

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
January 16, 2024 | 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Presidents Hall – Franklin Hall

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anderson, Dana; Asher, Sofiya; Bala, Hillol; Brinda, Chelsea; Buggenhagen, Beth; Butters, Rebecca; Cavar, Damir; Chen, Xin; Cohen, Rachel; Daleke, David; Dekydtspotter, Lori; DeMaine, Susan; DeSawal, Danielle; Docherty, Carrie; Eaton, Kristine; Freedman, Seth; Furey, Constance; Gahl-Mills, Karen; Giordano, Anthony; Grogg, Jane Ann; Hamre, Kristin; Herrera, Israel; Hojas Carbonell, Virginia; Housworth, Elizabeth; Ivanovitch, Roman; Johnson, Colin; Kravitz, Ben; Lalwani, Ashok; Lanosga, Gerry; Lion, Margaret; Loring, Annette; McCoy, Chase; Michaelson, Jonathan; O’Brien, Travis; Paschal, Joshua; Perry, Brea; Ramos, William; Reck, Cathrine; Rutkowski, Leslie; Sapp, Christopher; Sela, Ron; Shrivastav, Rahul; Silvester, Katie; Sinadinos, Alison; Tanford, Alex; Thomassen, Lisa; Torres, Vasti; Tracey, Dan; van der Elst, Louis; Whitworth, Cale; Wyczynski, Stephen

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ahlbrand, Ashley; Bridges, Chandler; Cole, Shu; Dalkilic, Mehmet; Dau-Schmidt, Kenneth; Eskew, Kelly; Koda, Marsha; Kubow, Patricia; Lammers, Sabine; Lochmiller, Chad; Mather, Tim; Northcutt Bohmert, Miriam; Raji, Aaliyah; Raymond, Angie; Siek, Jeremy; Terry, Herbert; Walton, Christi; White, Tameka

GUESTS: Arthos, John; Barbieux, Eavy; Dabrowski, Andrew; Dayhoff, DeeDee; Diekman, Amanda; Graber, Kathryn; Hardesty, Julie; Jaques, Kevin; Kreilkamp, Ivan; Lepselter, Susan; Lester, Jessica; Miles, Emily; Quill, Theresa; Romero, Ursula; Ryan, Colleen; Ryan, Katherine; Seigel, Micol; Van Gucht, Dirk; Walbridge, John

Agenda

1. **Approval of the minutes of November 14, 2023**
 2. **Memorial Resolution for Fred McElroy**
 3. **Executive Committee Business** (10 minutes)
Colin Johnson, Faculty President
 4. **Presiding Officer’s Report** (10 minutes)
Rahul Shrivastav, Provost
 5. **Question/Comment Period** (10 minutes)
Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to Provost Shrivastav or President Johnson by emailing bfcoff@indiana.edu. Questions should be submitted no less than two business days before the meeting.
 6. **New Policy on Tenure and Promotion** (15 minutes)
Jessica Lester, Co-chair, Faculty Affairs Committee
Katherine Ryan, Co-chair, Faculty Affairs Committee
[Discussion Item]
- B14-2024: Indiana University Bloomington Principles and Policies on Tenure and Promotion
7. **Questions/Comments on Policy on Tenure and Promotion** (10 minutes)

8. **Updates from the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee** (15 minutes)
Julie Hardesty, Co-chair, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee
Erin Wyatt, Co-chair, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee
9. **Questions/Comments on Updates from the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee** (10 minutes)
10. **Updates from the Graduate School** (15 minutes)
David Daleke, Dean of the Indiana University Bloomington Graduate School and Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Health Sciences
11. **Questions/Comments on Updates from the Graduate School** (10 minutes)

Transcript

Shrivastav ([00:03:27](#)):

Ready to go. Okay. Alright. Good afternoon. We have quorum. Let's get this meeting started. Thank you everybody for joining us. As we always do. We will begin first with approval of the minutes from the November 14th, 2023 meeting. If we have a motion to approve that. Motion to approve anyone to second it. Second it. Thank you. All in favor of approving the minutes as written. Looks unanimous. Thank you. Minutes are approved. We will go on to the next item, which is a memorial resolution for our colleague, former colleague Fred McElroy. I invite Carrie Docherty VPFAA to read that memorial out.

Docherty ([00:04:21](#)):

Thank you. Frederick L. McElroy retired from Indiana University Bloomington as an admired and dedicated instructor and deeply committed to the citizen of his department and the university. He left a lasting signature on the teaching and service scrolls of distinction in the Department of African-American and African diaspora studies. Fred was born in January 16th, 1950 in Louisville, Kentucky and graduated in 1972 from Brown University with a concentration in American civilization. He received his PhD in English and American Studies from Indiana University in 1987. He was appointed assistant professor and then Afro-American Studies that same year. By the end of his tenure, Fred had taught or developed nine different courses offered at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The topics ranged from Afro-American Autobiography introduction to Afro-American Studies and Black Intellectual Traditions. He won at least four teaching excellence recognition awards. There are many test testimonies to his abilities and his ability to connect with his students.

([00:05:46](#)):

The following is just one example of an expert from a department doctoral degree holder and a current tenure track assistant professor. What I admired about Dr. McElroy was his ability to steer the minds of his students across unexplored territories, challenging them to critically examine the social, economic and political factors that shaped the black experience. Dr. McElroy's devotion to empowering his students to navigate the complexities of our world continues to inspire me as I embark on my journey as an educator and mentor. Fred served on 22 graduate research committees eight as chair. He was at different times the director of undergraduate studies, director of graduate studies, an invaluable contributor as a member of the MA planning committee. He was a member of the Collins Living Learning Center's curriculum Committee and for 10 years he served on the selections committee for the college's individualized majors program. Fred was often called upon to deliver department history in public settings. He was able to place the establishment and development of the department in the context of an earlier national black studies movement in the late 1960s and early 1970s. He was adept at tracing and evaluating the evolution of programs, departments, institutes, and graduate programs. In some, he

was able to demonstrate the uniqueness of the African-American and African Diaspora studies department in terms both specific and broad. Dr. McElroy died July 11th, 2018. He's missed by colleagues, former students and friends who carry on his legacy of dedication and excellence.

