

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL

November 15, 2022 | 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.

Presidents Hall – Franklin Hall

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ashlbrand, Ashley; Bala, Hillol; Bielasiak, Jack; Brinda, Chelsea; Cavar, Damir; Cole, Shu; Daleke, David; Dau-Schmidt, Kenneth; Davis, Allen; Deeds, Anna; Deliyannis, Constantine; DeSawal, Danielle; Eaton, Kristine; Freedman, Seth; Gahl-Mills, Karen; Guerra-Reyes, Lucia; Gupta, Nandini; Herrera, Israel; Housworth, Elizabeth; Johnson, Colin; Kalentzidou, Olga; Kravitz, Ben; Kubow, Patty; Lalwani, Ashok; Lammers, Sabine; Lanosga, Gerry; Lion, Margaret; Loring, Annette; McCoy, Chase; Pastore, Bell; Pavalko, Eliza; Peters, Raymond, Angie; Chuck; Reck, Cathrine; Seibert, Kyle; Sela, Ron; Sheldon, Rebekah; Sherman, Jim; Shrivastav, Rahul; Siek, Jeremy; Sinadinos, Allison; Singh, Kashika; Svetina, Dubravka; Tanford, Alex; Tracey, Dan; Walton, Christi; Whitworth, Cale; Wyrzynski, Stephen

MEMBERS ABSENT: Arcuri, Toni; Asher, Sofiya; Bridges Jr., Chandler; Cohen, Rachael; Eskew, Kelly; Frazier, Lessie; Furey, Constance; Giordano, Anthony; Groth, Dennis; Kollbaum, Pete; Michaelsen, Jonathan; Northcutt Bohmert, Miriam; Olcott, Courtney; Ossi, Massimo; Perry, Brea; Ramos, William; Sapp, Christopher; Shy, Katie; Simpson, Marietta; Smith, Wyatt; Sterling, Thomas; Wu, Jiangmei

GUESTS:

AGENDA:

1. Approval of the [minutes of October 18, 2022](#)
2. [Memorial Resolution for John A. Boquist](#)
3. [Memorial Resolution for Stanley A. Hagstrom](#)
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. Proposed Change to the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty (5 minutes); Rachael Cohen, Parliamentarian and Chair of Constitution and Rules Committee [Discussion Item]; [Current BL-ACA-D8 Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty](#); [B12-2023: Proposed change to BL-ACA-D8 Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty](#)
8. Questions/Comments on Proposed Change to the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty (5 minutes)
9. Task Force on Research Reorganization Report (15 minutes); Caroline Chick Jarrold (Chair), Chemistry; Patty Ingham, English; Halina Goldberg, Musicology; Leslie Rutkowski, Counseling and Educational Psychology; Kim Novick, Environmental Sciences; Deborah Widiss, Law; Bill Hetrick, Psychological and Brain Sciences; Pete Kollbaum, Optometry; Angie Raymond, Business Law and Ethics; B15-2023: [Report on Proposed Research Consolidation by VPR](#)
10. Questions/Comments on Task Force on Research Reorganization Report (10 minutes)

11. Retention and Graduation Updates (15 minutes); David Johnson, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management; Sacha Thieme, Assistant Vice Provost and Executive Director of Admissions; Sarah Booher, Assistant Vice Provost and Executive Director of Retention
12. Questions/Comments on Retention and Graduation Updates (15 minutes)

SHRIVASTAV: ...until I get the agreement.

RECK: Just give us another minute. We're waiting to count and make sure we have quorum.

AGENDA ITEM ONE:

SHRIVASTAV: We do have quorum. Meeting is called to order. Welcome on a Tuesday that actually feels like November for a change. And as we always do, first order of business is approval of the minutes from our last meeting, which was October 18th. I hope you've had a chance to take a look at it. I think we go straight to a vote. All in favor of approving the minutes as written, please say aye or raise your hands. It looks like we have a majority. All opposed. None. Motion passes.

We will next do a memorial for two of our colleagues who have passed away recently, John Boquist and Stanley Hagstrom. And as always, it will be Eliza. Thank you, Eliza.

AGENDA ITEMS TWO AND THREE:

PAVALKO: Thank you very much. First memorial resolution, as Rahul said, is for Jon Boquist. John Alexander Boquist died August 28, 2019. In 1969, John entered the Master of Science and Industrial Administration Program at the Krannert School at Purdue University and then decided to continue studying for a PhD in finance. In the fall of 1973, John began his first faculty position at IU's Kelley School of Business, and he didn't leave until he retired in 2011. John began as an assistant professor and retired as the Edward E. Edwards professor of finance. Along the way, he took on many institutional responsibilities, including service as the Director of Executive Education from 1985-90. John always loved teaching. He taught in domestic and international executive education programs throughout his career. In 1979, he received the university-wide Herman Frederick Lieber Memorial Award for Teaching Excellence, and in 94, he received the Max Barney Executive Education Teaching Award. Also in 1994, John was recognized by Businessweek magazine as one of 12 masters of the classroom, professors singled out by the MBA students as the best teachers in the world of business. It was clear that teaching was a first love for John. Although Jean, his wife, prefers to think of it as his second love. John never ceased to be intellectually curious. Even in his retirement years, he published a paper with a doctoral student and fellow colleague. The insight he developed over several decades of teaching and research led to a coauthored book, *The Value Sphere: The Corporate Executive's Handbook for Creating and Retaining Shareholder Wealth*, which is currently in its fourth edition. In 2008, the Myer Brookwas chair was established in the Kelley School of Business with a very generous gift from Dave Meyer, who had gotten his MBA in 1979. Dave, a former student, said of John, "I knew I wanted to be like that guy. I developed a respect for his amazing work ethic and his ability to get along with people. I also respected his amazing intellect. He had

all the skills I wanted to develop.” For a man who devoted the bulk of his career to classroom teaching, this is the ultimate compliment. His former colleagues continue to enjoy teaching his cases in class. John's wit and humor were exceeded only by his intellect.

Our second memorial resolution is for Stanley Hagstrom. Stanley A. Hagstrom, '88, passed away on October 2, 2019. Stan attended the University of Omaha, completing his undergraduate degree with masters in math, chemistry, and physics. He went on to complete his PhD in physical chemistry at what is now Iowa State University in Ames, Iowa. The relatively new field of quantum chemistry was Stan's focus, and the last few years of PhD research were at IU's Bloomington campus. He later joined the faculty in the chemistry department, the quantum chemistry group led by Dr. Cheryl, and was one of the founders of the quantum chemistry program exchange. Quantum chemistry was one of the early scientific areas to use computers which led Stan to be involved in the development of Indiana University's first computing center in the 1960s and of the computer science department in the late '70s. Initially a full-time faculty member of the Chemistry Department, he transitioned in 1974 to half-time faculty roles in two departments, chemistry and computer science. He retired from IU as Professor Emeritus in '94. He continued to collaborate with colleagues for another 20 years. Stan was very active throughout his life and had a multitude of interests, embarking regularly on wilderness adventures with friends and family. He played tennis, volleyball, and squash. He flew small planes and gliders, went canoeing, hiking, spelunking, mountaineering and rock climbing, engaged in astronomy, woodworking, flower gardening, and bird watching. In his early 50s he became a serious bicyclist and continued to ride regularly until his mid-80s. He studied and photographed wildflowers and would not hesitate to stop and examine a wildflower on a bike ride. He restored a vintage German glider and with a friend, built telescope components. In retirement, Stan's activities were primarily tennis, gliding, and bicycling. He also looked forward to a weekly luncheon with his Romeo group, which stood for real old men eating out. Thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR:

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you, Eliza. If you are able, please stand for a moment of silence. Thank you.

First order of business is executive committee report by Cate Reck.

RECK: Fantastic. Thank you, everybody. Thank you for being here this afternoon. It's definitely chilly. It's definitely fall. You know, you're in Bloomington in fall if the temperature has gone 74 to 24 in one week. And we could wear shorts and a down jacket all in the same week without leaving town. So, you know, it's definitely autumn. My remarks are pretty short today. Four things. Strategic planning is underway. I do want to thank everybody who's participating in a working group. But I do want to encourage everybody who is a BFC representative, and just faculty at large, please participate with the working groups, communicate. Let's come up with some inspirational and aspirational ideas. There's a form on the IUB 2030 website, where anybody—working group, planning group, Executive Committee, doesn't matter—if you are in a group and not in a group, you can submit comments, you can make suggestions, you can be part

of the process. So please make sure that if you have ideas that any working group would want to see, that you get those voiced, please.

