, sometimes overall it works well. And it's crucial that we continue to support faculty shared governance on this campus. Please educate your colleagues who might be junior faculty or maybe coming from other institutions, how much we value shared governance at IU. And I hope that you agree we all should be working to uphold this crucial work that we do in collaboration through shared governance. I want to remind everyone to fill out the committee volunteer form. You can find this button at the bottom of the BFC homepage. There's a wide range of ways that you can contribute between the standing committees, the campus committees, and then the elected committees. There's always a great deal of need across the campus. So I hope you can encourage your constituents and yourself to fill out that form.

In January, the faculty voted to change the constitution to specify the makeup of the graduate students on this council. I'm happy to report that 909 faculty members voted and the responses were overwhelmingly positive, with 842 yes responses to the change in the language in 67 no. So that is passed. I also want to remind folks that although today we will be voting to change a faculty grievance policy in order to be in compliance with the UFC policy. And this needs to be done by February 15th and she will do an excellent job of delivering the information. I do want to actually remind people that we have a task force that is actually overseeing the overhauling of all grievance policies between SAAs and faculty. So we want to do a very holistic overhaul and we want to make sure all voices are heard. So although maybe your language or certain suggestions that people have made may not be reflected in today's vote and the language for today's policy. That does not mean that ongoing change will not be happening throughout the rest of the spring. With that we have a full meeting and I want to make sure we have we're careful of our timing. So that's the end of my message today. As always, please let me know if you have any concerns or questions between Lana or myself. So thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you, cate. I will now continue my report. In addition to dealing with the loss of Kim and sort of navigating the changes after that. There's a lot to report from campus. First, let me start with mental health resources as, as President Whitten shared recently through an e-mail. I'm excited to highlight a fantastic new offering at IU for all our students. A new partnership with Timely Care, which is a 24-seven virtual mental health service platform, which will begin rolling out to all our campuses in late March. By late summer undergraduate and graduate students on all campuses as well as IU online students will have free on-demand access to Timely Care. This will be a great addition, a great additional resource for students to supplement our existing student care, counseling and other support activities.

This comes largely from a recommendation from our mental health taskforce. I know several of you here who are participating in those conversations over the last year. And so my thanks to all of you for the leadership and sort of looking beyond the curve, beyond the corners in supporting the well-being of our community. Just as a matter of awareness about this company. It allows us to access licensed providers and counselors in all 50 states and more than half of Timely Care's mental health providers identify as people of color. In addition, the student, the services include professionals who identify as LGBTQ+, speak multiple languages, and have various religious and spiritual beliefs and when you have the opportunity to look at their virtual or their web based sign-up section. Individuals seeking those services can identify a counselor that matches their needs in terms of a variety of these variables. So I believe this service provider hopefully will provide timely, but also sort of access to professionals who understand the needs and perspectives of the diversity of students that we have on campus.

The second big thing I want to share is the 2030 update. I know Carrie who's somewhere here sitting back there and Cate will be providing more detailed update, but I'm excited to hear about where we are with that planning process. As you know, a collaboration between all schools and units and 450 plus faculty and staff and students engaged in it. Again, for us, this is hopefully going to be a roadmap. It will be a living document. It will be an overall guide for us to move forward for the next several years. And I'm committed as I hope you all are embracing the ideals and creativity, integrating the objectives laid out in that emerging plan into

our daily lives at IU. I recognize that any major plan like this comes with bumps and hurdles. This will be no different. I also recognize that this is a strategic plan. It is not a plan intended for every individual and everything all the time. It doesn't mean we stopped doing what's important to each one of us. This map will really, or this, this plan should really tell us what we as a community, want to strategically focus on in the next several years. But I trust in us to make these strategic choices, renew the ways in which we work together, forge new connections within our community, but also with multiple external constituents. That's one whole pillar of our strategic planning framework, which will include local, regional businesses, are alumni leaders in Indiana and beyond, I strongly encourage you to have continued engagement in this process. And again, I look forward to Cate and Carrie giving us an update later in this meeting.

Speaking of forging connections, I've spent the last few days traveling. I spent Thursday and Friday in Richmond at IU East Campus meeting with our board of trustees. And then yesterday and today I met some donors and several of our state legislators in Indianapolis. We discussed the historic strengths of our university, exciting opportunities to collaborate and innovate as we move forward. Including a host of initiatives and partnerships designed to transform our research, teaching, and service to IU with impact both regionally and globally. I look forward to your collaboration and your leadership in the days and months ahead as we start to shape the next chapter in IU's history.

I want to give you a few updates on our searches. Since the last BFC meeting, things have progressed well for the Kelley School of Business search, the second review of candidates and semi-finalists selection happened yesterday. And we are on target to begin interviews later this month. For the Media School search, the second review of candidates and semi-finalists selection is scheduled for early next month with interviews targeted for mid-March. The Graduate School dean position has been posted and will close by the end of the month. Interviews should begin soon after that. As a reminder, that is an internal search. And finally, the Dean of Optometry, the position has been posted. It will close on March 1st. Interviews are scheduled to begin in the middle of March, so for important searches underway, and I'm hoping we can share new leadership in our upcoming meetings here.

In closing, as we strive to make IU the best that it can be for all our students, for our faculty, and our staff. It is important as, as I say, multiple times, that we all spend time taking care of ourselves and taking care of each other. I know these are challenging times. Stress levels continue to be high. There's a lot of changes happening across the board, nationally, regionally, and locally, which does not make things easy. But I also know we're strongest together. And as long as we keep moving as a community, we will continue to make good progress for all of us.

Before I open this up for questions from the floor, I want to recognize two questions that were submitted via email, and I'll read those out verbatim. The first one is: "if some schools with relatively low stipends are told by the campus to increase them. Is the campus that is the provost providing some assistance with the new base funds that the provost receives every year or did the mandate come with instructions for each RC to figure out how to pay for it". Second question which is related, "can you help explain the financial implications of the campus mandate to increase essays, stipends, how our units being asked to shoulder this financial burden, and where is the money coming from"? Let me respond to the two together because they are really addressing the same underlying question. As you may recall from about a little, little more than a year, a little less than a year ago, after the BFC taskforce met and made the recommendation to increase the minimum stipends for our academic appointees. We decided to take the action and

the recommendation was benchmarked based on data that David Daleke and his team had led in another thing and making some recommendations on because the associated costs for these increases were not figured into the budget planning. It was too late by the time that recommendation was made and adopted.

We, that is the campus, covered more than 90% of the costs associated with the stipend increases. This was done primarily by three by cutting expenses in three different categories. The biggest one was on the IT replacement side, we delayed purchases and routine replacement cycles for all things IT those are not just your computers, but servers and switches and a whole bunch of IT infrastructure that allows you and me to pull out your devices and do the work we do constantly. Two other elements we targeted to recover that money was a freeze on all nonessential travel. And third was a drastic reduction in all non-essential entertainment and other expenses in our decentralized budget model. And this is the piece I hope you all recognize. Most of the funding available is given back to the schools. In fact, over 80 per cent of the total revenue that comes in is automatically based on the RCM formula. Going back to the schools. The remainder is used largely for fixed expenses, everything from buildings to electric costs, to some other essential expenses including scholarships, i.e. costs benefits and things like that.