Shrivastav ([00:07:43](#)):

Thank you. Carrie. If you are able, please stand for a moment to silence and remembrance of Fred McElroy. Thank you. We will now move forward with our regular business and we begin with an executive committee business report from faculty president Colin Johnson. Colin,

Johnson ([00:08:21](#)):

Thank you first just a quick housekeeping matter for members of the council. We are coming up on the time in our calendar when the time has come to start thinking about the election of a new president elect and so ballots will be going out to members of the council in fairly shortly, so please keep an eye out for those and be thinking about whether or not you'd be willing to accept a nomination or who you'd like to nominate for the position. It's a challenging job but a very important one and so I would strongly encourage everyone to seriously consider involving themselves in the shared governance process in that way.

([00:09:01](#)):

Before I turn to my prepared comments this afternoon, which I'll be offering in lieu of a more routine report on executive committee business, I want to take a moment to wish everyone a belated Happy New Year and to welcome you back to part two of AY 23-24. As anyone with any degree of sense will readily acknowledge, I think these are challenging times for multiple reasons and even as the world continues to try to exhaust us, it is imperative especially for our students' sake, that we do our best to maintain a sense of optimism about what we are capable of when we work together in good faith. With that having been said, it will undoubtedly come as little surprise to anyone present at today's meeting that the bulk of my own and the executive committee's time and energy over the past few weeks has been claimed by two events that have garnered constable public attention in the local and national press.

([00:09:49](#)):

The first is the administrative disposition of a disciplinary case involving one of our colleagues. The second is the cancellation of a public exhibition that was supposed to take place at the Eskenazi Museum of Art beginning next month. Before I say anything else regarding either of these matters, I want to assure members of the council and our faculty colleagues generally that neither of these occurrences have gone unnoticed or uncommented upon by myself or other members of the council's leadership. Indeed, I have personally spent hours and indeed whole days over the past several weeks engaging with campus leaders to try to make sense of what has been reported publicly to try to give voice to what I understand faculty concerns regarding these reports to be and to try to think through potential paths forward. Much of that work has taken place behind the scenes as it should for various reasons, so I wouldn't necessarily expect people to be aware of it, but I do want to assure everyone that it has been happening.

([00:10:40](#)):

I also want to remind everyone that there is distinct virtue value for the faculty's own purposes to allowing elected representatives the time and space that is often required to do such work just as there is value to striving to maintain open lines of communication and collaboration between the faculty and campus leaders to it and with regard to the first recent controversy, despite the impression I'm sure

many people understandably have that I am best positioned to be interceding in complicated matters related to individual faculty members by virtue of the degree of access I temporarily enjoy to various academic administrators. It's important for everyone to understand that in many regards, I'm actually the person least well positioned to be doing so, particularly if people expect me to defend the procedural affordances and basic integrity of policies adopted under the auspices of this council's authority. Put simply I cannot on the one hand argue for the rectitude and indispensability of procedures that vest specific committees with the responsibility to consider controversies involving faculty and a thoughtful even handed fact-based way and then on the other hand, inject myself directly into extra procedurally into the business of trying to mediate such disputes.

[\(00:11:53\)](#):

I certainly cannot arrogate to myself the right to adjudicate them in any substantive sense. This is particularly true given the fact that unlike review committees which enjoy certain investigative prerogatives related to their charges, I'm no more entitled to be collecting evidence related to a specific case by interviewing people or rifling through personnel files to content myself that my understanding of a particular case is correct than any other faculty member is I am however responsible and perhaps uniquely so for insisting upon the ethical rectitude and indispensability of policies and procedures promulgated under the faculty's authority and for demonstrating our collective investment in orderly procedural through my own measured behavior. For that reason, I will not be commenting directly this afternoon on the substance of any particular case lest I do anything to create the impression that faculty are prone to rush to judgment content, to dispense with orderly process when their ire is raised however justifiably or simply hypocritical, we are not.

[\(00:12:55\)](#):

Believe me though when I say that there are many forces at work in the world today that would love an example they could cite as proof that such claims are well founded, I will not give it to them. That does not mean that I have nothing to say about the procedural questions. Recent controversies have raised in many people's minds regarding the state of university and campus level policies governing the adjudication of claims related to faculty conduct. However, irrespective of the particularities or merits of any specific case, that procedural question that has emerged in multiple fora over the course of the past few weeks and that has been directed to me by multiple parties is essentially the question of whether BL ACA-D27, which is the Bloomington Campus's policy on faculty disciplinary procedures continues to have meaningful force in the wake of recently approved revisions to a ACA-33, which is the university level policy on academic appointee responsibilities and conduct, particularly given the inclusion in that revision of a preparatory qualification in the scope section stating that as a university level policy ACA-33 supersedes any provisions in campus personal misconduct policies that are inconsistent with it.

[\(00:14:07\)](#):

Even as another provision of ACA-33 provision 5-E explicitly states that a campus faculty governance organization IE in our case, this body may have a policy that includes the involvement of a faculty advisory board in the decision to impose severe sanctions. Faculty are understandably eager to know the answer to this question because in lieu of the existence and recognition of such a campus level policy, ACA-33 could be read to authorize certain administrators to investigate allegations of professional misconduct, make findings of fact and impose what the policy refers to as common or severe sanctions without ever having to bring the matter before a duly constituted review committee in which faculty accused or professional misconduct would be afforded the opportunity to defend themselves against such allegations. Given the fact that severe sanctions per the revised language of ACA-33 include suspension with or without pay, salary reduction, loss of privileges, prohibition against

participation in certain classes or activities or involuntary termination, the general implications for faculty of how these policies sit relative to one another are undeniably profound.

[\(00:15:23\)](#):

This is especially true in light of the provision in the constitution of the faculty which explicitly affords faculty legislative authority over appointment promotion and tenure compensation conduct and discipline and grievances of campus faculty consistent with university faculty standards and for those of you who are interested, that is in the constitution of the faculty Section 2.1 A.F. This is the thicket of policy language and questions about the implementation of policy As a general matter that the executive committee waded into at its first meeting of the new semester last Tuesday, given time constraints, there is no way that I can possibly reproduce the substance of that discussion in this context, although I can attest to the fact that it was indeed substantive. What I can report on the executive committee's behalf however, is that collectively members were unable to come to a strong consensus on the reading of how these two policies currently sit relative to one another, at least as they're expressed at the level of the sentence in the word members of the executive committee did unanimously agree on two things.