Today we'll be hearing a report from the BFC Taskforce on Research Reorganization. As one emeritus faculty member told me, task forces are where good ideas and good intentions go to die a slow death. But thankfully, this was not the case for this task force. I say this task force executed their job beautifully, perfectly, and very effectively. So, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the members of the task force as it was a very highly productive and very effective working group. And they generated a report in a very short period of time. The goalpost the charge kinda changed two or three times during the time period of when they were charged in spring. So, I appreciate their flexibility and when the target has been moving. I also want to take this opportunity to thank Carolyn Gerald who chaired this task force. She is a force within herself. So, I thank her for her leadership, for this Herculean effort. Her participation was an exceptional example of having the right person for the right job at the right time. So, thank you, Carolyn, I think the whole task force feels the same way. I feel confident. I had hoped that by today's meeting, I would be able to tell you that the roster was filled for the SAAA Committee, the Student Academic Appointee Affairs Committee. Alas, I've not been able to fill that roster. So, I am calling upon you, my wonderful colleagues and BFC representatives. Please, harken out to our colleagues and help me try to find both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty. What I would say is pretty important is they do have to have some understanding or working understanding of SAAs, I think, to make the biggest contribution. So there have been multiple responses of "I don't work with SAAs" when I reach out to people. That's perfectly reasonable. But I think we're at a point of the time period of the semester where people are over-committed and I'm just not getting the responses that I might have hoped. So, Israel, when you ask the question two meetings ago, "Will it be charged in form to this semester?" I had hoped so. It looks like spring will be when that will be starting. Please send me your names. We will still go through per policy bringing them to nominations committee and they'll be vetted in the same way. I do want to make sure that we get appropriate faculty for the appropriate committees. I also want to outline we've received some proposals through e-mail. One of them was a proposal in faculty salaries and this has been directed to the budgetary affairs committee. We've also received five suggested changes to the bylaws and some very large-scale changes to the constitution. And these have been referred to Karch. So just notifying you of the information that we get through the email address and that they're being they're being sent to committees as appropriate. Finally, Lana will be sending out the ballot for nominations committee this week. She's still would like if you have any more suggestions for who might actually want to serve on nominations committee and it would be a good fit, please let Lana know. But she does want to actually get the ballot out and the vote done. So please check your inbox and make sure you vote, make sure you look for it. And those are the end of my comments. I hope you have a good break next week if you for whatever you seem to celebrate, hopefully you have some downtime and I hope you enjoy it.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE:

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you, Kate. I will continue. Next item is my presiding officer's report, which would be mine. So let me give you my formal updates on what's happening on campus, which is quite a bit. It's been it's been an extra gap with us missing one meeting. So, this may be

a good time to run by you some of the things we've been doing. First and foremost, we've launched AMP IU. It is a pathway to a number of accelerated master's degree programs. As part of our increased focus on the future of graduate education, we are looking to build on existing accelerated master's programs to match student interests and market needs with degree opportunities. Our goal here is to support students in developing competencies and mindsets that cross and combine traditional disciplines. We've created financial incentives for departments that participate in AMP IU programs, and these incentives will be based on the outcomes achieved through those programs, which will be the number of students who successfully complete an accelerated master's program. So basically, it means students who complete both an undergraduate and graduate degree in prescribed timeframes. In terms of attracting students to these programs, an outward facing marketing plan is scheduled to roll out in 2023. That gives our departments and faculty time to create as many of these pathways as there is an appetite for. Our goal with the marketing plan is to communicate about accelerated master's programs with ambitious prospective students and families early in their educational planning, and by communicating early on, we hope to boost enrollment in these AMPs and support degree pairing flexibility for students. I know David Johnson is here and I can tell you he's already itching to go out on the recruiting trail as early as next semester to showcase just how many and how good our opportunities for our students will be here on campus. So, I hope you can help make his dreams come true very quickly, right, David. I encourage you to use this opportunity to innovate and create new combinations of study that will attract and benefit students both during their time at IU. But as you all know, the benefits of these kinds of programs last well beyond their time at the academic institution alone. If you or your department is interested in creating a new program or submitting a formal degree proposal or have any questions, your point of contact should be Jeff Rutherford, Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs, and the easy email to remember is ampiu@indiana.edu. David Daleke is here as well, and I'm sure he'd be happy to answer any questions that you may have about this issue. And thank you David, for you and your leadership in helping us launch this program. The second big update is on Faculty 100. Phase One of our other recent initiative, Faculty 100, is also moving forward. This phase will focus on the recruitment of up to 25 early and mid-career hires whose research portfolios synergize with current and emerging faculty strengths. This initiative is open to all schools, colleges, and disciplines. Funding is available to those to establish departments and schools, as well as to imaginative and interdisciplinary areas of opportunity. The first round of submissions were due yesterday. And I know I haven't seen it myself, but my office told me there were about 75 sort of applications submitted as of last night. These proposals will be reviewed and prioritized by a group of representative faculty committee members. Again, Caroline, thank you in advance for doing this as well for us. And this group was a group we selected with feedback from the BFC leadership. Proposals will continue to be considered on a rolling basis until all funds earmarked for this effort are exhausted. Later phases of Faculty 100 will align with priorities and research areas identified through the IUB strategic planning process. So, this is the only subgroup of the Faculty 100 that we are doing ahead of time. The rest of these should be done in conjunction with the strategic planning efforts that are in high gear right now. On that note, thank you for everybody here who's participating in the strategic planning process. Working groups have been meeting over the past few weeks and we continue to receive submissions to our online feedback forums as well. The working groups will continue to meet and analyze the data through the end of the semester. By that point, I hope they will have articulated a list of goals and measurable objectives which the planning and then the executive committees will review and use in the

creation of a cohesive strategic plan draft. That draft will then obviously be shared through various channels, including at least two focus groups for further refinement. Before we lock in our final plan, I look forward to sharing some of the ways this process directly and indirectly will lead to material improvements across campus. As you all know, we are very busy conducting a number of searches, so I wanted to give you a quick update on those. The Hamilton Lugar search invited four finalists. The last finalist just finished on-campus interviews. We have received a lot of feedback from various constituents. We are still reviewing that and also doing some internal and external off-list reference checking for those candidates. I'm hoping I can start synthesizing all that information to sort of move towards the final decision in the next several days. The OVP FAA, that is, in short, Eliza Pavalko's position, there were two finalists identified by the search committee. The campus visits finished last week. I have again received the feedback and I'm hoping to finalize that decision in the coming days as well. The Dean for the Media School, the search committee was re-created. This is a search that was ongoing when I first started in February, we did not find a suitable candidate, so we took a pause and relaunch the search. The search committee was charged yesterday morning. The next steps will be scheduling listening sessions and recruiting candidates. I'm optimistic we'll get a strong candidate in the search this time around. For the Kelley School, that is another search that's ongoing. The listening sessions are wrapping up. Today is the last one. And recruiting will begin in earnest once the position profile has been finalized and shared with the larger constituents. So much of the winter break into early spring, we'll be recruiting for candidates, followed by the airport interviews. I use air quotes there to say we don't really do airports anymore. So, Zoom interviews, followed by on-campus visits sometime in the spring semester. That's the update from me as always. Thank you, everyone for everything you are doing. I know the semester gets to a crescendo from here on out. It'll be pretty hectic. I hope you have a little break here in the next week before we come back to wind things up. So, I hope you all have a wonderful Thanksgiving holiday. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM SIX:

I do not believe there were any questions submitted to me this time around. So, I will move if you don't if you have any questions, I'll open it up to the floor. If not, we'll move on to the next item. Okay. Seeing no questions, we will move on to the next item which is a proposed change to the constitution of the Bloomington Faculty Council. Rachael, take it away.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN:

RECK: Rachael's not here.

SHRIVASTAV: I didn't even see Danielle. Danielle, take it away.

DESAWAL: I'll take it away. All right. So, I'm filling in today for Rachael. Is it going to work? There we go. Success. So, this is our old business from our last meeting that we weren't able to get to, which is a proposed constitutional change, which is an amendment to the constitution that comes from the BFC Constitution and Rules Committee. Next slide, please. Alright, so as we talked about before with the, whoops, nope, one back. There we go. As we talked about before, with the changes with the student academic appointments, one of the things that we talked about was increasing that representation here within the BFC. That requires an amendment to the

constitution and the following is being proposed. The amendment process for the constitution has a multitude of steps. So, the first thing I'm going to do is walk us through what is the proposed constitution change. Then I'm going to tell you about what that actual timeline is going to look like for us to do that so that we know how to kinda think about discussion and conversation. So, one of the things that we're doing is redescribing the composition delegation of voting representatives that will come from the GPSG. So, the current language states that "three graduate students selected in accordance with the procedures of the graduate and professional student government." The amendment that is being proposed will be that the following language will exist at 5.5 H2: "three graduate students selected in accordance with the procedures of the graduate and professional student government of whom two shall be the president and vice president of the graduate and professional student organization, and one shall be a student academic appointee." Now I'll have you do the next slide. Now, timeline. So, there's multiple pieces that go with this that are in accordance with the BFC constitution from Article 8. So, the first piece is an amendment that's initiated by the council. So right now, today, November 15th, we're doing the discussion of the proposed amendment. In two weeks, for December 6th, we'll do a vote from the BFC that is a vote for the general faculty to consider the amendment. So that will be essentially what will then prompt the rest of this process. So, after December, our meeting on December 6th, then very promptly, our fabulous faculty president will be circulating a proposed amendment to the voting members of the faculty here on the Bloomington campus. That then needs to have 15 class days to be considered by the faculty so that if any additional discussion or conversation is prompted, we're able to one, host it and two, record it. At the conclusion of 15 class days, which puts us at January 17, 2023, the ballot will be sent, which will be accompanied by a summary of the arguments, both pro and con, presented during any general faculty meeting at which the amendment was considered. The vote will be electronic via Qualtrics. It's going to come; Lana will be sending that. Then a majority of those voting shall be necessary for the adoption of the amendment. So that's the timeline and process. Then the previous slide. We can bump back to that so that you can see again what is the proposed amendment to the constitution. And then we'll open it up for questions. Yes. Okay.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT:

SHRIVASTAV: Yes, this does not need a vote, but it's open for questions for our discussion.

DALEKE: Hi, thanks. I just have a very simple recommendation for maybe a friendly amendment, is that the word organization should be replaced by government.

DASAWAL: I was thinking the same thing [unclear].