Therefore, in the long run, every impacted unit will have to find ways to build these additional costs into their operational budgets using the strategies that are best suited for that particular department or unit. Because each unit is different, each school, college, or divisions within schools and colleges are different. It will, the response will have to be unique to that particular school. Our finance team continues to work with each impacted school and college. Then on integrating these changes, I anticipate having a two to three-year time-frame. So each unit can find ways to gently adapt without creating major hurdles or challenges on their own budgets. We will try our best to offer bridge funding as needed through continued cost-saving measures. At the end of the day though, whether it is SAA compensation or other strategic initiatives that we want to do moving forward. The answers are going to be very similar.

We have to be strategic in our decision-making. We have to find ways to reduce expenses where we can. And we have to find ways to increase revenue across campus wherever we can. It will mean being innovative and the types of programs we offer. It will mean finding ways to, for example, grow enrollment in certain areas where we have opportunity to do so. It will mean more effort on private fundraising and philanthropy. Shifting expenses from general funds to other sources of revenue including grants and contracts. It is going to be a series of many different things that we will have to do to move forward with our budget realities of today. We have had a successful decade or more using a strategic strategy that largely relied on enrollment growth. Unfortunately, that strategy is no longer viable as we move forward. And so we have to shift our attention to doing things a little differently. But we should all understand that moving forward, we will have to make choices in support of our priorities in graduate stipends. SAA compensation was one that we all collectively, through the task force decided was important for us to do so. I'm glad we have been able to do it and we will continue to invest strategically in years to come. Once again, are you between one-thirty should lay out our roadmap for our priorities, and we will then work to achieve those goals over the next several years. With that, I will open it up for other questions if there are any from the floor. And if not, we'll move on to the next order of business. Yes.

AGENDA ITEM SIX

MCCOY: Yeah. I would like to applaud your efforts for Timely MD. I think this is a fantastic thing for our students. Myself having 500-700 students this semester. I've heard from them and seeing from them some of the struggles that they've been dealing with. Students who are already noticing this and have come to me to ask if I know anything about it. And I've tried to look through some of the resources and I'm not sure or I'm unable to find anything concrete about how many services they can access because I know with caps there's a limit. When is that type of information going to become available to students?

SHRIVASTAV: And thank you for asking that detail. The I'm not sure if anybody from the committee who's aware of the implementation is here, the service should begin. Our service should be good with become available in mid-March. Our new Vice President for Marketing and Communication is creating all that information, including a marketing plan, everything from t-shirts to bus wraps, to posters on campus, a website, easy to access QR codes that students can point and shoot on their mobile devices to get direct access to it. All of that is in the works. We're trying not to release it until the services will be will become available. It's just when the contract kicks off. So all of that will be released campus-wide. Probably a few days before the service actually is available for students to log in and utilize. Yeah. So it is IU-wide, by the way, it is not just IU Bloomington. It says for all students across the entirety of about 89,000 students total. Great question. Thank you. Okay. Israel.

HERRERA: So first, thank you for your kind words with Kim. That's really appreciated because Kim was very instrumental person advancing my career in my department. And thank you Eliza for coming back and serve again. My question is related to the expectations about the new Vice Provost. So the expectation is to have the new one in fall or is something that is going to happen during the semester?

SHRIVASTAV: Well, again, this is still a conversation I'm having. I don't have a firm answer. I do want to get somebody sooner rather than later. I know Eliza would greatly appreciate that. But I also want to make sure that none of the processes get broken to the extent possible. As you all know, we are in the heavy period of tenure and promotion process. And again, thanks to Eliza, this change has been extremely seamless, but bringing a new person too soon may create some disruption there. So I have to balance the need for continuity with the need for doing it sooner. So again, give me a few weeks maybe in the next meeting or the meeting after, if we've had a chance to regroup, think through some logistics, identify the details. I'll be happy to share additional information at that time. Okay. Thank you. Seeing no other questions. Let's move on to the next item on the report. The first one is a report from the Office of the Vice President for International Affairs. And for that, we have Hannah.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN

BUXBAUM: Thank you. Good afternoon. Thanks for the invitation to update you briefly on what's happening in international affairs. Let me start just by recognizing the impact of the devastating earthquakes that have just happened in Turkey and Syria. I just want to mention that because our offices have had a lot of outreach today, asking what is going on there. So we're focused, of course, on making sure that we do not have students or faculty in the affected areas. To the best of our knowledge, we do not. And then focus likewise on making sure that our very, very many current students and scholars with family in those affected areas are getting the support that they need. We've also been in touch with a number of student organizations and local relief organizations that are starting to lead community response in terms of setting up fundraising efforts, connecting through to relief organizations on the ground and so forth. So I think the

Office of International Services will try to have the most recent available on information on those sorts of efforts. But I greatly appreciate all of the outreach that we've had from, from departments and schools wanting to ensure that their students are being, are being cared for here.

So let me just start with a reminder of the mission of our office. So providing strategic leadership in advancing the international dimension of our work. Supporting academic and administrative units with the resources and expertise they need and ensuring that all of our international activities are consistent with regulatory requirements and best practices. Today, I just wanted to give a brief update on some of our core priorities. The basic message here is back in business. So we are recovering from the effects of the pandemic across all areas of our operation. I'll start with education abroad. I do not expect you to see any of those numbers, but look at the bars so you can see where the pandemic was. The bar to the far right is our projected education abroad enrollments for this academic year. Over 4,200 students university-wide are expected to participate in steady internship and also service learning programs overseas. That that accounts for about 3,400 from the Bloomington campus. This is running about 95% of our pre-pandemic enrollments. And we're just delighted, of course, in how eagerly students have returned to that activity. I'll also say, since July 1st, we've had nearly 19, nearly 20 new credit-bearing programs approved. So your departments are likewise very eager to get back to developing new opportunities, new programs for students overseas.

That office is also responsible for our language immersion program for high school students. So we have a program for high, for honors students in foreign languages across all of Indiana high schools. That had likewise been on hiatus for two years and started up again last summer with nearly 150 students. So we're excited to begin that again as well. In terms of international student enrollment, again, you can see the trend lines. The bottom line is Bloomington, the top line is university-wide. So we're definitely rebounding. I will say we are continuing to see declines in students from China, which used to be our number one sending country. India is now our number one sending country. And there we are seeing very robust growth. Overall, we now have nearly 5,500 international students enrolled at IU Bloomington that's nearly equally divided between graduate and undergraduate students. Application increases are keeping pace. So our applications for the next academic year are again, looking in good shape.

We continue to put weight on student quality and geographic diversity. So we have focused a lot of recruitment efforts on Sub-Saharan Africa, parts of South America, in addition to our more traditional sending countries. And we're continuing to see good, good growth in those areas. Although of course, just due to demographics, China, India, and the rest of the top ten sending countries will, will always play an important part on our campus. Our gateway offices, so those are the ones identified in red. They remained open during the pandemic and whenever possible we're conducting in the country events. They supported primarily recruitment events during the pandemic itself because of course, other academic events such as faculty workshops, conferences, seminars where we're not taking place during, during that, during that year. But now they are again back in business and hosting events of various kinds. And I just want to remind everyone we do have a grant program that makes matching funds available for events taking place at the gateway offices and information on that and our other grant programs is available on the IU global website.