[\(00:16:32\)](#):

However, first and perhaps most importantly, there is not a universe in which the faculty of this campus would wittingly turn over to a single appointed administrator the right or the responsibility to impose disciplinary sanctions on faculty up to and including involuntary termination without the involvement of a duly constituted review committee made up of faculty. Indeed, I think there was broad consensus that I think there was broad consensus that had those involved in the business of policymaking at the campus level been aware that university level revisions to ACA-33 could be read as nullifying BL ACAD-27 whether in toto or in substantial part revising BL ACAD-27 to explicitly reaffirm its general applicability under provision five E of ACA-33 and to bring into any arguably discrepant dimensions of it into alignment with ACA-33 would've been everybody's top priority in order, sorry, I just don't think it ever occurred to anyone that the supremacy what might be referred to as the supremacy clause included in the revised version of ACA-33 would be read that way in order to clarify the situation for everyone's benefit, we have referred BL ACAD-27 to the Faculty Affairs Committee for immediate review and inundation with an eye towards reaffirming its applicability.

[\(00:17:59\)](#):

I expect to receive those proposed revisions shortly, at which point they will be brought to this council for discussion and a vote. To be honest, I suspect these clarifying revisions will be welcomed as much by various campus administrators as they will be by rank and file faculty members. The second thing that members of the executive committee agreed on is that the first matter aside and even as recently revised ACA-33 does currently afford faculty a sound mechanism to contest sanctions imposed against them on substantive or procedural grounds. This is provision six under the procedure section of ACA-33, which clearly states academic appointees adversely affected by administrative action taken against them for violating this policy or whose rights under this policy have been denied. Have the right to a campus faculty Board of review while we are amending existing policies to clarify their intent.

[\(00:18:50\)](#):

Then my general advice to all my colleagues would be this, if anyone feels that they have been unfairly sanctioned by a campus level administrator or sanctioned in a procedurally irregular way, they should raise that concern fulsome before the Faculty Board of Review. Bearing in mind that FBR is a different body than the Faculty Misconduct Review Committee, I understand that some people are likely to find this advice unsatisfying, but let me tell you why I think it is the best counsel that can be offered at the

moment as well as why ultimately I think it serves the faculty's interest best in the longer term. Our systems of institutional government resemble in many respects other systems of governance in which powers are intentionally separated. The way powers are separated is not like the way powers are separated in the US federal government. However, for example, among other differences, we do not have courts to adjudicate competing claims over the meaning and circumstantially specific applicability of our policies. We actually kind of do, but if you knew who it was, you probably wouldn't like the answer.

[\(00:20:03\):](#)

What we have is what I hope is a shared ethical belief in the capacity of purposeful, thoughtful fact-based procedural wisdom to help us resolve contentious issues in a way that everyone can accept. Faculty involvement in these processes isn't just about sharing decision making power with appointed administrators. It is also about sharing ethical responsibility. If ACA-33 as revised provided no means for faculty who feel they have had severe sanctions imposed against them unfairly or in a procedurally irregular way including as a result of cramped or inaccurate readings of policies to appeal their cases or to make their cases, then I would probably feel some license to insist on certain readings of the applicability of our policies as they relate to specific cases. I might also feel licensed to insist on administrative intervention to rectify perceived procedural irregularities, but since ACA-33 does provide a procedurally irregular remedy to address other contr controversies regarding the applicability of policies and procedures, I feel less considerably sanguine that insisting is the right way for us to go.

[\(00:21:13\):](#)

In this case, bottom line, at least in my estimation, we cannot stand on the sanctity and ethical superiority of orderly procedural wisdom that involves thoughtful, serious work by our colleagues who serve on duly constituted review committees and then demand the controversies over the interpretations of policies as they apply to specific cases be resolved by administrative fiat. As satisfying as such interventionism might feel if it yielded an outcome that people felt was just in one instance, it would set a terrible precedent, so that's controversy number one, where the second recent controversy is concerned the controversy surrounding the institution's decision to cancel the planned Halaby retrospective. I will leave it to Provost Shrivastav to answer questions about that. What I can report is that to my knowledge, no elected member of the faculty leadership was consulted prior to that decision being made. I know I wasn't. If I had been, I can assure you that I would've underscored as if I needed to the potential cost to the institution's reputation of erring on the side of caution due to public safety concerns even if such concerns are entirely sincere.

[\(00:22:23\):](#)

If the primary concern in this instance as has been reported was the institution's inability to ensure the safety of the art itself over the exhibition's plan duration as has been reported, I would also have strongly encouraged university leadership to explore the possibility of mounting the exhibit personally virtually rather than simply canceling it. Although I should note I have not talked to anyone involved with the exhibit in that, so I'm probably getting ahead of my skis since that is itself a great deal of work which they might or might not be interested in doing this because what is at stake in this exhibition, indeed any exhibition is not just the speech and expression of the artist and artist in general, which should itself be a matter of paramount concern to everyone, but also the speech and the expression of the scholars, curators and professional staff who work tirelessly over the course of years to surround works of art with precisely the sort of context needed so that they can be better understood. But again, I would like to give Provost Shrivastav the opportunity to explain the circumstances surrounding this matter in his own words since it is precisely explanation that I think many people are seeking at the moment and expecting.

Shrivastav (00:23:31):

Thank you, Colin. Appreciate your comments and yes, I'll address both of those here. The next item is the presiding officer's report and I will proceed with that. Good afternoon, happy New Year. Welcome back. I hope you've had a relaxing and wonderful break and as the new semester sets off, I know you are getting busy with your classes and research. Clearly we've hit the ground running and I know this is a difficult time for all of us. Ordinarily I give campus updates at this meeting at the beginning of my report, but in light of all these issues and the limited time we have in lieu of regular campus updates today, which I will share with our faculty online, I want to address the critical topics that Colin has raised here and others including the several questions we have received through since our November meeting. As I know there may be questions and discussions from this group as well, I would ask Colin and our parliamentarian, Rachel, if we may combine and extend my remarks and the Q&A portion of our agenda as needed while saving sufficient time for finishing other items on the agenda.