SHRIVASTAV: Okay. Other questions? Yes.

BIELASIAK: I just have a question about the language and some clarifications. What happens if the President is a member of the SAA? Yes. Does that take care of the requirement? One additional member. We mean at least one of the three or do we mean two officers plus one? So, I'm unclear about the language.

DASAWAL: Alright. So, let's all remember that I am filling in, so I'm gonna do my best. I believe that it will not replace one so the intent, and hopefully what this communicates, is that they'll always be three graduate students. And so there isn't, the President or the Vice President. Could be student academic appointees on this campus, and that would be just fine. But there needs to be a third person who specifically is holding the lens of a student academic appointee. Did I answer that? I feel better that David is shaking his head and the affirmative.

SHRIVASTAV: Yes.

SIEK: Just to understand the background on this, I'm curious. Who made the proposal to make these changes and what are they trying to achieve? Please don't take this the wrong way. I'm just curious about the background to understand.

RECK: This proposal was in response to trying to make sure that SAAs were represented on the council appropriately from the beginning of fall. And this was one of the mechanisms that we were hoping would achieve that success.

SIEK: And do we know what their opinion is about this change?

RECK: That they liked it.

SIEK: Okay. Very good. I was hoping.

RECK: We had been in communication with GPSG to make sure that we're moving in the direction that would be supportive of them.

SIEK: Yeah. Thank you.

RECK: Anyone from GPSG? I need glasses, so I'm not going to make sure. I'm not sure. Perfect. Chelsea, if you want to speak to this, I would welcome that.

BRINDA: Yeah. I think that it's obviously really great to have a designated as a person. I am just a little concerned that by specifying president and vice president, that removes a little bit of flexibility as to who actually can attend. If I can't attend, do we have the privileges of sending alternates? That's unclear to me right now. Obviously, I'm the only one from GPSG here right now. So That's just something I would like clarification for. But that's just my only concern. Obviously, I think it's great to have the SAA very explicitly put in this amendment.

RECK: So when we had talked about this, we paralleled the same language that the undergraduate IUSG has. And so we were actually getting parity between those two languages, because right now the undergraduate organization says president and vice president, and for the graduate students then it would say president and vice president. And then the third position was going to be specified as SAA. Everybody is allowed to send a proxy. So that's irregardless of whether it's a student group or whomever it is, everyone is allowed to send a proxy.

SVETINA: I had a similar comment regarding the president, vice president, whether it would need to be both. It feels like it's almost a redundancy and then to increase diversity if they said president or vice president it might've given more voice to additional graduate students. So, I was just wondering what the, and I think you might have answered that, but maybe that's something that the graduate students, professional student government should have input on, but I'm not sure if, why they are president and vice president. So, I don't know if there's any comments.

RECK: Is anyone from besides Rachel, who's out today, is anyone on CARC? It's hard for us to field questions when we weren't on the committee to hear the conversations. Great. Alex, do you have something?

TANFORD: I was on a previous CARC when this same question came up. And the answer is the elected part. We are in an elected body and we know that the president and the vice president of the GPSG were elected and that's why it was limited to officers.

SHRIVASTAV: Any other questions? Seeing none, I will move on to the next item. Okay. There is more.

SPENDL: Just in relation to Jack's question. Jack, would it help if it said President and Vice President and at least one shall be a student academic appointee?

BIELASIAK: Actually, that was my preferred language, if we inserted at least.

TANFORD: I think that's a substantive change and would need to be voted on. Because if you say it that way, it leaves who holds the third seat undecided. This sets out who fills the three seats. If you say at least, one shall be, and that one is an officer, now you have what do we do with the third seat? So, I would oppose it. We should vote on whether we want to change that language because it has consequences.

SHRIVASTAV: I think this is not a voting item right now, but it is something that should go back to the committee that drafted it and come back with their preferred language and the rationale for it. And when we vote on it, then definitely we should consider whether it's appropriate or not. I agree with Alex. It is a substantial change. Chelsea.

BRINDA: Yeah, I just wanted to clarify that the present position isn't SAA, so it'd be great if that didn't count as the SAA and that third position was the SAA. Okay?

RECK: That's the point of making that last position always be SAA.

BRINDA: Right. All three of them just saying that. Yeah. Perfect.

SHRIVASTAV: Just to be clear, the GPSG precedent is always also president and vice president as representing the entire graduate student body, not just the SAAs, and I suspect that was the intent behind the language as stated.

UNCLEAR: Margaret, back there.

BIELASIAK: Hearing the discussion, I agree with Alex so we can withdraw my friendly amendment.

FREEDMAN: Would it clarify it if it said, “and the third shall be an SAA”? Because now it's unclear if we're talking about that “at least one” version or the “it has to be one SAA” version.

SHRIVASTAV: I think that's a friendly amendment.

FREEDMAN: That was my intent for sure.

AGENDA ITEM NINE:

SHRIVASTAV: Okay. Anything else? Okay. You can digest it through December 6th and then we can come back and take the next step on that one. Thank you very much. Let's move on to the next item, which is taskforce on research reorganization. Carolyn and the rest of the team.

JARROLD: We are grateful for the opportunity to present the findings of the BFC taskforce on research reorganization. I'm Caroline Chick Gerald, chair of the task force. Hermann B Wells Professor in the Department of Chemistry. Before we get started with our presentation, I would like to begin with introductions and thanking the people who worked tirelessly on this task force. Unable to attend today's meeting is Eduardo Brondizio, Distinguished Professor in the Department of Anthropology and the director of the center of the analysis of social ecological landscapes College of Arts and Sciences.

GOLDBERG: Hello, I'm Halina Goldberg. I'm in musicology at the Jacobs School of Music, but I'm also affiliated with several units in HLS, most closely with Russian and East European Institute, and also a couple of units in the college, Jewish Studies among them.

HETRICK: I'm Bill Hetrick, chair of the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, member of the cognitive science program and the program in neuroscience.

INGHAM: I'm Patricia Ingham, I'm the Martha Biggerstaff Jones Professor of British literature in the English department and I direct the Institute for Advanced Study.

JARROLD: And our colleague, Pete Kollbaum, the Associate Dean for Research in the School of Optometry, is also not present.

NOVICK: I am Kim Novick, Professor of Environmental Science in the O'Neal School where I also direct our PhD program.

RAYMOND: Hello everyone. I'm Angie Raymond. I'm the Director of Data Management and Information Governance at the Ostrom Workshop, and I'm also in Business Law and Ethics at the Kelley School of Business.

RUTKOWSKI: I'm Leslie Rutkowski, professor of quantitative research methodology in the school of education.

WIDISS: Hi, I'm Deborah Widiss, Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Affairs at the Mauer School of Law.

JARROLD: As you can see, the makeup of this taskforce reflects the diversity of research and creative activity on this campus. To provide some context for this report, as some of you might recall, VPR Fred Cate presented a document titled Enhancing Research at IU at the research office fiscal year 23 budget conference. The document outlined the general goal of consolidating the budget, staff, and decision-making at the research offices on the Bloomington campus and Indianapolis campus into the Vice President's office. Because this consolidation would necessarily have implications for campus leadership with respect to the research missions of the Bloomington faculty, and because of concerns about its primary focus on overhead bearing external funding as a sole metric for research productivity, the BFC resolved to assemble a task force charged with gathering data to address questions on factors that impede research, metrics for research excellence, and related matters. We began our work in late August 2022, and it became quickly apparent that this plan was already actively being implemented without stakeholder input. Our charge was then revised to entail gathering data to inform BPR and how the changes that are now underway could produce the most positive outcomes on the full range of scholarship, creative endeavors, and research excellence on the Bloomington campus. We spoke with and gathered feedback from a range of stakeholders, including chairs, directors, faculty at different ranks. We met with the provost, the BPR, and some personnel at ORA, who provided data on funding per FTE for the various units and external funding participation levels. As a metrics initially, initially provided as rationale for the consolidation did not give the full picture of trends in external funding on campus. So, we won't bore you with reading the report that was sent to the Bloomington faculty last week. Rather, we're here to provide you with this context and a synthesis of our research. First, the feedback and data were very valuable, and we thank those of you who took the time to share it with us. As noted in the report, the task force and many stakeholders that we consulted appreciate the theoretical goals of their structure, which include reducing inefficiencies, increasing funding for research activities, and increasing the percentage of IU researchers receiving external funding, while at the same time recognizing that external funding is not a primary marker of research productivity in some disciplines. Improvements in services related to grant submission through our [inaudible] with an emphasis on large center grant activity and more collaborative relationships between faculty and ORA would likely increase the funding portfolio on campus for areas of research that rely primarily on external funding for support. What we learned was that this consolidation has been ongoing with little stakeholder input or research on viability, expected outcomes, and other considerations that should be made prior to an overhaul of the research support structure. In the meantime, IU announced that Purdue and IUI units would be split from what has been IUPUI. The President announced IU 2030, an ambitious strategic planning process which the provost is put into action. The initiative for hiring 100 faculty was announced, and the Vice President for Research announced he will be stepping down from his position at the end of the academic year. A search for his replacement has been initiated. All of these factors need to be considered, and all warrant discontinuing this consolidation until the strategic plan has been formulated, and the vision of the incoming VPR can play it can play a role in the restructuring. In addition, the reorganization

itself has raised a number of concerns and we've urged the administration to stop the ongoing restructuring and to fully reconsider any changes that will be implemented to ensure that the campus has a research office with full budgetary discretion and complete authority over the research development on the Bloomington campus. As justification, we will highlight three major points from our report. The first being the leadership structure, the second being faculty input and the need for a data-driven approach, and third, the definition of research that should be fully considered in any restructuring. I'll turn it over to Bill.