Before I leave this global presence slide, I just wanted to briefly mention. One other aspect of our global presence is formal representation of the university overseas. For purposes of

deepening our partnerships and engaging our very, very large and active international alumni base. And last fall, we took a trip to Germany and France with President Whitten, where she was able to meet with the Presidents of Free University of Berlin, the University of Hamburg, and Sorbonne University, which are three of our most important partners in Europe. This March, we are planning a trip with her to Mexico City, which would involve a visit to the gateway there, but also discussions with the autonomous University of Mexico, which again is one of our, one of our very important partners in that region. And in May, we're hoping to go with her for her first IU representing trip to Asia, to Tokyo and Seoul. So I think that is that's likewise an important part of communicating the importance of our global activities to the university. I'm trying to convince the provost as well, but I hear a lot about budget conferences and things that are happening in April. So maybe next year.

This is not old business, this is kind of new business. I am super excited that the Ferguson International Center building, which has been in the planning and under construction for a long time, is now open. So we, in this building, we are going to move all of IU Global's offices into one place. So currently we have offices scattered across campus. And now we're going to have the Office of International Services, the Office of Overseas study, the partnerships team, gateways team, everybody in this one building. It's going to be great for our capacity to serve our students better, to bring the international students and the study abroad student population into the same place for their services, create new room for student organizations. So we have nearly 100 international student organizations that have historically had no dedicated place to meet or do their work. So we are very excited about this. The first unit overseas study is already in the building dealing with things like temperatures that go up to 85 degrees in the middle of the day, but they are there working on all of that on our behalf. So Office of International Development, the team from Bryan Hall are going to be moving over next week, Office of International Services at the end of the month. So I'm hopeful that by the beginning of March or so we're gonna be all in there. There will be some formal open house to follow. I hope to show off that new building to everybody soon.

I thought that I would spend just a little time on a few programmatic initiatives that you may be less familiar with, but are important to the work that we're doing, particularly in curriculum internationalization, campus internationalization at, at IUB. One of them is the Global Classroom Initiatives. So this is a fellowship program where we make small awards to faculty members who link their class being taught here at IU with a counterpart class being taught at a foreign partner university. So this does not involve student mobility. What it does is require students to work in team-based, project oriented ways with students from another country. So it's intended to build, of course, intercultural skills in a way that is relevant to the particular subject matter that the students are studying. We have had just tremendous feedback from both from the Faculty Fellows who participate in this program and also the students and an incredible array of projects that they work on. So in one class, students from both institutions co-published an article on, on their topic. One led to the creation of website one led to the creation of a whole series of audio documentaries about solidarity economies in Latin America across a range of subject matters. This is a tool to permit students who are not studying abroad, nevertheless, to have a meaningful intercultural experience as part of their academic program. We take usually about this. This is an IU wide program. So we usually have about eight to about eight fellows per semester with a number of them, of course, from IUB.

The second program I wanted to mention was the Intercultural Competence Certificates. So this, which we first piloted in Spring 2020 and have now been, been greatly

expanding, is a professional development program that again, is intended to develop skills in intercultural communication and collaboration. We started it as a staff-oriented program. So we recognize that there are many, many staff members at, at IUB who interact on a regular basis with our international students. And you often just did not have the experience or the skills that helped them navigate intercultural challenges in supporting those students. So it's a series of sessions that, that develop these skills. People can just take one session if they want to, or they can take the whole program which then leads to a certificate. At this point, we've now had over 2,200 participants across our campuses. Nearly 750 people continued with it to do the whole program. We are now expanding it to include mid-level and advanced certificates. And we're getting a fair number of repeat people who want to continue to the next level of this work. And we've had a great array of people participating, including, for instance, members of the IU Police Department who did this as a team, people from the local BMV. These are, these are offices that, whose interaction with our international students greatly impacts the experience that those students have on campus and in Bloomington at-large. And we have found this to be a really successful way to try to improve some of those, some of those interactions. In the meantime, we're having quite a number of faculty members also take this, which I think is great because, well, for obvious reasons.

The last one I wanted to mention is the refugee task force. So this is a group that is spearheaded by the team in the Office of International Services in collaboration with many campus and community partners. It's really meant to consolidate support for students who come to us as refugees or asylees across all of their needs. So that means housing, enrollment in programs, finding school enrollment for their children if they have children. Connections to faith communities, connections to resource agencies throughout the state of Indiana. At this point, we have 40 students who are in this category. Most of them are from Afghanistan and Ukraine, although not all. Most regrettably, this is going to continue to be an important initiative for our campus, for the foreseeable future. We don't even need to look forward to the era of climate refugees to understand that this issue of students coming to us from a position of very deep need and lack of local contexts, local connections is going to continue to be very important. And we're, we're very grateful for all of the, again campus and also external partners that are helping with this, with this initiative.

So I'll stop there and just say, as you all know, all of the work we do in OVPIA can really be effective only if it is done in partnership with faculty and with academic departments. And we're really looking forward to continuing that work under the umbrella of the new strategic plan. So we've been participating in various of the task forces and so forth to ensure that some of these international activities and the needs of our international community are accounted for in that work. And I think I think it's gonna be a very good model for moving this collaborative engagement forward in the future. Happy to take any questions.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT

SHRIVASTAV: We have time for your questions. Yes.

MCCOY: First, a point I just want to say working with your gateway officers has been a fantastic experience. I've worked with the office in Beijing and the one in India as well as Mexico City to host virtual events for prospective high-school students. And they've been really wonderful. So if anybody's thinking of working with them, they've been great to work with. But I do have a question specifically about there have been a lot of layoffs in the tech industry. And many of our students that are here at Indiana University Bloomington are seeking degrees in those fields and

they are quite concerned and worried. Has there been a response from your office to help assuage some of those fears and maybe resources for them because I know they're concerned about losing their positions and then having to go home.

BUXBAUM: It's affecting most directly recent graduates who are looking for the Optional Practical Training extension on their visa. So if they have a job placement in the industry that they were trained to enter, then they can extend their visa for a period of time and stay in the United States. All I can say is, yes, it's subject of huge concern for many of our students. We of course, do not control the, the job placement piece. And so we just tried it to connect them through to their career their career counselors, career advisors, and other resources to try to find to try to find those placements. But I agree with you. That is a real challenge for those who seek the OPT placement after graduation.

SHRIVASTAV: Questions? Seeing none, oh there's one. Israel.

HERRERA: Thank you. Thank you Hannah for presentation. And it has been glad also to work with you in the International Affairs Committee. So that's great. Actually, we had a meeting and one question that was raised is about the regarding the grants regarding the funding from your office is regarding the teaching faculty, the entities? Because there is more, most of the grants or funding is for research. And some entities who are not able to travel nationally or internationally or inter international venues, they'll have the opportunity to apply for this funding. So I don't know if there is reason behind among all the opportunities that your office has for all faculty?