(00:24:49):

I see both of them nodding, so we'll take that as approval and move forward with that.

(00:24:56):

I emphasize again here this forum is the deliberative setting where we can talk through important and sometimes challenging or contentious issues both for our faculty staff and students and for campus as a whole, and while we may not always agree, I trust we honor each other's perspectives and assume that we all have the best of intentions for my part from our work together. Over the past two years, I'm assured all of us in this room want what's best for IU Bloomington, our faculty, staff, students, and our shared future. Surely as I do myself, I ask all of us to grant that grace accordingly. I would frame my comments and responses to the many questions we have received over the last few weeks on three topical areas. While each of these are large topics, we will cover each to the extent possible and we can schedule additional follow-up conversations in this setting as needed.

(00:26:02):

The first broad topic is affirming our commitment to all members of our community, particularly our Palestinian Arab and Muslim community members. The second broad topic relates to affirming our commitment to academic freedom, artistic expression, and to open inquiry, and the third broad set of topics is affirming our commitment to faculty governance. I will cover each of these in turn and then open it up for additional questions as time may permit. And Rachel, I know you're always great at keeping close track of time. First and foremost, let me say this plainly and loudly as I can. As an institution and a Bloomington campus as leaders and members of this community, we are endless in our commitments to the wellbeing, success and overall wellbeing of all members of our community to the academic freedom, artistic expression and to open inquiry and to our longstanding traditions and structures of faculty governance.

(00:27:12):

These are and these are and endure as core values of the institution and above all, we must protect what makes us us. That does not mean it'll be easy. That does not mean we will always agree on what's the best way to do that or whether this is a simple path forward or even that all the factors in any given decision may be widely known either today or for a long time to come or forever. While it may be easier in some ways to be fully transparent about the full facts in every case for the whole community to know and understand things from the get-go in practice, that's not always possible sometimes for legal or security reasons or they are not ideal from a reputational or relational standpoint or they're simply not practical at scale with the sheer scope, size and the pace at which this institution must operate, I have always said and have shared the same with our deans and our senior leaders, including with the BFC

presidents and the executive committee that I will share what I'm able to as I will do today, but we should all remember that sometimes the best decision may be the better of two or more bad choices and without the full picture or filling in our own gaps, it may be easy to rush to judgments in ways that don't honor the complexity of many of the issues we are working through today, a community and the world in assuming the best intentions of each other.

[\(00:28:57\)](#):

We understand we may not fully agree with every outcome based on what we do or do not know in the end, however, we must be united in protecting what makes us us and work together towards our highest values as an institution, knowing for sure that this will not always be a smooth ride. When it comes to affirming our commitment to all members of our community, particularly our Palestinian Arab and Muslim community members. I understand fully this includes both words and deed. I have been disheartened as I'm sure many of you have been by many of the headlines in social media about IU on this point over the past week. Many of those stories and commentaries have not reflected on who I think we are. While there are tremendous differences of opinion amongst members of our community on the heartbreaking conflicts in the Middle East, irreconcilable, so I think of us as a community that is always welcomed and encouraged everyone regardless of their beliefs and background. Over the past few months, this has clearly been put to challenge as it has across the entire country.

[\(00:30:22\)](#):

Some have felt safety and security, the most fundamental of human needs and our very first obligation as an institution to be at risk in these times of need, members of impacted communities have reached out for response and action. As I have shared previously with this group, President Whitten and I as well as numerous other university leaders have met with IU faculty, staffs students, alumni donors, and others of all backgrounds related to the current conflicts in the Middle East, Jewish and Israeli, Palestinian, Arab and Muslim, so many of our community members have personally shared with us the deep loss, anger, hurt and fear along with specific incidents on campus ongoing into this semester, this heartbreaking time continues to bring. As you can imagine, we have also heard the widest range imaginable of ideas on what the university should do or not do, say or not say, how we should respond or not respond, how best to live out our core values as a community.

[\(00:31:36\)](#):

Over the recent months, we have taken numerous steps to ensure the safety and wellbeing of our community. Our staff continues to support student organizations and meet directly with students. We remain focused on acting swiftly to respond and support students who make a bias report, including supporting students in our Israeli and Jewish communities as well as our Palestinian and Arab communities. And throughout the fall semester, we have provided increased security and public safety resources across campus still with newly publicized stories. Some now question the strength of our support for the Palestinian Arab and Muslim community. Others have questioned whether university actions come in response to pressure from external stakeholders, several particularly referencing a fall letter we received from one of our public officials. Others have posed questions about the mission and purpose of the campus antisemitism advisory board, which we convened in 2022 far prior to the current geopolitical challenges with recommendations and participation from faculty, from administrators, as well as community leaders.

[\(00:32:58\)](#):

While I'm not able to speak about any individual disciplinary case, much as Colin referenced as a personnel matter and I will speak more about other circumstances shortly, let me confirm that all decisions in the matters at hand were made independently by university officials. In consideration of all

the factors involved as is our responsibility as well as our precedent, our aim has been straightforward. If not simple, our aim is to ensure that safety, wellbeing and success of all our community members remains our priority. While we continue to work closely with and respond to our legislative leaders on any requests and have met those several times, including most recently in November with our antisemitism advisory board, we continue to work independently through each circumstance we face on a case by case basis in all. We remain dogged in our commitment to ensure we create the best living, working and learning environment possible for all members of our community.

[\(00:34:13\)](#):

So to our Arab and Muslim identifying faculty member who wrote recently asking whether she would be treated fairly or supported at IU, I say, welcome. We are thrilled you have made IU your home. Your new colleagues and I will do everything in our power to support you in your life and in your career, and I know we will. The second broad topic is affirming our commitment to academic freedom, to artistic expression and to open inquiry. As faculty, the full freedom of instruction and exposition and expression of a subject is one of our most cherished and fundamental responsibilities and values. And I know to many faculty it is one of our values that is constantly under attack. Academic freedom, like a constitutional right to freedom of speech means by nature there will be objectionable content, even objectively objectionable content as part of our public discourse. It is a guarantee that not everyone will like what every faculty member may have to say or create, but we believe we should have the freedom to do so to pursue truth and knowledge wherever that may lead.