HETRICK: Regarding the structure. Our fundamental concern with the proposal is that we view this as undermining the role of our provost, the Chief Academic Officer of the Bloomington campus, in shaping, supporting research and creative activities on our campus. Indiana University, as you all know, is a multi-campus institution with Bloomington as its flagship. The campuses are under separate leadership by a provost here and chancellors elsewhere because each campus has unique research, teaching, and service profiles that require separate leadership and distinct leadership. Simply stated, the proposal for research reorganization bypasses the provost and has hollowed out the Office for the Vice Provost for Research. Essentially, the oversight and leadership over the research mission of both IUB now and IUI, but not the IU School of Medicine, is now within the Office for the Vice President for Research who reports to the President of the university, not the Provost. New roles had been envisioned, created, and filled at the vice president for research level and again at the level of university administration rather than Bloomington positions within the Office for the Vice Provost for Research. The proposal, the proposed roles, I should say, include a new Vice President for Research Development who's been named, and seven new directors of research who are charged with serving the university as a whole. Again, the role of the Office for the Vice Provost of Research appears to be hollowed out, and critical campus reporting structures bypassed, such as the established reporting lines between chairs, directors, their associate deans for research, their deans there, um, relationship with the provost, and then back down that same chain. Further, the proposal called for putting the IUB Office for the Vice Provost for Research budget under the Vice President for Research. And there were discussions earlier on about whether the OVPR was needed at all. Taken together, it is our view, that is the task force's view, that the reorganization as proposed and as has been implemented so far, will harm research development on the Bloomington campus. To be very clear, our aim is to empower our provost so that campus specific opportunities and threats, which within the domain of research and creative activities can be carefully, effectively, and efficiently addressed. Again, towards our campus specific needs. That proposed reorganization directly undermines this aim in our view.

INGHAM: I'm going to speak to this point about the research restructuring, hollowing out some of the functions of OVPR as it relates to CIM directors. So, CIMs, centers, institutes, and museums, that are at the campus level have been under campus-level supervision. The level of turmoil in these organizational shifts and developments has been in our research of special concern to campus-level CIMs, their directors, and their staff. Different CIMs, as you probably know, have particular remits related to campus faculty. They have particular funding sources, and these can vary quite significantly. There is as yet no real clarity as to where these will sit. For a time, they were gonna be all shifted to the university level, now we're hearing different kinds of possibilities about this, about some perhaps staying at the campus level. But I just want to stress that the turmoil about that decision and the structural unsurity about what the

organization chart is going to look like has really been of great concern and has caused a great deal of unnecessary disruption to the work of the centers, institutes, and museum directors. The importance here is not only of relations among faculty, faculty leadership in OVPR, but staff who have important institutional memory and expertise, but seem to be increasingly sidelined as the reorganization developed. Furthermore, a number of CIM directors have expressed serious, serious concerns about the possibility of the elimination of important, seen perhaps as minor from the university level, important OVPR are functions, Faculty research coordination for research development. From one view, the CIMs are engines of interdisciplinary research, and a lot of research developments happens on the ground at those, at that level. The management of funding arrangements, partnerships with the college, with other RCM units, the administration of external review processes, assistance with problems with space management and space allocation and the like. All of these were previously coordinated with important and assistance from OVPR faculty leadership and OVPR staff, and we have concerns about decisions being made regarding the deaccession of repository collections without adequate information or mechanisms for consultation preliminary to those decisions.

RUTKOWSI: Thanks. I'm going to address two points, one on faculty input and procedure and then the other on data-driven decision-making. So, first of all, it's not just the consolidation that's been concerning to us as we've tried to fulfill our charge, but it's the process by which it's been taking place. As we started our work in August and moving into September, the picture that came into focus is that there is an opaque, fluid, and top-down restructuring that was taking place in a way that sidelines IUB campus leadership over the direction and supportive research and creative activities. Further, the reorganization was taking place without any input from the deans, the chairs, or from key researchers on the campus. And then, because I spend my time mucking around in data and with the models and analysis that does that sort of stuff, I'm going to talk about data-driven decision-making. Restructuring and consolidation should be based on a careful data-driven evaluation of where and how the current structures aren't currently meeting the needs of research faculty at IUB. And restructuring and consolidation decisions should be based on the evidence around current actual barriers. And the consolidation should be given to research offices—I'm sorry, consideration should be given to comparable research institutions and consideration about what their structures look like. In research institutions that have a vibrant research and creative activity culture. We wanted to be clear that we're not opposing consolidation outright, but improved efficiency should be balanced against quality of support for faculty, and importantly, this sort of careful analysis should precede the implementation of a top-down restructuring that appears to be happening with little input from the stakeholders that this office is intended to serve.

WIDISS: And then I'm just going to build on that to talk a little bit about the definition of research and creative activities, because one of the things that we heard as we spoke to people around campus was external funding is one metric, it matters a lot for certain kinds of research, primarily in the hard sciences. It's not necessarily the right metric for gauging research and creative activity in much of the arts and humanities, it's not in the law school, my home, it's not in a lot of the different units around IUB. And so the taskforce took that to heart, and one of the things that's included in our report is a suggested definition of research and creative activities that's intended to really capture the breadth of research and creative activities on this campus. So that includes laboratory field-based research, that includes development of theoretical models,

that includes interpretation of text, preservation of artifacts, creation of new artworks, you know, really a wide bandwidth of research and creative activity, and I think that with looking towards metrics and gauging research and creative activity it's really important to calibrate those metrics to the different kinds of research and creative activity that happens around this campus, which requires conversations with the different disciplines to understand what are the right metrics for those different disciplines to capture that. When looking at peer institutions and trying to assess how we stack up, our campus is different from a lot of the other flagship campuses in the Big Ten or other major public universities. We have multiple campuses. We do not have the primary med school here. We have a relatively new and relatively small engineering school. We do not have an agricultural school. Those all drive a lot of external funding. We have historic excellence in the arts and humanities. We have a world-famous music school. We want to make sure that we're capturing that research excellence, building on that research excellence, and calibrating support to that. So, in assessing and looking at peers, being pretty careful about what that comparison looks like, we think is really important. And then in thinking about whether it's at the vice president for research level, whether that OPR, at whatever level support for research and creative activities is happening, thinking about what are the structures that support that range of research and creative activities, what can make each of us more productive in our research and creative activities, and what's the supports that are best calibrated to that?

RAYMOND: By way of wrap-up, it's my task to say a couple of things. The first is that during every one of the interviews that we conducted, every one of the conversations we had at some point in time, the question was asked, What can we do to help? How do we make this process better? That was always our goal along the way. And I want to clarify with some really up-to-date information that is at least up to date is the time of the writing of the report that you all received. We do understand that there's been a pause in the movement of the research budget from Bloomington to the UA level. However, the staff are still being reorganized in a way that severs existing conduits between the Bloomington faculty and the research office. The new Interim Vice President for Research Development was appointed to continue to execute the consolidation and is still actively reorganizing staff and moving forward with appointing newly created university-level research directors for the physical and mathematical sciences as well as for community engagement. So, at this point, we'd like to ask, we'd like to hear the specifics about how this process has in fact been paused. That's not the up-to-date information that we have. That concludes our submission. We're open for response to that and questions.

AGENDA ITEM TEN:

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you. Let me just give you a quick update on where we are and then we can open it up for discussion. The, as you all know, Vice President Cate has announced his intention to step down. The search for a new VP will launch within days, I hope. I know there's been taught with the VFC and UFC leadership for nominations. So, a lot of my effort is to look for where we are going rather than where we have been. The intent here is to create a single research support office. Just because that, particularly in the climate that we're in where staff hiring and retaining is an extremely difficult challenge. Those of you who are in the units will recognize most units are short on proposal development and other research support staff. So, the intent is to create a unified research office. However, given not only the feedback we've received from this team, and I greatly appreciate it because I know your intent is to strengthen the campus