BUXBAUM: That's something that we review from time-to-time, the eligibility criteria for all of our programs. And there are of course, programs that are open to everyone, right? So the Global Classroom Initiative is a good example that's not limited to tenure stream faculty, that's, that's open to everybody. And in general, the programs that are more focused on promoting mobility in the service of teaching are broadly open. And the ones that are focused on promoting mobility in the service of research collaborations more often are limited to tenure stream faculty, where research is part of the part of the criteria on which they're, on which they are judged. So that tends to be the rough dividing line, but we do go back from time-to-time and look at that and ensure that we're not under under serving colleagues in different ranks.

HERRERA: So regarding the international mobility is one that is just limited to certain faculty but not for example professional development because it highlights professional development. But can we say that that's the one that is not intended for teaching faculty, correct.

BUXBAUM :The International Mobility Grant. In general, we would characterize as in the service of research. So for instance, we also support graduate students who are going for pre dissertation research and so forth. So that those mobility programs are more research related. Let me just address maybe the, the larger question behind, behind all of this, which is funding for travel full stop, whether domestic or international, is one of the areas that we tend to pull back on when we're dealing with, when we're addressing financial considerations. And we simply in OVPIA, do not have the size of budget that can make up for lack of travel, funding opportunities across departments, schools, and so we have to do our best to shepherd, to steward the resources we have. And that is what lies behind some of these, some of these separations of programs where we think of them as teaching or research oriented. And regrettably, I would say that's, that's the reality of that situation. I will say, this is one of the areas where we work with a development officer to try to get some philanthropy going that can help expand those

resources. Because I think a lot of potential donors to the university do understand that these are opportunities that are important for our graduate students and our faculty.

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you, Hannah. We'll move on to the next topic which is proposed changes to BL-ACA-D22: Grievance and Review Procedures of the Bloomington Faculty. Presenting this is Shu Cole, Katherine Ryan, John Carini, and Dimitry Romashov.

AGENDA ITEM NINE

COLE: Thank you. Thank you, everyone. Okay. Thank you, everyone. So this is the second reading of the proposed revisions and I would first like to acknowledge all the committee members that who have worked on this document. There are many changes. And then this in this a second circle or that was shared with the committee, included one more change, which is additional changes. One is in the section two, number D, appeals. These are the new language. Before I start, I think that I want to remind everyone that the purpose of the revision is really to make sure that the Bloomington faculty grievance documents is in compliance with the University ACA 17, the Uniform Standards for Faculty Grievance Procedures. In this language, the item I, this is the new language that we have added in the first circular, but the red crossed out that sentence was not deleted in the first circle, which is supposed to be deleted because this was the older language who which says that the board of review should be able to review the decision regarding tenure promotion along with the procedures. But the new university language clarifies that the role of the board of review is really focusing on the procedures. So we propose to delete the sentence which should have been deleted in the first draft, but we did not. So that was the additional change. And the other item is in response to the comments that was brought up by during the discussion in the first reading. In regards of the use, being consistent with the pronoun usage in throughout the document. So we read through the document and one more time and then make sure that when the subject is plural and we are consistent using they're/them. And when the subject is singular, we decided to adopt APA, suggested the singular use of they, there, and them. In these cases, I think the APA, seventh edition suggests that when the subject, when gender is irrelevant to the context of the usage of the pronoun and go with the single or use of they, them, there. So we have decided to keep the use of the singular. They're/them to replace the his and her in the original document. So those are the two considerations that we're bringing up in the second circular for your discussion. Any questions? That's that's the only changes we have made since the last discussion.

SHRIVASTAV: It's open for discussion. If you have any questions yes.

DAU-SCHMIDT: I am actually serving on the reward now, review board now, at least for one semester. And so having some experience with it, I took quite an interest in these changes. And there are some, some good substantive changes in here. I noticed, first of all, it improves the process by requiring administrative response to each grievance, which is which we have had problem with just the semester that I've that I've served on the committee or the board. It requires the provost to give reasons why if he does not agree with the review board, gives reasons why he does not agree with it, which would also be an improvement over the over the current state of affairs. And it also gives the right to a hearing with counsel and the right to question witnesses, which I think is a due process requirement that I'm kinda shocked they don't already have in our review board process, but that's definitely improvement. I have talked with some of the people involved, at least with Catherine and with, I've sent emails at least to the chairs of the task force.

There are some other changes that I hope to see when the task force goes through and review this. At the very least, I would like an organized procedure by which the administration gets the records that they make decisions on to the review board because right now we don't have an organized procedure and we end up looking around, trying to find where the records are and who can give them to us and whether we have a right to them or not. Then also I wanted to, I think that we need to emphasize the importance of the faculty's participation in this. I mean, the faculty review board is not just another step in an administrative process. The faculty here have shared governance on these issues and as a result, their opinion needs to be taken and be given great, great, great, great, great importance in considering these cases. Not only because of the shared governance, but also because they're really the only members of the public. We've talked about how most of these most of these grievances are confidential now. And so they're really the only members of the larger, the larger university public that gets to hear what's going on in these cases. So that's another reason why their perspective has to be important. And once again, if they do have a hearing here with council and an opportunity to question witnesses, that's a that's a hearing procedure that's well beyond what sometimes happens in some of these administrative, administrative decision-making processes. So I'm glad to vote for these changes and I also hope to see further changes when the task force works on this in the coming year.

AGENDA ITEM TEN

SHRIVASTAV: Other questions or comments? I believe this doesn't need a motion for a vote. So any motion to vote on this? Yes.

LION: I move we vote on us.

SHRIVASTAV: Okay. I guess that needs a second. We have one.

UNKNOWN: I second.

SHRIVASTAV: Sounds good. Thank you All in favor of approving the changes as proposed, please raise your hands. It looks near unanimous as well. The motion is approved. Thank you very much. The next item is an update on strategic planning, IUB 2030. We have Carrie Docherty and Cate Reck. Take it away.

AGENDA ITEM ELEVEN

DOCHERTY: Wonderful. Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for giving me a few minutes to talk about IUB 2030. I want to start just by acknowledging and thanking Cate, she has been an amazing partner during this process and has really been great to work with. And many of you, either you or your colleagues have also played an important role in the process. So thank you all for what you've already done and what you'll continue to do. So we put together a little slide deck about the process thus far and what will happen moving forward. So as a quick reminder, you know that the IU framework is grounded in three pillars. Students success and opportunity, transformative research and creativity and service to our state and beyond. So that has been our framework that we've been working off of. And it's the same framework that all of the other campuses have been utilizing as well.

So this process has really been broken up into three phases. The first phase started on October 16th when we had our kickoff event. And it was the first time that the community really came together and talked about how we were gonna go about the strategic planning process. Immediately after that meeting, the working groups started meeting weekly. It was a

gargantuan effort to buy a lot of people, to mobilize their calendars and schedules to get together. As you've read and heard. And many of you know, we had over 450 faculty, staff, and students who were involved in these 25 working groups. And each working group was focused on a particular topic within each pillar. We also had some focus groups. Thank you, Kyle [Seibert]. I don't know if he's still here, but really. Thank you. Thank you. Helped pull together some students to get their thoughts and opinions around some particular items regarding the strategic plan. And then we've consistently had an online portal for feedback. So these working groups were tasked with getting all of this done by December 16th when they handed their recommendations over to the planning committee. And I keep nodding over to Cate that she should interrupt me and chime in whenever she likes.