[\(00:35:35\)](#):

At IU, our campus is a place where debate and dissent are not only encouraged but cherished aims of our mission. So when it comes to restricting academic or creative freedom, much like free speech even for issues of safety and security, the bar is exceptionally high. At the same time, the realities in our world today are no less pressing. We are acutely aware of the repeated tragic acts of violence in our schools and on our campuses when there are hotly contested issues, contentious issues, and I think current happenings in the Middle East certainly qualify. Emotions run even hotter and the safety and security consideration must come even more to the fore. In the case of events led by members of our community, we make every effort possible to allow events to happen as organizers hope. We have extensive processes in place that encourage and support community members in planning ahead, thinking through logistics of each event and any potential contingency or controversial aspects that may draw special attention either from members of our own community or particularly for those from the outside and these content neutral policies and practices and the people executing them work exceptionally well.

[\(00:37:05\)](#):

We have literally thousands of events and all different types of all different types and content from performances and athletic events to lectures and student meetings all over campus across the year and nearly all of them come off seamlessly. This works to the point where it's almost easy to take it for granted, but the reality is with almost any public event on campus today, we are regularly consulting with public safety officials. It is not all that infrequent that there are specific plans developed to make sure sometimes elaborate safety precautions are in place and responses readied in case of needed action. We are constantly working with our partners in the city, in the state, and even federal law enforcement and government for the wellbeing of all of IU's campuses for events with controversial topics. At IUB, we also have a dedicated demonstration response and safety team, DRST, you might have heard of that acronym.

[\(00:38:14\)](#):

Often these are trained staff members who serve as an onsite resource to help ensure free expression both for participants of the events and those who may come in dissent. It is not infrequent that plainclothes officers or other security staff are assigned to events as an extra safeguard and that in fact may be the reason why many of our events go off as seamlessly as they appear. As I said earlier, our first obligation is to ensure that this community is safe and while we may not always, hopefully rarely see it, there is a tremendous amount of work in the background to ensure the faculty's right to academic freedom and creative expression is protected and our community members' right to free speech is honored that safety is what ultimately allows the freedoms that we all cherish so dearly. I would add here that our policies and practices regarding events are purposefully and entirely content neutral.

[\(00:39:22\)](#):

Whatever the content of the event, the key question is how can we protect the safety and the rights of the participants? So when it comes to recent Palestine student group events in November, which has been reported widely on, I would clarify that the event was not in fact canceled and restrictions had nothing to do with the content beyond its expected demand on safety resources as it included a potentially controversial speaker. There were two other previously scheduled large events on campus that evening and significant security commitments made to both of those. And because the event organizers did not follow our policies or plan in advance, it was determined that the needs of that event could not be met by security at the place and the time that the planners had hoped for. As with other events of potential high visibility and risk, I was made aware and the group was formally asked to reschedule the event for another time.

[\(00:40:30\)](#):

The planners went ahead with the event bringing exactly the risk to the community. We try very hard to avoid. We were fortunate that night that it did not escalate to any level. That became a matter of concern in the case of the planned exhibit of the Palestinian artist Samia Halaby at the Eskenazi Museum scheduled to begin next month. The same type of assessment was involved. This exhibit had been in development including with IU partners for some three years, so it was not at all unexpected or the content of Ms. Halaby's art and the nature of her personal statements and beliefs unknown. However, recent events certainly recast the setting and the stakes as you see across the country college campuses as some of the most diverse intellectual communities on earth and are a particular and visible flashpoint in these international debates. Beginning with the contentious public event at the sample gates in October, which drew hundreds of outside people to our campus and nearly ended in violence to a series of subsequent protests and rallies on several IU campuses, we have been on heightened alert to events and gatherings here that might galvanize the competing parties and become a rallying point in a way that compromises the safety of our community members and our safety resources regardless of the content of the art or the background or perspectives of the artist involved.

[\(00:42:09\)](#):

When this decision on the exhibit was made in December, we had every reason to expect this could become an especially controversial event at this historical moment and by design it would be located in the same place in the center of the campus for three months much of this spring semester. So in this case, we had clearly competing values. We had an exciting W exhibit of a major international abstract artist and alumna three years in the making. We also had a potential lightning rod at a charge political moment that might draw ongoing or major protests and require significant and long-term security we would need for hundreds of other events. I know the outcome is especially disappointing for many, including the curator and her team in the museum who have worked on the exhibit over several years. I fully understand the concerns raised, believe me, no one involved was unaware or surprised by what's happened since or that we are not having this conversation.

[\(00:43:19\)](#):

In our view, this was one of those cases where we had no good options as we are talking about academic freedom, I would also address happenings related to the Kinsey Institute, which I know is an expressed concern for many this week. In fact, tomorrow a special working group I charged will host listening sessions on campus. We have, I believe more than 150 participants registered and I encourage all to share your perspectives and concerns about how we best continue the legacy of Kinsey at IU while complying with the new state laws. As with other issues we are discussing here today, we are deeply committed to protect what makes us us. The questions again is how the Kinsey Institute and the collections are and will remain an integral part of IU and a visible marker of our commitment to academic freedom. While we have and will continue to explore all possible outcomes options, it is evident that some change, those which likely go beyond simple accounting measures will be necessary.

[\(00:44:36\)](#):

The final version of that will be up to the board of trustees, but please know all the concerns the group hears will be taken into account to the fullest extent possible. Everyone involved understands the stakes and potential impact on IU and wants what best wants what's best for us to move forward. In the final broad area, which is affirming our commitment to faculty governance, I will particularly address questions that have emerged on faculty discipline and the disciplinary process. I have said often before and repeat here, leadership of this institution is a mutual endeavor. As the campus's chief academic leader and a fellow faculty member, I deeply honored the faculty's expertise and autonomy in shaping the academic experience. I'm fortunate to work with you and support these efforts including this council as the faculty's elected representatives. This includes matter of faculty discipline and disciplinary processes. In just a minute, I want to invite Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Carrie Docherty to explain more fully on how faculty complaints are handled currently so we all fully understand the process, but just so we are clear about the context.