as it is for me, so what you're doing is really helping me. But also, the same feedback has come up through the deans, as well as a similar sort of exercise through IUPUI, the intent moving forward is to maintain and associate vice precedent that would jointly report to the campus, and a similar position, Associate Vice President and Associate Vice Chancellor for Research from IUPUI, which will continue to oversee expenditure and spending and priorities for each campus separately. So, I think that was the single most important feedback that came through multiple channels, and Fred has sort of accepted that and retained that in the organization as it stands today. A lot of the other things that were being proposed have been frozen in place, including the research directors, being, that were being, that nominations were opened for, those have been frozen, no position will be hired except if anything that is deemed mission critical. If there is something that just prevents us from moving forward, particularly in areas related to compliance or other things that need to go on and I'm fully supportive of it. Everything else needs to stop until the next person has been hired, a deeper decision on the organization has been, has had a chance to be completed before we lock in a new organization structure. I cannot share the names, but I can tell you the search will be co-chaired by somebody from IU Bloomington and somebody from IUPUI. That'll give us a good opportunity to stay deeply engaged in recruiting the next Vice President for Research and in shaping the organization and prioritization of the office as it, as it moves forward. One of the things I want to share with the larger group, I shared this with the committee in my conversation with them, is that the university organization and the way UA works today is very different than it has been historically. And there is a much closer partnership between the president and the provost, as well as the president and the chancellor at IUPUI. And the two of us, as well as Jay Hess, the Dean of the School of Medicine, and I are working much more collaboratively in shaping institutional priorities, whether it's strategic planning efforts, hiring efforts, or any other effort, but it is really a partnership between, I would say four people: Andy Klein, Interim Chancellor for IUPUI; Sue Sciame-Giasecke, who is the new vice president overseeing all the regional campuses; Jay Hess, the School of Medicine; and me. The four of us really are driving several of the high priority areas in consultation, very close consultation with President Whitten. The UA units then are in response to the priorities that we're setting for IU as a whole. I know this is radically different than how it has been done in the past, and I think that's where some of these issues that the committee has rightfully raised will be addressed. It is, it is new. This is the beginning of my ninth month and I'm by no means the newest member of the Cabinet. I'm now one of the longest serving members of the cabinet. Believe it or not. It is, it is still a work in progress, but I feel comfortable where we are headed and certainly the feedback and concerns that the committee has raised give us ways to sort of pause, review, and build enough checks and balances into the organization so we don't run into a conflict between priorities we need to set for ourselves as a campus and the priorities that the new VPR will set up as a campus. With that, I would open it up for questions. I can give you specific questions and responses. The issues around since, I think I'm glad you brought that up. Because that is something we were talking about, I was talking about with Fred as recently as Saturday, last week. I think there is work to be done. You're right. There is work to be done. One approach to it is to say this is an IU-wide resource to be done through VPR. The other approach to it as to say, yes, it's supports all of you as it supports all of higher ed, but it is primarily a IU Bloomington resource. And we can take those pieces and move it out or leave them up in place. I don't think it is settled yet. I think a lot will depend on conversations we have. A lot will also depend on who we end up recruiting. Because if that is a person which can showcase a vision for taking these centers and promoting it so it emphasizes what we want to achieve from it, I don't

mind that person overseeing it, but if that person feels that these will be a distraction, then I'd rather have it on the provost's office and then try and make sure we never lose sight of the value that they built for us as a campus. So, I think there's still, since the time you all started as a group reviewing this effort, I think the proposed org chart, to my knowledge, changed at least three times. Most recently, maybe ten days ago, following a conversation with the deans. So, this is fluid. I think it will remain fluid, but I acknowledge and appreciate you highlighting several of the concerns that you have brought up in your in your discussions.

INGHAM: If I could just add to that. I mean, we have understood increasingly that there may be advantages, particularly in terms of the national model for these offices with aligning IU's research office alongside what we've been calling Model A, the national model housed in a vice presidents office. Whereas historically we've had a kind of Model B right. But I think the, the concerns we have are that this shift is being thought of in rather inert ways. It's being thought of as a kind of collapsing, a consolidation that willing, has a good chance of continuing to contribute to the problems, the structural problems of communication between campus level research office and the university level research office that we heard volumes about in our interviews of people on campus. And so, we would just urge that. And it's a little disconcerting that the org chart has changed three times in a relatively short period of time. So, we would just really urge, as this org chart has developed, that there are structural efforts to increase transparency, accessibility, communication, and the kinds of deep relationships that the campus level OVPR had with researchers on the ground. And that's something that we've, a piece that we really feel it has been sidelined in a certain way and it's part of why the CIMs are sort of the canary in the coal mine in a certain, to a certain degree. So, I would just, I think I can speak for all of us and say that we really urge the new structure to be very, to think very long and hard about how to ensure that communication, accessibility, research development really does keep some of its feet on the ground with faculty, with deans, with department chairs, where the magic really is happening.

SHRIVASTAV: I could not agree more. Other questions from the group? Yes.

CAVAR: My perception of this development was actually that there was an interest in bringing together different areas, different segments of IU, and facilitating collaborative research, which I personally liked a lot because I had some connections to the medical school and to IUPUI as well. And we faced incredible red tape in collaborative research and getting joint grants. It was easier for us to establish a grant with University of Florida, than with IUPUI. And I was hoping that this is changing and that there is a perspective that in future we'll have actually instruments that facilitate that, these joint offers. I'm not interested in org chart. I'm interested in the effects for us as faculty members to facilitate research and collaborative type of grants.

SHRIVASTAV: Yes. Again, I don't have the history, so I don't know what the barriers were, but I have heard this from multiple people. But our intent is certainly to ease those pain points. How we do it is still, as I said, it's still fluid, but that is the intent and it's not just remove the barriers, it's really to try and incentivize cross collaborative research, interdisciplinary work, within and outside IU Bloomington wherever possible. There's also the very practical issue. None of us, anywhere in the country, you have enough staffing that we need to support it, and sometimes

there is strength in numbers because you can share support responsibilities through a unified effort. That's the other driving force. Yes.

SHERMAN: Thank the committee for all your work. This is an incredible committee when it comes to representing the various kinds of research that are done on the Bloomington campus. And I would say that if the people on this committee have concerns about the directions that have been put forth, then I have concerns about the directions. I hope that the committee will be listened to, will be included in changes. I've been around long enough to have heard the words, "nothing is set in stone yet, we're still thinking about it," and then suddenly it's done. And I would simply say that if at the end of the process, the members of this committee are still not satisfied with what was done and feel that it's hurt research and the Bloomington campus, then I will be upset and I hope a number of my colleagues will be upset.

SHRIVASTAV: [unclear] words, Jim. Thank you. I just want to point out one more thing here. There is roughly a 5.5 million dollar budget that flows from IU Bloomington provost's office to IU Bloomington research activities. We are making sure that continues to happen. But there's a larger piece that already flows directly to VPR and then flows to various entities. That's the [inaudible] assessment piece. There is the ICR piece. All of that is probably five times larger than the campus operational budget is. As a provost, I want to make sure that that spending is reinforcing the strategic priorities for the campus. Not being competitive or being orthogonal to whatever our priorities are as a campus. And I think it's that synergy that'll help us accelerate the overall success in our research. And to me, it's the other part that is more important. The 5 million plus part is something we are already keeping an eye on. There was another question from that side.

KRAVITZ: Yeah. Thank you. I want to underscore a word that Patty brought up. Turmoil. There has been a lot of it around this process, just based on numerous conversations I've been having with my constituents. So, you're saying there's a new org chart as of ten days ago. Well, that we have to find that. And then we have to say, Oh, where did that come from? What's different about it? We have to study it and all of this stuff. And this takes a lot of time and a lot of conversation. And when I'm doing that, I'm not doing my research. And all of this impacts mental health negatively. We're all worried. We don't know what's going on. As Angie was saying, people are offering to help because they just want to know how can we be part of this process. So, I have, I remain agnostic about the research reorganization itself. I think there could be some very good things that come out of it. I would just say, please let's not make sudden changes because that's bad for everybody.

SHRIVASTAV: Point taken. Agreed.

JOHNSON: I just wanted to emphasize that one of the questions that happens when these kinds of reorganizations occur, this happened with the graduate school, It's clearly happening with the research reorganization, is how administrative visions for the kind of amplification of efficiencies correspond to existing shared governance structures with regard to policy-making, input, provision, and that sort of thing. So anytime anything moves from the campus level to the university level, we have committees, one of which Ben chairs right now, research affairs, for example, that either implicitly or in fact, get kind of cut out of the process. And my sense is that

those considerations haven't always factored into what may be very well intended and perhaps even productive, kind of reconsideration of organizational structure. And I guess just as president-elect of this body and as a faculty member and as somebody with a deep investment in the significance of shared governance, not just as a sort of legislative exercise, but also as the kind of fully legitimated representative face of the faculty, that those considerations not be set aside as people are thinking about reorganization. Like, you've done a phenomenal job, but the question of what research affairs standing is in the longer term, in terms of making sure that these kinds of moves are vetted and considered carefully, and that they ultimately end up carrying the imprimatur of faculty assent in terms of structural reorganization, depends on not setting to the side the consideration of kind of who the administration is accountable to in terms of...Because that's how you build support for change. And I think that's not always happened in some of the things that have happened, certainly from the President's office, and it needs to happen more because we've had to go through several cycles of reverse engineering ways for faculty to sort of be involved and to make sure that our voices are being heard in an orderly process, I would just encourage that as consideration moving forward.

GUERRA-REYES: So just following up on what Colin was saying, what, you've called this process a fluid process. So given the fluidity, what if any considerations or processes are going to be in place so that faculty can provide feedback to ongoing reorganization efforts.

SHRIVASTAV: Well, I think the next biggest step is searching for a new VPR, And I know faculty will be part of the search committee, but I'm sure there will also be broader opportunities to engage with the candidates that come in. All other organizational change, particularly the hiring positions, has been frozen in place at this point. There is none of those seven, I think there were seven directors that were proposed. I think one has already been hired. That person will stay on, but the remaining six have been frozen. There were a couple other non-faculty positions as well. I think Director of Federal Relations and a few others, those have been paused as well at this point, the only searches that are ongoing will be anything that, as I said, is essential for critical operations. So that is ongoing. I am hoping that the next VPR will have the opportunity to think carefully through what the organization should look like, work with this group, probably the committee here, but also the research affairs committee in articulating and shaping the vision, and hopefully also in identifying the right candidates in the right position. Irrespective of that, I plan to remain engaged in not only in the search, but also in the reorganization efforts. And as I said earlier, the priorities for the office are being set already jointly between Andy Klein, Jay Hess, and me, with active support from regionals, although the regional campuses don't have a huge research, I won't say zero, there is some, but it's not as large as the other three units do. Does that help? I wish I had a very clear, this is the organization, but I almost don't.

GUERRA-REYES: The only concern that I have is that if the only input that faculty have is in hiring, then we're in problems.