Then we rolled into phase two. And phase two was really about the planning committee looking at all of the goals, strategies, objectives, recommendations, and refining them, elevating them, prioritizing them, and really thinking about where we want to go in the future. They were asked to focus on ambitious, big, strategic goals. We really wanted to not do more of the same, but really transcend the work that we're doing now to something bigger and bolder. And I have to say that it was a challenging task in many of these planning committees might have had 50 goals that came out of those working groups and hundreds of strategies. So they really did a lot of work to go through those. And again, elevate, refine enhance. They did quite a bit of work in December over the holiday and really tried to get those priorities down to something that our community could begin to synthesize and consider. The planning group reports were due to the Executive Committee in January. And at that point, we were able to continue to get this feedback. So we had our four planning committees. We again got feedback directly from our academic schools. Hopefully, your department chairs and your deans shared this information with you all for feedback. We got feedback from our vice provost and our vice presidents, and again, continue to review the online feedback that we were getting. I have to say this has been a really iterative process. So at every point in time as we're getting this feedback, we're, we're incorporating it. In some ways that's fabulous and other ways it's really hard because we'll get great feedback and we'll incorporate it. And then we'll get additional feedback that, and we're like, Oh, we've already made that change, we've already made that evolution. The draft that you saw three weeks ago is very different than what you're going to see tomorrow and that will continue to be the process.

So our plan is tomorrow, we will be putting a preliminary draft of our goals and objectives for IUB 2030. If you remember anything that I say today. It's this it is a draft. It is a working document that is ready and primed for your feedback and for your comments. Please, please, please take the time to read through these. What you'll find is we only focused on the goals and objectives at this point because we want to be dreaming big. Anybody that's been on these working groups has probably heard me say big, bold, ambitious. We want to, we want to be thinking big. Resist all, every sense of your being to get in the weeds to think about well, but what about this and what about that? And what about, I want to have those problems of figuring out how to achieve these goals. I want that problem. Do your very best to try and not, not get in the weeds, but think about these goals and objectives. And once we coalesce around those, then it'll be about the strategies, then it'll be about the implementation plan. But we have to get together on the roadmap, as the Provost said, of where we're trying to go.

The other thing that will surprise you is the version that we shared with the academic units in January was pretty long. It had a lot of information and we did that for a reason. All of that work was great. We want to retain that work. We want to use all of those great ideas as we move

forward in implementation. But what you're going to see is a pair down. I want to say it's maybe five pages of goals and objectives. Big, bold, ambitious. So it'll be an easy read, it'll be a quick read. So please take the time to go through that and provide us your feedback. Because we're finally in phase three, where, I know, where we are starting to coalesce around some ideas.

But we need your participation now more than ever. We have a town hall scheduled in a week, February 15th and 16th that we wanted to give you two opportunities. Attend one or attend both, whatever works for you. But the more you all can come to us with constructive, forward-facing, solution-based ideas that we can implement into this plan. Amazing opportunities that we'll have. Now if you're not available, that online portal is still gonna be there. We have staff monitoring and checking it daily to make sure those ideas are incorporated as well. But we really want this to be a community process. So if you can come to the town halls, great. If you can't, please provide us that online feedback.

And then the final plan is due to the provost and the president on March 1st. So that's really when the fun begins. The implementation phase is where we really get to take all of this dreaming that we've been collectively doing and start thinking about how we're actually going to make these things work. And I know you all have been thinking and talking about implementation. That will be April and beyond. But as of right now, we want to get an implementation team together to really think about who are the entities on our campus, the people on our campus that are gonna help us strategically move through these goals. We're going to of course, have to prioritize these goals and objectives. It's a seven-year plan for a reason. We can't achieve everything in the first year. So we're going to have to prioritize and stage how we go about this work. But what we can, what we know is that each year we will reflect upon these goals. We will track how we're doing. We will have concrete metrics around these goals so we can see how our progress is being made. And then we will be agile and ready to adjust. Because just because we're making these decisions today doesn't mean that, oh, I don't know a global pandemic might happen and it will require us to quickly pivot and react to something else that happens. So again, Rahul started it at this meeting and said this strategic plan is all about providing a roadmap for us. But we still need to be flexible in reacting and responding as our life is always evolving. So anything?

RECK: I would like to just add in here that I see part of my role for the next year and beyond. When I'm past president. Not that I'm counting... five months down. No, in all seriousness. What I see the next steps of where I can contribute is really helping with what Carrie has lovingly been calling the parking lot. So through this process, all the 25 working groups has come up with huge numbers of improvements, but they're not going to make it into the strategic plan. That's not the purpose of that document.

So I'm hoping that as chair of long-range planning next year, that typically that committee is not huge. But I'm hoping that in your volunteer form that is now live on the website at the homepage, at the PFC homepage. I'm hoping that more people would actually see the vision of, yeah, I'm really interested in student success. And I want to be able to help actually prioritize changes that are not maybe the strategic planning level changes, but the duh, we should have been doing them all along kind of changes. Through these processes and hours and hours of people talking with each other those are the kinds of things that may not make it in the strategic plan. But I really want to make sure that common sense things get changed for everybody and we don't have to wait for a seven-year implementation of the strategic plan for really just normal things that need to be changed on a daily basis get done. So I do encourage you if you've been on

these committees and thank you, there's been so many people on this council who've been in these committees. If you have the same sense of obligation that I do to making sure that these great ideas go forward. Please sign up for long-range planning. Please be part of, not a five person committee, maybe a 20 person committee, so that we can actually make these prioritize decisions and then talk to the administration about what needs to be changed on the ground. So thank you.

DOCHERTY: The last thing that I will say is if you haven't visited IUB 2030, that is a great place to start. The draft plan will be populated there tomorrow. You can see the URL right there. But again, if you just go to IUB 2030, it will be easy to find. You will also receive an e-mail that will have a direct link to this website. So make it as easy as possible to visit. Obviously, the earlier and the sooner you can get us feedback, the more we can continue to improve and enhance the plans. So in your very, very busy lives, if you can, make sure you're reviewing it and encouraging your colleagues to review it. I think that will help the process substantially. So I'm happy I think we're happy to take any questions.

AGENDA ITEM TWELVE

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you, Carrie and Cate. This is now open for your questions. You must have done a great job, Carrie. I must say Carrie and Cate to have done just an incredible job navigating this huge task. And I know this firsthand because they have spent hours and hours including late nights and weekends in the conference room right next to my office, where I almost hear them pulling their hair sometimes, but also laughing and sharing joyous moments. So thank you for all your work on this.

DOCHERTY: We still have our hair, so that's a good thing.

SHRIVASTAV: Okay. Moving on to the next item which is proposed changes to BL-ACA-06 review procedures for administrators on the Bloomington campus to be led by Colin Johnson, but also Cate Reck and Marietta Simpson, Take it away, Colin.

AGENDA ITEM THIRTEEN

JOHNSON: Hi everyone. So as you're probably all aware, we've recently had a global pandemic that disrupted a number of things that are near and dear to our everyday operation, including on multiple levels, various forms of review and evaluation that are just part of the landscape of what we do on a daily basis. Certainly with our colleagues who were looking at tenure and promotion, the institution was fairly quick to take into account the situations that they were in and just try to make, I think, very welcome provisions to allow the pandemic not to completely derail their progress towards tenure and promotion, but there are of course, other forms of regular review that are really central to maintaining the integrity of the institution as well. And those include reviews of upper-level appointed administrators. In much the same way that I know on this side of the pandemic units have been making an effort to kind of get back into the regular process of supporting review.