[\(00:46:00\)](#):

As you all know, faculty policy created by this body along with the university faculty Council provides standards and procedures to ensure all academic appointees employed by IU are held to the same standards of responsibility and conduct. These are your policies that administrators and leaders are implementing based on interpretation as well as precedent. Now I understand well, and as Colin has just described, not everyone may agree with those interpretations. There may also be disagreement on what happens in any given case, depending on what details may become known outside the participants. I will emphasize with any of the current disciplinary policies, faculty found responsible have the right to appeal any decision or sanctions offered, and that appeal process includes a panel of faculty peers in the case of ACA-33 that is the Faculty Board of Review. It is a myth that faculty disciplinary actions or sanctions may not be heard by a panel of faculty.

[\(00:47:20\)](#):

The question is whether that happens prior to the sanctions being issued as is supported by one policy or on as is supported by another policy in new cases that may come in on appeal if the Faculty Board of review feels a given policy has not been followed appropriately and makes that recommendation to me, for example, to refer a matter to campus policy, that campus policy which may involve the faculty misconduct Committee instead of or in addition to their review. I am happy and I'm committing here today that I will act on that recommendation as appropriate because I am a decision maker in the line of appeals in most disciplinary matters, I attempt to stay at arm's length from the details and administration of these cases until and unless they reach me on an appeal. At this time, let me call on

Carrie to walk us through how the policy is implemented today and share any data to demonstrate the precedent for this body about these policies. Carrie,

Docherty ([00:48:35](#)):

Thank you so much and obviously thank you for giving me the opportunity to openly talk about the policy as well as our practice. Obviously there's been a lot of discussion, so my plan was to walk through the policy much of which Colin eloquently already did, so I will try to move quickly here. Details on the faculty responsibilities and conduct are spelled out in university policy ACA-33, which was revised and approved just in early 2023. I would add that if allegations are related to topics such as sexual misconduct to discrimination, harassment or research misconduct, they also fall outside the purview of this policy and are specifically delegated through UA-03 and ACA-30. But under ACA-33, any member of the university community can bring a complaint against an academic appointee for alleged violation of policy. When this happens, after the determination of which policy is appropriate, the senior administrator of a unit, often the dean or the chief academic affairs officer, me as my role as Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs will determine if a formal investigation needs to be conducted and then will do so.

([00:50:15](#)):

This formal investigation may lead to finding of facts, a determination of responsibility and appropriate sanctions. If the respondent is found responsible for the violation of policy, the administrator or the vice provost will actively consider the facts of the given case as well as, and again, it's important to note when repeat patterns of behavior or misconduct have occurred, bias, potential safety and security risk, ethical behaviors or other actions and factors that may indicate a given sanction. Again, Colin already stated that within the policy it notes both common or severe sanctions. And again, list those. A common sanction can be imposed by the administrator or the vice provost, and I would emphasize that in the policy, common sanctions include the reassignment of a faculty member's responsibilities and reduction of course, load with commiserate salary reduction in the event of a severe sanction.

([00:51:37](#)):

The policy defines that this includes suspension with or without pay, salary reduction, loss of privileges, prohibition against participation in certain classes or involuntary termination. When considering a severe sanction, the case may involve a faculty advisory board, which as many have stated and Colin reiterated on our campus is the Faculty Misconduct Review Committee and they can be included in the decision to impose a severe sanction. We've also reiterated, but I think it's important to state again, the appeal process still exists through the Faculty Board of Review. So in response to some of the questions that we've received, I looked into the case data for the last five years, so over that time there have been 49 cases related to faculty discipline that have come to the Vice Provost office. 24 of those included allegations of violation of the code of conduct of that group. Sanctions in nine of those cases included reassignment of teaching or service activities or limited interactions with students. To the best of my knowledge, only two cases were referred through campus policy D-27 to the Faculty Misconduct Review Committee for review.

([00:53:29](#)):

I just want to confirm in my last moment here that the application of ACA-33 has been applied consistently with all cases that I've been involved in. We have followed the policy as well as the historical precedents that has occurred on our campus. However, I wholeheartedly and would robustly support the updating, changing, revising, clarifying, improving of these policies and I would strongly encourage you to not only look at D-27, but also ACA-33 to make sure that they are consistent. Again, I

want to thank you all. I know how much you all do in an incredibly busy time of year and I appreciate your time.

Shrivastav (00:54:31):

Thank you, Carrie. As I said earlier, I'm not able to talk about any individual cases. However, given recent concern, let me say clearly from my understanding of recent events and a read review of the relevant policies as the data Carrie shared suggests, I am confident that the policy and precedent are being followed carefully and consistently based on its current interpretations. What Carrie has done in her new role as Vice Provost follows the same interpretation of policies that was in place prior to her assumption of the vice Provost role and even prior to my tenure as provost. But again, these are your policies as faculty and faculty leaders if you feel the policy should be interpreted differently, I will reiterate what Carrie said and urge you to work with your UFC colleagues to clarify. In closing, and before I open this up to other questions, I want to first apologize for the questions we did not get to today, particularly those related to technology services and doctoral enrollments.

(00:55:44):

One other thing I want to briefly mention is that Dean of Graduate School, Dean Daleke last week recommended to me based on benchmarking of institutional data, we increased the graduate stipend levels and I have accepted that recommendation. That announcement was made last week, I believe, and you'll be hearing more about that in the coming days for other questions. We will respond to those individuals directly and we'll share information at a future meeting as is helpful. But in closing, and at the risk of sounding sentimental at this challenging time in our world, we are deeply fortunate, most of all to have the gift of each other. While there are definitely hard days and difficult decisions in each of our work including and maybe especially in my role as the provost, it is an honor being here and I embrace the challenges we face and the amazing opportunities that lie ahead for us as a community at IU Bloomington in many ways as an institution of the state and for the state, IU is a public testing ground for every issue.