SHRIVASTAV: No, no. Hiring will be step one. I think, after that, the next person must, whoever we hire, I will be saying, here's what we need the office to do. And I would like the office, the person to then say, for me to deliver on these goals, here's how I need to organize my office. Which I think is the right way for the next leader to do. We don't want to freeze an organization and then bring in a leader. I think that this does disservice to them. Yes, Bill.

HETRICK: As we're speaking to this issue of process, it strikes me that I think that what's consistent with our concern at a fundamental level is that in this interim process, if we want to empower you, we want our campus to be represented as strongly as possible. The vice president for research, if it's selected by a committee that's co-chaired by Indy and Bloomington, and if the committee is comprised of individuals equally from Indianapolis and Bloomington, I'm still not sure, and I think that's what these questions are about, well then where's the campus input through you? So, I think that in the interim, if we're freezing the process, we would like to restore the authority of the Vice Provost for Research so that these questions can knowingly go to that office with appropriate support and staff, vet it, feed it to you, and inform the process. I just think that that's where the fundamental disconnect lies, is that right now, we're holding off on a process that's going to lie at a level different from yours or above, if you think of it as the vice president, president, provost. And we're kind of wondering, well, what's the campus-level process? What's the campus-level input to you? That I think is the fundamental problem.

SHRIVASTAV: So, right now, Brea Perry serves in that role as an Associate Vice President and Vice Provost, and it's an interim basis. In the latest iteration of the reorganization, that role is retained and that role continues to have a joint reporting line to the provost, and that role also continues to have oversight of the provost side of the funding. So, it is more or less preserving the old organization with a joint reporting line to the vice president. I don't want to spend too much time re-inventing that until we have the next vice president, because we may or may not keep it as is, but if we decide to move away from that position, then the next vice president will have to address how they will create some sort of checks and balances on issues that this committee has brought up.

HETRICK: In terms of research development, I think because there's an Associate Vice President for Research Development in place now, the relationship between that position and Brea Perry's position, the Vice Provost for research, is not clear. They may just be two people competing in that office for attention. It's not clear that you've empowered our Vice Provost for Research to represent exclusively our campus. I think there's some confusion along these lines that would be easily addressed by saying, in the interim, this person's going to sort of have their powers restored in a more absolute sense, and work with university-level people as appropriate, but really be able to take the input and to think through these priorities, work with this committee. But maybe you were to say something.

WIDISS: I would just build on that as well. I mean, I think one of the challenges is, I appreciate the pause that's responding to suggestions we've made and other people have made, but now, because the process has sort of started to be implemented, it's an awkward in-between because of course, OVPR used to have a Vice Provost for Research and then Associate Vice Provost for Research under that person, you know, that we're doing important work, and those positions, I don't think any of those are currently filled because we started on this path. And so, I think that one of the tricky things right now, while appreciating the pause, is there's real work that office was doing that now there's no way Brea by herself can do it. And the staff, a lot of them have already transitioned over into central administration. And so, it's sort of, the pause is good in some ways in that it allows us to think, but it's also creating a vacuum both in terms of the regular work of that office and in terms of letting that office have a voice into thinking about the

optimal structure. So, I'm not sure what the right solution on that yet, but I didn't get the challenge.

SHRIVASTAV: Point well-taken again. There isn't a good solution here. The other side of this is, if we, we are about to embark on a on a search for the next VPR, and we also want to leave, we also want to have the organizations set up in a way that the next person can come in and grow rather than come in and put out fires. Because that's just a loss for all of us. The more time that's spent doing that, the more time we lose collectively. So, the pause is then in response to all the issues, not just from your committee, but we had a similar discussion with the deans and Fred Cate not too long ago. The same themes emerge out of that as well. So, your work and that really reinforced each other. But we don't want to go too far back because then the next person will have to, will have that much of a hill to climb. So, there isn't a great solution here other than what I'm hoping will be a as quick as possible search for the next VPR. Because the transition, the shorter we can keep the transition, the better it is. If you have other suggestions, I'm happy to explore with President Whitten or with Fred Cate as appropriate. We are running out of time again. Thank you very much. I've had multiple meetings with this group and I really appreciate all the work and all the thoughtful advice you've all given. I know this is not the end of it. I'll be engaging with this group even more moving forward. I want to move on to the next item which is updates on retention and graduation. And this is David Johnson, Sarah Booher, and Sacha Thieme.

AGENDA ITEM ELEVEN:

JOHNSON: Thank you, Provost Shrivastav and thank you, President Reck for inviting us to participate today. I will make a connecting point to research and the fine panel that just presented. In the strategic planning work, there is a significant focus on research, and particularly where our lens is in the undergraduate space and focusing on undergraduate students engaged in research and amping that up to borrow that phrase. So just look for more to come in that space as we do strategic planning, as you spoke with strategic planning earlier. Well, good afternoon, Bloomington Faculty Council. It's a pleasure to be here with you. I'm David Johnson, the vice provost for enrollment management, and I have two great colleagues here with me today who will be supportive to answering questions. We have a quick 15-minute the presentation which I'll go through, and then time for Q&A. We want to make sure we have time for a good discussion with you. I'll quickly let my colleagues introduce themselves.

THIEME: Good afternoon, Sacha Thieme, Assistant Vice Provost and Executive Director of Admissions for IU Bloomington.

BOOHER: Hi, everyone. Sarah Booher, Assistant Vice Provost and Executive Director of Retention for Enrollment Management.

JOHNSON: I'm pleased to share some enrollment information with you, retention information, graduation information, and some next steps. And so, before I dive into quick slide deck of slides, the first slide is kind of an overview, and the last slide is one you'll want to make sure we get to and have time to get to, so we'll save time for the Q&A in the space allowed for that, if that sounds good. So, we'll jump in. This is a quick overview of what we're talking about here

today, about retention to the second term, which has been relatively stable. And you can see the rates, retention to the second year has been rising a bit and then a slight decrease during the pandemic. And we'll show you slides on that. Four-year graduation rates have increased by more than 14% in 12 years and six-year and eight-year graduation rates have also increased 5%, not quite as high as the, as the four-year rate. We have slides on these that we'll be getting into, this is just a quick overview, and we'll talk about test optional and the move to test optional and the opportunity to provide a world-class education for students. But also, we'll talk a little bit about strategic planning to, as we began the hour-and-a-half, talking about that briefly. So first, a little bit on the fall enrollment. And this is just a quick overview. We're really pleased to have delivered on what we had been asked to do. And that is to deliver the class of 2020 to the, beginner class is the language we use, beginners, so it's freshmen that you're typically used to. And that's a record class size, as you can see, also a record median GPA. All 92 counties represented in this class for the fifth year in a row. Record number of states represented in this class, 48 out of the 50 states in this class. We do have students enrolled at IU in other years from all 50 states, but in one particular cohort, this is a record for 48 in one cohort. And then a record number of historically marginalized students, underrepresented students. And so, we've been on a decade or more journey to increase our representation of underrepresented students, and we have a record there. Record in terms of our support and giving students gift aid to assist them in their enrollment at IU and their affordability of an IU education. And also, a record number of students coming with a 4.0 GPA. This is the largest beginner cohort as I, as I mentioned, and what the gray is the undergraduate beginner cohorts. And you can see those across time. The red is the budgeted target because I think it's important to mention that we are in discussion with the faculty and with the provost. Provost in the last 15 years and in the budget office and many players. We set targets and then we work hard to meet those enrollment targets. And we have done so over the last 15 years, 45% of the students enrolled test excluded. This is our first glimpse into test optional for this cohort, and we'll have a little more conversation on that in a moment. So, my time is up already. I see. That went fast. Highest beginner, median high-school GPA. We're pleased with that. And continuing to work to recruit and enroll students who perform well in high school. That is the benchmark that we are looking to and we'll talk more about that. There's the historically marginalized student enrollment, as you can see over time, continue to increase this population. And of course, we're always asked, well, who makes up this population? And so, you can see on this slide, the light blue is the Hispanic population as that is growing in our country, and a redefinition in 2010 of how [inaudible] calculate some race and ethnicity. And Hispanic is a continued growing population, along with the two or more races and kind of that royal blue at the top, and in the mustard color, there is the African-American, Black student population, which has been rather slightly increasing, and then we had a really nice increase this year. And we're continuing to work in all of this space to lift up our diverse student populations. Then the record beginner or receiving gift aid, as I mentioned earlier, the 73% is 7,123 students. Out of our 9,736 freshmen received gift aid, and the average gift aid. This is from all institutional gift aid or excuse me, all gift aid, not just institutional. And the average award is 10,000. If we look at institutional gift aid only, taking out state and federal, it's about 7,000 is the average award. Fall beginner demographics of test-excluded students in 2022. These are the populations of students who chose to be more often than not to be test excluded. And so, you can see who these populations are there. Let you look at that. And this is going to be pretty germane to our conversation in a few minutes about retention, and so I'll give you a moment just to look at that. More women, more 21st century scholars, Pell recipients, first-generation, students with