BFC has been trying to focus on regularizing and restoring regularity around the process of administrative reviews. And in conjunction with the Provost's office, who ultimately provost being the person who's ultimately charged with the responsibility for evaluating upper level administrators, appointed administrators, including vice provost and deans of academic units, in the process of trying to get those procedures ironed out, restored and put back into operation on a regular basis. We have reviewed some of the relevant policies governing what those procedures

look like. And we come to today with the recommended change to one policy which is BL-ACA-06, which is actually the policy that governs a review of campus-based vice provost and deans of academic units. So for those of you, I will say too, there's a parallel process, a discussion that's going on at the University Council level, having to do with similar processes as they pertain to UA level appointees and also to the deans of core schools, which are units that actually have representation on multiple campuses. And a similar conversation will be happening at the University Faculty Council shortly. So ultimately, our goal is to bring both of these policies into agreement with one another. Essentially, the same logic prevails in those in those processes.

The primary, if anybody has questions, we can talk a little bit about it. I don't know how familiar you are with ACA 06, but in its ideal form, the process of reviewing school deans and the process of reviewing vice provost is actually a fairly complicated one that should in practice, take about 18 months to transact from beginning to end in the sense that preparation for undertaking, particularly with deans, reviews begin, should begin in the spring preceding the academic year in which the review process is going to take place. There are a lot of pieces that have to be put in place, including the constitution of a review committee, which is something that happens in conjunction with the Provost's office, consulting with the BFC, data collection and the formation of a number of assessment instruments or data collection instruments that are used to seek input from faculty and the affected unit. Then usually in the fall of the year when people are undergoing review, there's a fairly extensive process, again, of data collection. And ultimately the review committees are charged with writing a fairly lengthy report, which then goes to the Provost's Office, the Provost for review, to inform their decision about whether to reappoint, whether to move in a different direction, and certainly how to advise deans and vice provosts about how to transact their responsibilities optimally.

So in the policy as it currently exists, one of the things that came to our attention for various reasons. The policy as it currently exists includes this list of eight questions which were in its current form required questions that review committees were obligated to address in the reports that they submitted for the previous consideration. After a fair amount of discussion on our part with the members of the executive committee and with other parties, we came to the conclusion that although these questions can be helpful and although these specific questions probably came from a place where they were, they were mandated to achieve certain kinds of ends. They actually turn out to be in practice questions that are, have been in the past difficult for review committees to answer and certainly are, are very difficult for individual faculty in certain units to answer in many cases because of the fact that they asked faculty to comment on and review committees to comment on achievements, forms of compliance with institutional goals that they may not even be familiar with.

And so in thinking how to improve this process and how to make it more practical, and ultimately frankly, how to give faculty on who serve on review committees greater latitude to set their own goals and their own priorities in terms of the kind of information that they would like to communicate to the provost for consideration. We're suggesting the replacement of these eight questions with a more qualitative description of the charge of review committees. And so the language that we would like to propose be substituted for that list of specific questions that currently exist in a CS6 reads as follows: The provost and president pro tempore of the Bloomington Faculty Council shall convene the review committee. This is the review committee charged with obviously conducting and writing conducting the review and writing the report for the person under consideration shall provide the review committee with the description

of the duties and responsibilities as the administrator and a review, the review committee shall have latitude in establishing its own procedures.

And up until this point, the language is the same as currently exists in the policy. Provided that its final report to the Provost contains a frank, evidence-based assessment of the review, of the reviewee real or perceived strengths and weaknesses as a unit leader, including an assessment of how the reviewee has impacted the unit's performance, along with the constructively framed set of recommendations for how the reviewee might address any real or perceived shortcomings in their performance moving forward. So this was a theme I think you got from Carrie's presentation about the utility of constructive input from faculty. But our feeling is essentially that by removing the kind of lengthy and in some regard, awkwardly articulated set of questions that exists in the policy and replacing it with this language that we will essentially allow faculty to review committees to perform a version of the assessment and evaluation that ultimately the Provost has to, I think perform in terms of considering the eligibility of the person under review for continued service. That it will actually allow committees greater latitude to frame their reports and language that really reflect their priorities and communicate to the provost information they would like to see passed along, um, to the Provost. And frankly, in terms of establishing or including a list of constructive, really framed recommendations for how the review we might address shortcomings. That it will allow review committees to establish a baseline by which in subsequent reviews, the incumbent who's in that position will be evaluated in addition to whatever priorities or whatever concerns the Provost wants to bring to bear on the review process. So that's really the substantive recommendation that we're bringing to the Council for consideration.

There are a few other superficial things, but one of them, and it's not actually superficial, it's existentially important, but nonetheless significant. Currently, the policy as written, lists the deans of Eskenazi, Hamilton Lugar, and the Media School as being sort of subsidiary deans with respect to the executive dean. As those of you in the College of Arts and Sciences know, the administrative structure of that unit is beautifully rich and complex. But it's not necessarily clear that those deans exist in a kind of subsidiary relation to the Executive Dean of the College. Nor is my understanding that they work in that fashion. So it's our sense that the better approach is simply to list them as the four executives charged with responsibility for transacting that unit's business in collaboration with one another. Do you have anything to add?

RECK: I guess I'll just say Colin's done a wonderful job of explaining the rationale when speaking to people, they really would like to see more latitude in how the reviews go forward based on the unit. So there's so many things that come up that may not be answered in those eight or nine questions. And so different units just have really different foci and different priorities at different decades. We're looking to not change with our perspective about what new questions should be. But for evermore, allow the next review committee to then develop the set of questions that are relevant for that time period and that person and the priorities for that unit. And so I hope you understand it's not about anything other than latitude. And making sure that the review committee once comprised is thoughtful about how they're coming up with their questions that are unique for that situation. Thanks, Colin. That was great.

AGENDA ITEM FOURTEEN

SHRIVASTAV: This is now open for questions and discussion. And as a reminder, this is the first reading. There is no vote today, it has just an open discussion. So I invite your questions. So

per protocol, I think this is open for only for members of BFC, so you need to okay. Okay. Okay. Can you can you join us here? It will be easier. You hear the question. The question was just to repeat, can you give examples of what evidence-based assessment might be? Is that, did I reflect that right? [Question asked by **KUBOW**, who was not using the microphone]

JOHNSON: I think that's certainly a suggestion that we can take back and think a little bit about it. What might be helpful is if you have, if you have thoughts about what those examples might be, if you could send them to us and then we can see sort of how we might integrate it into it. That might be helpful. I will say I'm a little, I mean, there's a lot you can do with parenthetical by way of suggestion. I always worry part of the reason we wanted to get away from the enumerated questions is there's part of me that feels like anytime we try to be specific, we also then create a kind of incentive for people to lean in the direction of those kinds of suggestions. And so I would just say that as you're thinking about as or if anybody else wants to think about suggestions of what that might look like. I personally am sympathetic to the idea that that can be helpful in terms of the actual implementation of this. I would also just encourage us to be a little careful about not over or specifying because I think the whole point of it is to provide latitude. I'm to the point of what we're suggesting is to provide latitude for review committees to speak in language that they think is appropriate. But like I said, if you've got suggestions, that would be great.