(00:57:04):

We can choose to be daunted by it or try to ignore it and pretend we should never change or we can embrace it in all its messiness and its uncertainty as our timeless service mission and prime ourselves on discovery and knowledge at creating the next generation of scholars and leaders for Indiana and far beyond. We are here to bring on tomorrow and make it better and in the process, once again, I say protect what makes us us. And with that we have just a few minutes for a couple of questions. I will open it up to whoever wants to bring one up. Alex,

Tanford (00:57:50):

There's a common element to the three topics that we're here today, Kinsey faculty disciplinary process and canceling Halaby, and that's lack of faculty involvement. And indeed it appears that the current administration distrusts the faculty that somehow we won't see things the right way. So I'm going to give you an easy question where you can help solve this problem by saying why are there no faculty on the working group for Kinsey? I don't mean faculty who currently hold chairs or administrative position. I mean just several faculty from the Kinsey Institute other than its director working faculty. Our current policy and the CREM policy says there should be faculty involvement. Can you add some to the working group?

Shrivastav (00:58:41):

Okay, so I hear two questions. Why aren't faculty involved and why isn't Krem involved? Is that safe? Okay.

Tanford ([00:58:47](#)):

Well, I understand why CREM's not involved. We're in the process of trying to make a workable policy, but just some faculty.

Shrivastav ([00:58:53](#)):

So there are three faculty involved. It's a group of about 11 people I believe. Three of who are faculty, one from Kelly, one from Stephanie Sanders is I think her appointment is in the college gender studies and of course Justin who's the director and the faculty. The other way faculty are involved is through the listening sessions that are happening. And again, if you haven't already, please sign up and share your concerns and ideas. The first session begins tomorrow afternoon. In my opinion, the faculty are involved deeply, so I have met personally with the faculty from Kinsey Institute. We will continue to meet that group as necessary. CREM was involved and is not involved at this point because it is not impacting the academic mission of Kinsey or the faculty. No faculties role research, lab space, area of teaching or research is being impacted. The only thing that is under consideration or was under consideration is the administrative side of that. We are constantly, as in this committee or with other committee balancing what is feasible. We can make 30 people committees. Those are impossible to navigate and manage or we can make small committees that can function effectively and have open lines of communication, which is what we are trying to do with this particular case.

([01:00:39](#)):

Other questions? Yes.

Michaelsen ([01:00:43](#)):

So if I'm hearing you correctly, the art exhibit was canceled due to the threat of violence. Is that the concern here? Was there a credible threat that way? One, and then I guess it gets to this point, who made that decision? Who thought this? And it comes out sort of in this email on December 20th and we are not informed about it. I hope you can appreciate, then I'll finish it is a chilling effect on artists to say, your work is controversial. We aren't going to do it pure and simple.

Shrivastav ([01:01:24](#)):

So I

Michaelsen ([01:01:34](#)):

Thank you.

Shrivastav ([01:01:35](#)):

So

Michaelsen ([01:01:37](#)):

It was not an applause line. I'm sorry, but thank you all.

Shrivastav ([01:01:40](#)):

So thank you for bringing that up. It is a constant, all of these issues are monitored constantly. It's not four people getting in a room at one moment in time and making a decision. These are issues that are monitored and the situation around us is evolving in real time, often, constantly, especially in a situation like this. With every issue there is a risk reward assessment made. Do we want to do an event at the time at the location in the format that needs to, what are the advantages? What are the disadvantages? At any time where you feel the risks are higher than the reward, we have to rethink that situation. As I said in my comments before, we have had instances where we were fortunate we didn't have violence, but we certainly came pretty close to having violence. Some of you have been participating in those events. Others may or may not be aware of it, and it's not one single incident, it was multiple incidents. So this decision was not made lightly. It was made with due consideration by taking input from a number of groups, facilities, security, the staff within the art museum itself. These are things that are constantly, constantly evolving.

[\(01:03:09\)](#):

Yes.

Furey [\(01:03:11\)](#):

I was just wondering if you have any concerns about the invocation of safety and the way that you've done, the way that you've invoked it here today, especially given of course, as you know, and events around the country and there's been of course contested ideas of whether there were credible threats or not. And so the vagueness of your kind of invocation of safety concerns, I just wonder as in your position, if you have any yourself concerns about what it means to invoke safety without giving specifics or without, and in light of the possibility that there may be in fact quite divergent ideas about whether there was in fact credible threats.

Shrivastav [\(01:03:57\)](#):

What makes this difficult? What makes this and other similar issues difficult is that for various reasons, I cannot share all the information that's available. What I can share with you is we are constantly in touch with state officials with the FBI, with a number of different security areas around a number of different issues. We always have to make a decision and sometimes you're making that when you have incomplete information. I will tell you from my perspective, if I have to make a decision on keeping a project, a program going when there is a risk of violence or risk of other incidents, I would err on the side of caution. Would I'd rather take a headline that an event was canceled or rather take a headline that an untoward incident happened, somebody got injured, somebody got worst case scenario. It's an easy decision for me at the beginning of each semester, we have a tabletop exercise with an active shooter situation.

[\(01:05:09\)](#):

If some of you sit down in that exercise and watch through the scenarios we go through, you will recognize the gravity of the situation, the realism of the dangers that we face and the reality of the world we live in. I mean, how many days do you go by before you hear about some major incident on the news? And when we live in a campus that is designed to be open much like this, there are security officers in this room, there is our DRST team in this room because they have to prepare for any untoward incident that happens and it is easy to assume nothing is happening because we are not aware of all the work that goes into making even a meeting like this. Go on and off smoothly. Elizabeth,

Housworth [\(01:06:08\)](#):

If Halaby had been an Indiana University professor artist, would your position be different?

Shrivastav (01:06:17):

Yes, It is very different because now you're talking about academic freedom and we do those kinds of things on a daily basis too. We do that on a daily basis as well. And that was a factor in our decision making I believe. Last question, is that right, Israel?

Herrera (01:06:38):

So you mentioned about the antisemitism advisory board and with all these incidents that we have had on campus, would you consider convening a similar advisory board for advice on anti Palestine incidents and also anti Arab and Muslim?

Shrivastav (01:07:03):

I can share with you. First of all, thank you for bringing that up. The antisemitism advisory board was not done in response to the Israel Gaza incidents. They were done a year prior to that. In fact, we are now, every major institution is creating similar boards and we find ourselves ahead of the curve. We have already talked about other issues related to Islamophobia. For instance, if you go to our DEI website, there is now a definition of both Islamophobia and antisemitism on that. We are already talking and we have been for over a year about creating a Muslim cultural center. So these issues are already in the works and when the need arises, we will do what is necessary to make the community as well-rounded and as safe for everybody concerned.