unmet financial need, and international students, and historically marginalized students more often than not, chose to be test optional. We'll come back to this in a few minutes. So, the outcomes, so retention, that was the enrollment piece for 2022. And now we're looking at retention from 2020 and 2021. This is a busy slide and a busy chart, we'll unpack this with some other charts in just a moment, but this gives you an aggregate view. Starting at the top, that gray line, around 96% retention to second semester and around 91% is the retention rate to the second year. And during COVID in 2020, we dipped one percentage point and then 0.4% drop in 2021. And so we have some things we want to talk about to mitigate that. But that wasn't that much of a dramatic drop compared to some more recent years that we had been in pre-COVID in terms of retention rates. Even during the pandemic, students stuck with us and we had the highest four-year graduation rate, as you can see there in the 80% range. And, excuse me, six years, sorry, that's a six-year rate. And then the four-year rate is around 69%, [unclear]. We put it in an eight-year, but it does not much difference between. Six is the nationally benchmarked benchmark that we would want to look to, and that's the 80%. So we do compare a lot of our recruitment and enrollment and a lot of our work with our Big Ten peers, that is our competition. We know from data that we review annually, that is where our students apply. Out-of-state students, if they do not apply, if they do not enroll here, where did they go? They go to Big Ten. Where do they apply? We also know that at other institutions. And so this is kind of just switching back and forth between 20 and 21. And sorry if that's a little disconcerting to some, but really you can just kinda see where we are in the opportunity here. I see this as an opportunity and I take the challenge. We collectively should take the challenge, and the provost has encouraged us to take that challenge, to move us up into the 92%, 93%, 94%. And where would that put us? In the middle, and move towards the top 25% of the Big Ten. There's opportunity here. Graduation rates. Same thing. There's opportunity here. If we improve retention than we can improve graduation rates, too. So, we're not in a bad position. We're certainly much better than the national average in both of these. Just in the competitive landscape of the Big Ten, we could work all collectively to improve these rates. There's some opportunity here. So, my last slide speaks to that opportunity. But retention to IU to the second year, I already spoke to these numbers. But I just wanted to call out the context, because context matters, right? You say, oh, 1% drop in retention or slight change in retention, whatever. And 1% is not huge, but also 1% is students. There are real students behind that. And so, we want to make sure we mitigate that in the future. But just to be reminded that this is in 2020, that drop was in the depths of the or the heights of the COVID pandemic. And then in 2021, those were students who had been in the height of the pandemic and their senior year in high school and then came to their freshman year in college in 2021 still reeling with this triple pandemic as I describe it, The global health disparities, financial inequities, and social justice issues that we all know so well have happened during this time. So, I don't need to go into detail here. All the BFC is aware of this and we had approval to be test optional before the pandemic, we were going to be the first Big ten institution in the country to be test optional, and then pandemic happened and well, and then everybody was test optional. No headline there. But we continue to be and we wanted to report on this to you. We have reported on it and we continue to report on this to you and the background if you're new to be BFC, the website link is there and we can provide that to you if you wanted to read all the details on why the research we put forward on going to test optional. But if you wanted just a one-liner on that, it's test optional gives students to decide on how they would be seen based on their academic performance in high school rather than more heavily reliant on a test score perhaps. And it gives an opportunity for students to take that into consideration. Again, you saw

this earlier for 2022, the current cohort, well this is the 2021 cohort backing up because we're talking about retention. Same population, same more often than not, these students were test excluded. So, then this is again a very busy slide, very small print there to see. So, I definitely can't read it, but I'm just going to remember what I know is on this slide. And that, is in the blue, that's the cohort retention rate. And then there's a line there for test excluded, which is just one point below. And then the test is included is a couple of points above. It's not about whether you were test excluded or not, it is really about the populations that choose to be within the test excluded category, and as you can see, I already told you two years of data who those populations were. And then this points to who their retention rates. And so, there's opportunity here, too. I keep speaking about opportunity because I think that is ahead for us with our strategic planning and where we put our priorities and where we want to focus in terms of retention for students. But those students below the cohort retention rate, you can see were unmet need, first-generation, Pell recipients, not directly admitted, and no OEM academic award or, and also the international students. Gender and race were not statistically significant here at all. So, this is just to put some context there that many variables predict retention and impact retention, right? And there's pre-enrolment variables. I did a dissertation 20 years ago on pre-enrolment variables that impact student retention. So, it comes back to haunt me, maybe in order to help me. How about that? He me. Haunting moments of the dissertation phase. So, during enrollment, also, some of these same variables and others rear as well for students. And we know these all too well and how we can support students in terms of their enrollment at IU. So the future, future opportunity here for support initiatives, is circled around all of these students that we invited here to give them an opportunity to get an IU education, and then how can we support them? Support them, academic and programmatic support. What is that? What is needed in that space? Additional scholarship funding for low-income students so we don't have students with unmet or we reduce the number of students with unmet need. Helping students not directly admitted successfully find a major. We have conversations about that happening right now. Sarah and Sacha are in conversation with colleagues about programming and support this spring for this cohort to help them make some decisions along with academic advising, of course, career coaching, and certainly faculty engagement is key there too. So, helping students navigate and find a major. And then finally, ensuring a sense of belonging is super important. Through all of this, we have to think about an equity lens and we have to think about social capital that students have and don't have and the opportunity to be engaged and connected. So, with that, I think I am able to go back to other slides and we're ready for the Q and A. Sorry for the fast power run-through. I did also want to say thank you to the EPC. I had that on my list and I just jumped in and failed to do so. Thank you to the EPC members here and those not here, particularly to Kelly and Brian for co-sharing. We've had two meetings with them about these reports and these data. And they've also helped us think about this a little bit differently and help tee this up for hopefully a good conversation today. Jason. Go ahead.

AGENDA ITEM TWELVE:

MCCOY: Hi, David. Thank you for your work and thank you, Sacha and Sarah for all that you do in the office of enrollment management and say hey to everyone over there for me. I do have two questions that I'd like to ask. What has been the impact of test optional on the students receiving gift aid? Have you seen an increased number of students who historically wouldn't have received gift aid? Particularly those from, say, some of our marginalized groups or even

rural counties. Because I know they've struggled to have higher test scores and so have we seen that increase?

JOHNSON: Yes, absolutely. In fact, in last year's report was the big lift because that was our first year being test optional. And so, we had more underrepresented students. We had more women, more residents receiving scholarships, and in some cases, doubling the number of students receiving those scholarships. And so, it has been significant because we've taken a test that you took maybe once or twice out of the mix. And so, what we didn't discuss here today, but those who've been around know we're test excluded in our scholarship arena, because if you're test optional and a large percentage of your students are choosing not to give you a test for admissions, then how can you use tests in scholarships? That seems very unfair. So we are very focused on the academic performance of students in high school and through admissions, and Sacha and her team have just done a tremendous job looking at the high school performance measure. And we look at the students in that regard for scholarships as well. And it has really paid off tremendously in terms of increasing students who have access to academic scholarships.

MCCOY: Wonderful. That's great because if they receive an academic award, as it shows, they have a greater chance of being retained.

JOHNSON: Absolutely. Yes.

MCCOY: I'll withhold my other questions so other people have a chance.

SHRIVASTAV: Angie's been holding her hand up.

RAYMOND: I have two questions. Can you go back? I think it was slide number four. There was a visualization about goal setting and then actual class size.

JOHNSON: Yes.

RAYMOND: Yeah. I think, I think this visualization has a clear picture here that might be an unintended message. But in 2021, your goal was 9482 or something like that somewhere. So, when you look at the target of 8700, you've exceeded the goal, which I'm absolutely positive, is a wonderful thing. But then instead of going, Hey, can we manage that size? The goal was retained for the overachieving. And I think this visualization presents a very clear picture of something the faculty has been concerned about for a while. If we discover that we can survive a year of too many admissions, the number doesn't go back down with target setting. And I just want to point that out because it is something that we talk about a lot at times, and I think it's important to say that and I hope that that's just noticed. I had a second question but go ahead and answer. No, no, no. Go ahead and answer. But I didn't want it. I just wanted to point it out because I think my understanding is we're gonna be a lot more data-driven decision-making, which sort of makes me excited. But this visualization points out, you can't just go with sort of what the Kelly School does, whoo, bigger class size, and now we're like, all over campus. This is a visualization that demonstrates the mental health tragedy that's happening to some of our faculty quite honestly. I'm tired and so are my faculty and we can't keep increasing invention and survive. That's not on you, right? And congratulations for hitting your targets, because I could never pull that off.

JOHNSON: Yes, it's a collective target setting in the red. And then we worked to meet those and sometimes slightly overachieve in terms of those enrollment targets. I've been at IU for 15 years and well before I was here, those who've been around can recall these conversations over the years. And then I wanna get to the finer point you've made at the end, but that we, we don't have the capacity to handle a population of 7,000 or 7,500. So, we look at this. We talked with the deans. We work with the deans around these targets, but to bring this forward a bit beyond the past and where we are even right now. We're going to again, next year, have a similar target for next year, But then we will bring this back down. And over the next few years because that will help us with managing the class size, managing the academic performance of students, graduation rates. It will also help with all the capacity pieces that you have mentioned that could be on the margins, or very presently, a challenge. And so, we acknowledged that and know that we've been in discussion with the provost about this and we're looking forward to continuing to bring a large group of students, but maybe not quite as large to the campus. And so, to the finer point is not to continue to grow, grow, grow and 10,000, 11,000, it's going to be brought back down over time. And in the next few years you see that. There may be some pressures in the marketplace, I won't go too far on this, but we all know about the enrollment cliff that's coming in 2026 or fewer students. We all know that fewer students at the moment are choosing to go to college in the state of Indiana. And so, we worked really hard to make sure we have a good mix of residents and non-residents. And we will have, over the next year, a slightly large class, just like this year. And then the next year we will be working to bring that down.