SHRIVASTAV: I can throw out example. I had nothing to do with writing this. So just put that context but I'm happy with what you all have done, but I can easily see evidence around student success metrics or graduation rates, for example, or graduate student enrollment or research productivity. How many faculty are externally funded, or how many books they are publishing, or how many awards they have. One. It'll vary by unit, but there's a depending on the questions the committee comes up with, you could easily have a metric that reflects where what the outcome is. And perhaps you could even find benchmarks. What do our peers do? What do our aspirational schools do? So I think that's a good way to put it. I think that was another question.

SVETINA: Is this the idea then that given the large is that the description of the duties and responsibilities would sort of prompt the committees where to start. Right. So if they are given, this is what your administrators are supposed to be doing. Your question is are they doing and then you come up with the committee would come up with the perspectives of how they interpret that. Is that the idea. So those questions that I think could be helpful but would be maybe too narrow in some cases, their responsibilities in the description would sort of prompt some of those. Is that is that where the heart of the conversation?

JOHNSON: In terms of the impetus, in terms of the impetus behind this. If you just show you kind of what was raising concern for us. And if you look at some of these questions, a lot of them seem the ones that currently exist. A lot of them seemed perfectly reasonable, but the issue of some of the questions like How effectively does the administrative representative promote the unit to persons outside the unit? You could imagine instances where a review committee could gather information and comment on that. But it is also true that people in those positions spent a lot of time interacting with parties and advocating for their units in contexts where nobody else is present, right? So I think one or questions about for example resource allocation or gaining resources for units. I think one of our concerns with enumerating these questions is the spirit of them felt right. But the way they were framed in many instances put people in a position or put review committees because these are obligatory currently, these are things review committees have to comment upon statutorily.

Our observation had been from previous reviews and our sense of reading this is that a lot of them put review committees in positions where they're being forced just to kind of comment on things that they may or may not actually feel that they have evidence to comment on. Our sense is that that's not particularly constructive for the review process and may actually weaken the unit's ability to weigh into the process or sort of to contribute essentially to the Provost's deliberations surrounding how successful or unsuccessful a dean has been. There are general job descriptions having to do with what vice provosts are supposed to do and what deans are supposed to do in terms of what the purview of their responsibilities are. And I think that's the information that should be communicated to review committees like when that when that process begins. But understanding the scope of those responsibilities from my perspective and from the perspective of the executive committee when we were talking about this as a little bit different than mandating the committees respond to these particular questions. If that makes sense, I don't know if that answers your question.

SHRIVASTAV: Next question.

GUPTA: Hi. This is actually a clarification question. I don't know how the review process works for administrators. Do they have to submit a statement like faculty do, describing why they should be tenured and promoted. In that case is the guideline for that statement based on questions like this or on something else altogether.

JOHNSON: So right now the policy is silent on what kinds of documentation people in these positions are required to submit. It is within the I believe it's within the review committee's purview to collect whatever information it needs. So working with the Provost and with the BFC as a kind of customary matter. I think it wouldn't be outside the realm of possibility that in most review contexts, people would be asked to supply some, some kind of written material or some kind of statement. But if you look at the full scope of ACA-06, it's really extremely extensive. So there are for example three levels currently are. I think it's two or three? Three different sets of questions that get developed by different groups of people. So school policy committees have prerogative to develop five questions which are then submitted to the faculty of the unit. This is in the context of dean reviews, vice provost, it's obviously slightly different. The BFC itself, the Executive Committee develops a list of ten questions which are then given, supposed to be given to faculty in a unit in order to provide information. The Provost themselves, you have metrics that you use in data that you collect for your own purposes in terms of this. So it's really an extensive, quite an extensive process, but the policy itself doesn't mandate e.g. the writing of a statement currently.

SHERMAN: Just a comment on the removal of the specific questions to something that's more flexible and has more latitude. I think it's really a good plan. I liken it to, I'm sure all of us are used to writing lots and lots and lots of letters to other universities for promotion and tenure. And the ones I hated most were the requests that came along with eight specific questions. I wanted latitude. I wanted to speak to the things that I knew about the person and their research and the impact. I didn't want to say question one, question two. So I think this is a really good idea and I think you'll get you'll get better results in terms of the the kinds of reports. So thank you.

JOHNSON: If I may, one of the things that was important to us was the introduction of the notion of documenting or speaking to real or perceived strengths, their weaknesses. Because it does seem to me in my own experience for some of these things and observation that while there is a difference between again, sort of like demonstrable, demonstrable successes, demonstrable failings in terms of people's management of the units that they're charged with leading. Perception

is also important. And I think it's really important for review committees to be able to say for example we have great confidence in it based on all the information we have available to us in the fact, in this person's ability to do X, Y, and Z. But it is also important if everyone in that unit, if many people in that unit, whether it's staff or faculty, don't, don't seem to understand how effective they are in those positions And I think that sometimes the senses of dissatisfaction that people have with kind of the work that upper level administrators do, or in some cases, the perhaps greater degree of credit that they receive, then maybe they deserve. A lot of it has to do with this kind of disjuncture between what many people actually see or have the opportunity to see and what's actually going on, usually in very close quarters in smaller, smaller groups. So our hope is that this charge will give people the opportunity to say, there's lots of evidence that this person is doing a good job. Now we just need to make sure that the people in the unit understand what it is that's going on. Or alternatively have the opportunity to say, this person is doing great and then have questions raised on the back end about how great they are actually doing. Because perception matters certainly for morale.

RECK: May I add one more thing. My favorite changes to this, that I think that the policy was lacking in the first place was the statement along with the constructively framed set of recommendations for how they're reviewing, might address any real or perceived shortcomings. Nowhere in the policy did it actually say, now, we've reviewed this person. Now here's the recommendation of what we would see that we would want to see changed. The review committee might have come up with that, but if it's not enumerated, it may not be part of the natural end to document. So by actually saying, well, okay, you've reviewed this person now, tell us, tell us, help us with the solution about what you think would be the best way forward, I think is actually quite powerful and was missing in the first place.

SHRIVASTAV: Yes, One more.

GUPTA: Sorry, It's me again. I guess. What I'm missing in this as the fact that it feels like it's sort of it doesn't recognize that the administrator in turn will have to perform in a certain way expecting that the review committee would perceive the performance. I mean, it's a strategic policy, right? I mean, it's not just the review committee's job to evaluate the performance, but also the administrator's job to do their job in a certain way that would be perceived positively by the review committee. So I guess I'm wondering what you think would change in terms of the administrator's performance of their job in response to this change in the review committee's policy?

JOHNSON: You mean relative to the currently existing policy? My hope would be that if review committees, which are made up of faculty, primarily in the case of well, should be, in every case, faculty would be heavily represented in all the review committees. My hope would be that if a review came back that included a set of, from a committee saying, these are what we think are your strengths, these are what we think are your weaknesses. And these are recommendations we would make for how you can presumably address some of your weaknesses. And if that's mandated and the charge, my hope would be that people in those positions would understand that a baseline has been set in terms of what faculty is expectations are.