RAYMOND: One other quick follow-up comes from a slide of your dissertation. Sorry, it was trauma inducing, it sounds like. So I remember the slide. I didn't see mental health up there and I wonder, how do you think that might impact? We've had other conversations here where we actually at one point in time, if I recall correctly, could not provide services for the students who actually needed the mental health assistance at times. And so, do you see that being critical?

JOHNSON: It's critical, and Sarah and Sasha can speak to the fact that they are having deep conversations with our colleagues and student affairs about this and an advising about this. So, this was not an exhaustive list. This was some of the quick hits that we see in the data, but absolutely there are many more variables that aren't on this list and that is certainly one of them. So, note taken and yes.

SCRIVASTAV: Ken.

DAU-SCHMIDT: Thanks. I just trying to understand exactly how this works when you don't have a standardized test. You talked about we focused more on the high school performance. Is that just GPA or is that also you have different ranks for different high schools. And then even if you do it among American high schools, I noticed, I mean, international students, a lot tend to opt for not having a test score, and I would think that that would be almost impossible to compare high school programs internationally.

JOHNSON: Yeah, I'll certainly let SaCha unpack this a little bit, but I will also just quickly kind of give a quick overview to say that we look at the students' high school academic preparation through the GPA that is presented from the high school, Then we look at the academic GPA, and

we also look at not excluding the outlet electives, And then we look at the students' opportunity to take advantage of dual enrollment, AP, IB, and those opportunities, And we weight all of that in terms of our consideration. Sacha, do you want to speak any further to this?

THIEME: I would say that's the summary of how we look at the academic record and how we equalize those academic records. When you have a million and one different high school curriculum designs out there. And then when we talk about holistic review, that's when we can start to look at a student's, the grade trends, we can look through the review of the essay, whether they've had traumatic experiences that they're articulating for us and whether that provides any clarity into the into the academic record or different changes. Leadership. We can also, are they working community service? All of the factors that are going into that review help us evaluate that. For international, they're doing a similar academic review. We choose really work, where possible, to have no light between our processes. So, they're looking at their academic records in a similar fashion.

DAU-SCHMIDT: Do they have AP courses in China?

THIEME: AP is, there will be more, we would see more IB, International Baccalaureate. We have International Baccalaureate in the States as well.

CAVAR: I was just wondering, our colleague from Kelley was complaining about large numbers, huge enrollment. And your number is of course amazing. But I am certain that this is not equally well distributed over the school or the university, right? So we would be happy about actually higher enrollment and some divisions. So you didn't break this down, but there's probably you'll probably have some resources where we could look this up. This will be helpful.

JOHNSON: Yes, and so one of our slides that we often sometimes do is kinda this circle slide that represents all of the different schools and the intended major on the part of students, and to your point that yes, Kelly is outsized in terms of the number of students, next then is the College, and then the rest of the campus and other schools. But Kelly does make up a big percentage of students interested in coming to IU. And as we think about directed mid and as we think about our scholarship approach, all of these pieces are opportunities to think about how we perhaps might adjust and change processes in the future. Working with the schools, working with the deans and their staff. Yeah.

THIEME: So we do monitor program movement very carefully and closely. So the, one of the unique features of our model is that students do have the opportunity to explore other programs and have extended time through university division and even through their advising and their schools to consider that. And so we have some of these students are gonna be floating into discovery programs. I say discovery because they had no exposure to them in high school. So that is a unique opportunity and we do through our messaging, through our recruitment, through our enrollment practices, are encouraging students to do that. So they may find the programs that want more.

SHRIVASTAV: Yes, sir.

BIELASIAK: This is very impressive and congratulations on your work. But I do have, I guess a concern about the quantity and quality problem. So we are driven by data points and numbers. And particularly in regard to retention, we know that has been a crisis over the last couple of years due to COVID, students are less engaged, they are experiencing mental health problems, they are taking W's in their 14th week of the semester. So what is sort of behind those numbers? What's the quality measure, the experience of the student in getting an education that benefits them, not only our university in terms of the numbers.

JOHNSON: Absolutely. You've pointed out the first opportunity there for us to maybe amplify more the academic support that students might need. And programmatic support, meaning mental health. It's very clear that the pandemic has been tremendously challenging to many of us. And many of us have had to care for family members while taking care of work and business and other family members. There's people sandwiched in-between generations of care. So, but for our students, I will say the opportunity for an academic support is going to be enhanced as we think about our academic planning in terms of strategic planning. And that's the kinds of conversations that Sarah is working fast and furious to align student affairs with undergraduate advising with first-year experience, which is in enrollment management.

BOOHER: Yes, I could just add that. I'm serving on the Strategic Planning Committee for Retention and Graduation. What you asked is a very robust conversation of that group in terms of looking at both who is admitted and the support they have. But then the growth of the freshmen class each year without similar growth and the support on campus to help those students retain and then graduate. So that, that is very much being discussed right now in our conversations and recommendations for the executive committee of the strategic plan to consider.

STRIVASTAV: Thank you, Sarah. Colin.

JOHNSON (COLIN): David, I'm wondering in terms of the metrics I think that really matter to faculty, I mean, there are many metrics that matter, but one of them certainly that I think concerns a lot of us is retention. So I'm wondering if you could speak to, presumably you collect data on when we don't retain students, why we don't retain students, and where they go, why they'd go? I'm wondering if you could speak a little bit about what you know about that.

JOHNSON (DAVID): Sure, yeah, Colin, absolutely. And these data here kind of point to who we do not retain. I mean, some of the examples, but we can also then look at the academic performance of these students. But we have all those data and we will, those are the pieces that we looked at. This was just the highest-level kind of view for you to see. But to the point of where to students go, they typically gravitate to institutions in their home state if they are out-of-state students, or if they're residents, they'll choose any of the institutions within the state with one up the road being a primary one that that might transfer into, and including our own regional campuses, they may go back there. So we watch these data as well as where students go if they don't even enroll here. So we look at it from the retention side, we look at it from the who did we lose side in terms of enrollment game. These data are super informative to the variables that impact student retention. One of the things Sarah is talking with colleagues about too, is an exit survey. We don't really have a clean, solid exit survey process for students here. You could exit

through student affairs; you could exit through talking to your academic advisor, you could exit by just exiting, just by leaving the residence hall and you're done. So there's a variety of swirl of students who just kind of exit the institution. So if we could get a stronger handle on that, again, working with our colleagues and Advising and Student Affairs and RPS, all of that will be much more streamlined.

BOOHER: Yes. I've only been in my existing role for a handful of months, and one of the first things I said to David is there's a huge gap here in our knowledge base of who leaves and why they leave. We can see the characteristics that we already know of these students and be able to say, okay, of the 9% of students who left at the end of the first year, here's what we know about them. What we don't know is why they left, and we can't analyze data we don't have. And so that is a high priority. We have a lot of I keep saying: that's a high priority. A lot of things we're very excited to pursue.

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you. Chase, you had a second question. I want to bring it back to you before we end.

MCCOY: Thank you. Of that number of 9,000, what is it, 9,736 or something like that. I'm curious how many of those are international, because it's my understanding that we also hit record for total number of international students. And where is that population coming from?

JOHNSON: Yes, it's 571 where the freshmen who are international students this year.

MCCOY: Has that, has where they're coming from changed.

JOHNSON: We talk with our colleagues IN international. And one thing that is, yes, absolutely. Because if you've been at IU for a while, or anywhere in higher ed in this country, you remember coming out of the recession of 2008, many institutions relied on China as a place where we grew our student, international student population, and we did so for a number of years. Geopolitics changes things a bit, and as this is kind of the South Korea model. I'll quickly unpack that. And you may recall this that a number of years ago, South Korea was the top number of students coming here, and to higher ed from other places. They built their own institutions; they created their own higher-ed landscape and research and faculty strength. And so not as large of a number of students from South Korea, and China is starting to do that, too. And so international admissions has worked very hard to diversify their recruitment with that lens, knowing that story would be repeating itself. So I will say India has been a country that we have been very pleased with our enrollment. We also work to have diverse enrollment from a number of countries throughout each year.

SHRIVASTAV: I think we have one minute left. If there's no question, we can give it back to you.

JOHNSON: I will end maybe on a more note of levity. How about that? Because my team knows I'm pretty serious minded and not too much levity. I don't tell too many jokes, I don't start meetings with jokes or anything, but I'll end in thirty-seconds here with this summary. In a vice provosts' meeting, I quoted something out of Teen Vogue and I said, I never read Teen Vogue.

but there was a great piece, a stat, and now I have never in my life read the magazine, Town and Country, but someone sent me an article, I think maybe my husband's send it to me. He doesn't read it either, but he saw it in Apple News, and I'm just going to read the headline here because I think it's important: Southern Exposure: college applicants, including those from liberal North enclaves, are flocking traditional southern schools where the vibe is more rah, rah than radical reckoning. Is it a new front in the culture wars, or just a twist in the overheated admission cycle? And it wasn't super-researched article or anything, but I will tell you it was a nicely written article and it had some really interesting stories and it played both sides of what's, quotes by students and all of that. So hey, if you have a few minutes and want to read something nonacademic Town and Country is your...

UNKNOWN: We're with that.

JOHNSON: Yeah. So, I mean, we're always following the Chronicle and Inside Higher Ed and Diversity Inc. and all of those trends and all the competitive data. But I just wanted to share that for a little fun levity. And I will say at, the reason I kinda thought of it is, we are the southernmost Big Ten institution. And so, we can have the mix of some rah, rah, but strong academics as well. I'll turn it back.

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you very much. Meeting stands adjourned.