And my expectation would similarly be that the Provost being in receipt of that sort of report would be put on notice that this is what the faculty would like to see happen. And if the dean is not responsive to that or the vice provost is not responsive to that kind of input, certainly, faculty have said very clearly in that context what they would like to see happen and how they would like to see the unit get there. And if the Provost does not say you need to care about this

kind of consultation with the dean because the Provost might not even necessarily agree with those recommendations. But I think it would put the provost in the position to say to an administrator under review, you either need to be responsive to this or you need to figure out a different way to get from A to B. Because this is now in writing from your faculty saying this is what we want you to do and this is how we think you can do it, right? So my hope would be that although ultimately and this is the reality of reviews at this level, it's the Provost prerogative, right, to appoint people in these positions and to decide on the issue of reappointment or non reappointment. I mean, that's just kind of is how the process works.

I would hope that everyone involved in those conversations would recognize that when the faculty say, where people on the review committee say, this is what you're doing well, this is what you're not doing well, or at least it's not perceived to be a great strength of yours. And this is how we think collectively, we can move in a better direction and the role you need to play in doing that, that if that's in writing then four years later when the subsequent review happens. It provides a very clear from my perspective point of departure for the conversation the Provost would have. That would start with, okay, four years ago, your colleagues told me this was a problem and you needed to do X in order to address it.

SHRIVASTAV: I would add to that, I don't think it'll even before years because starting this year we're doing annual reviews for all deans. It's largely based on metrics, deans and vice provosts. And so what I can say from my own administration anyway, the year in which these recommendations come that set a baseline for annual reviews every year. And depending on the recommendations, some actions may be public and some may not be public. It depends on what the situation is, but the goal for these, this, but every other feedback is really continuous improvement. Without that, this is all meaningless.

CAVAR: I think in general, these questionnaires are useless, actually. They are only useful and I really appreciate what you're suggesting here. They are only useful if you really think in terms of, we're sending this out to faculty and we want to quantify all the responses for very specific questions in a structured way. And this is what I would maintain. Actually, we were just working in [inaudible] issue for the college evaluation, formulating the questions for the dean. And I think that makes sense, right? So we get soft responses with very particular questions that we can quantify and then sort of judge, judge the responses from the faculty members. But otherwise, I think this has fought for committees and review committees. This is useful useless to have these questions. Those yeah, Yeah. Exactly. Sorry. I'm in support of that.

DELIYANNIS: Does the current policy guarantee the right of the reviewee to submit a statement illustrating their accomplishments. If the reviewee wants to submit a statement is a guaranteed so that no review committee can say No, we don't want a statement from you. So does the current policy guarantee this? And if not, perhaps that should be stated explicitly somewhere.

RECK: Again, I don't remember the whole policy. I don't recall a specific right of the reviewee over a year long process though, the hope would be that they would meet with the right people, including the reviewee and be able to capture that data or else I would say the review committee is errant. I mean, it just doesn't make sense that they wouldn't actually be communicating and getting information from the reviewee?

DELIYANNIS: Yeah. Totally. But I don't...

RECK: I think you're right. There's not a specific I don't believe there's a specific sentence saying that they have a right to submit information.

DELIYANNIS: I totally agree that in most circumstances things would work very nicely that way. But one can envision perhaps unusual circumstances where it simply, it would be nice to have that write explicitly stated.

JOHNSON: And I think that's something we can look at. I will say one of the things that the policy does guarantee right now is explicit consultation between the person under review and the Provost. The Provost is supposed to be, after all the information comes back, the report is submitted, data's collected, all sorts of other provisions along the way. The policy and the processes exist right now it does mandate those two people meet and have a candid discussion about the results of that. My sense is that that's one of the things that makes this kind of process slightly different than for example a tenure and promotion process where you're dealing with committees of people who are making recommendations by way of votes. Ultimately, the question of reappointment of people in these positions as it's the prerogative of the Provost. So my sense is that the most constructive contexts in which some of those concerns, like, Oh, the people in my unit misunderstood x or characterize something in the context of that. That's the kind of thing that I think somebody in this position would probably try to make clear to the provost privately in the context of that discussion. But I think but again, I think that a review committee could say it would be very useful to us in terms of being able to...

I would like to think of these things as being to make the strongest case on your behalf that we can like I feel like we have those that obligation to our colleagues bearing in mind that sometimes the evidence does not allow for a very strong case to be made. Right. But my sense is that competent review committee, which is allowed to consult with the person under review, would have the courtesy to say this is the kind of information we would like to give you the opportunity to submit in the context of this process or it'd be helpful to us to do that. So we can take a look at it and see if it would make sense. Maybe we'll come back with a kind of an adjusted recommendation, but certainly the policy does allow for that conversation. It mandates that conversation between the Provost and the reviewee before a decision is made.

SHRIVASTAV: Israel?

HERRERA: Yeah. I totally agree. I was reading the proposal in I believe that our success or the accomplishments should be included because we have this [inaudible] witnesses. But it's good to include what the leader, what the administrator has done for for the unit or the dean or, or whoever is review. So besides the strength and weaknesses, maybe one word would be this successes or the accomplishments, or also in the fourth line about how they reviewee have impacted in advance the unit's performance

RECK: Israel, my read of that. Thank you for the suggestion. My read was, when it says reviewee has impacted the unit's performance. To me that encapsulates both good and bad. So when you say the word advance, it's almost saying then impact makes it the negative and advance makes it the positive. You what I'm saying like how did you advance and impact? My read, which is why we chose the word has impacted unit's performance is just a global decision. And it's up to the review committee whether it's a good impact or a bad impact. So I don't know if you see that it's implied in the word impact, right?

HERRERA: Yeah. How about the success or the accomplishments? Because it's different. Someone who could have the skills or the strength for something and accomplishing something with those is fine.

JOHNSON: So is that a motion for a particular I mean,

HERRERA: it's just adding one word. I don't know if it's putting a suggestion or recommendation is just adding one more word. Including one more.

JOHNSON: Okay. Which would be specifically just remind me where I mean, you can make a motion. I mean, it's just a reading on some level so you could make a suggestion, maybe that's the best way to do it. I guess.

SHRIVASTAV: Yeah, this is the first reading so you can make a recommendation. And then when we come back to vote, the group can decide whether to keep it or modify it, I suppose.

HERRERA: It's just adding the word accomplishments or the successes of the reviewee In the third line, perceive a strength line.

SHRIVASTAV: If I'm understanding it right, your recommendation is to include the word accomplishments, for example, you would say, including an assessment of how the reviewee has impacted the unit's performance and accomplishments along with a [inaudible] for is that accurate?

HERRERA: Well, could be there could be, on the third line between strength and weaknesses

RECK: And accomplishments, you mean?

HERRERA: Right? Could be there or could be on the fourth line as mentioned.

RECK: Okay. I think we have the spirit of thank you for continuing to clarify with us, so we made sure we understood what you were bringing up. We'll just bring it back to EC and talk about it. That'd be great. Thanks.

SHRIVASTAV: Any other questions? Seeing none. I think that is the last order of business. I am pleased to return five precious minutes back to you. The meeting stands adjourned.