Herrera (01:07:58):

So that indicates that there will be an anti Palestine, Muslim and Arab advisory board.

Shrivastav (01:08:04):

There will be whatever steps are necessary to make sure we continue to move forward with those incidents, whether or not it needs an advisory board to be seen. Okay. With that, let me move on to the next item on the agenda and that is a new policy on tenure and promotion. This discussion being this is a discussion item, does not need a vote. And I invite Jessica Lester and Catherine Ryan co-chairs of the faculty advisory committee to take that on.

Ryan (01:08:40):

Thank you. We do appreciate the council's time this afternoon. My name is Catherine Ryan, my colleague Jessica Lester and I are going to present a policy proposal concerning tenure and promotion on the Bloomington campus. I will give a little context about that policy. Jessica will follow with some of the details of the revision and then we'll open it to comments and questions. Wait, so the purpose of the

(01:09:13):

Proposed policy is to explain the tenure and promotion process on the IU campus for faculty and librarians, and it includes information about guidelines for negative decisions and how to appeal those decisions. Now the rationale for this policy is that there was a document on campus with the same title, principles and policies on tenure and promotion, but it was just a document. It had much of the same information. It included all sorts of appendices and notes and texts about the tenure and promotion process. It was approved in 2015. It was revised in 2019, but it never had an official policy number

assigned to it and it wasn't in the form of the BFC policies that we see. So we were asked last spring as a faculty affairs committee to look at the policy, reformat the document or look at the document, reformat it to be consistent with BFC policies to take out the text that was no longer relevant, it was outdated, take out texts that was redundant with other policies, and then bring that revised document in policy form in front of this committee for consideration. So I'll turn it over to Jessica.

Lester ([01:10:41](#)):

Thanks Catherine. So I'm going to talk a little bit about the revisions that have been made, noting that, again, this is not a policy yet, but we have highlighted any changes given that many of us are familiar with this as a handbook that has been referred to across time. So some of the changes that were made that we did redline in the spirit of just being transparent about the ways that the handbook changed where gender neutral language is applied throughout. There were several minor edits, clarifying language that has also been used. And also there was deletion, as Catherine mentioned, of appendices and endnotes. There were multiple pages of appendices. Many of these appendices had footnotes that were linked to actual policies. And so one example of that, there is a text that was deleted and we have received a lot of questions about this particular deletion.

([01:11:33](#)):

So we want to do spend a little bit of time on this particular deletion is an example of the text wherein there was a footnote linked to an actual policy. And this particular deletion is word for word from a policy BL ACA-E2. And so given that we were asked to delete all things that were repetitive with the existing policies, this is one example of those kinds of deletions where the exact words and other policies were removed to transition this to an actual new policy. I do want to back up. I think we are missing one slide. We're missing one slide. I see. I do want to talk a little bit about the review process for this. So we were asked to begin this process, 22-23, spring of 23, the request was made and the fall of 23 new FAC members reviewed the proposal as well. And this was also brought to the OVPFAA associate Vice Provost and our vice provost also reviewed it. And then they also brought it to the associate deans who provided us feedback in November and December as well, given that they're the ones that often turn to this handbook in overseeing their own processes.

([01:12:48](#)):

With that, we want to open it up to discussion, feedback, questions that you might have.

Shrivastav ([01:12:55](#)):

This is open for discussion. Once again, there's no vote here today. This will come back for a vote at a future meeting. But if you have questions, concerns, this would be a good time to bring it up. Yes, go ahead.

Thomassen ([01:13:12](#)):

Thank you for undertaking this and for addressing the thing that seemed very controversial in explaining that this was redundant and existed in another policy. I think that was probably a concern a lot of people have. Thank you.

Lester ([01:13:24](#)):

Yes, you're welcome.

Shrivastav ([01:13:27](#)):

Anything else? Carrie? Did you raise your hand?

Docherty ([01:13:29](#)):

Yeah, I just might say just for consideration since this is really the creation of a policy. I'm not sure if the historical information is relevant here. So originally in this handbook, I think at the top of the document, 2014 and 2019 was stated

Lester ([01:13:53](#)):

2015, I think it's,

Docherty ([01:13:56](#)):

So this will be brand new 2024.

Lester ([01:14:00](#)):

Okay.

Docherty ([01:14:01](#)):

Sorry, I can't see you.

Lester ([01:14:03](#)):

And Carrie, just to clarify, you're referring in the actual policy at the bottom of the policy? Correct. We wouldn't have historical information.

Docherty ([01:14:09](#)):

Okay, perfect.

Lester ([01:14:09](#)):

Thank you. Thank you.

Shrivastav ([01:14:11](#)):

Alex,

Tanford ([01:14:12](#)):

Is there going to be an effective date or an implementation date? I mean when we act on this policy, it's likely to be in the middle of somebody's tenure process. Are you going to clarify when it starts into whom it applies

Lester ([01:14:32](#)):

In the actual policy? Yeah, indicate that. Okay.

Shrivastav ([01:14:37](#)):

That's the voice of experience. Other questions, Colin?

Johnson ([01:14:45](#)):

I would just make an observation. I mean, I think if we've learned anything over the past month or whatever, I know that people get a lot of circulars from us and from the UFC and everything and there's a tendency to rely very heavily, I think on our colleagues to sort of explain those things to us. And we have no better colleagues to explain these kinds of things in a kind of digestible way than the co-chairs of faculty affairs to whom we all owe an enormous debt. But I would just really encourage people to take a very close look frankly to everything they receive, but also at this because if there are concerns, everybody needs to start looking at the fine print very, very carefully and make sure that if we need to pool our collective knowledge and kind of attention to these things to make sure we're getting the best policies we possibly can. So please, if you've not taken a close look at it, do so,

Shrivastav ([01:15:38](#)):

Elizabeth,

Housworth ([01:15:41](#)):

I can make my perpetual comment that you could make the language gender neutral by changing all the subjects to plural to that never lies, so you can ignore it too. You said basically that this was policy that it was voted on prior to this, but it just had dates on it.

Lester ([01:16:08](#)):

It was approved, it was essentially the handbook that has been used

Housworth ([01:16:13](#)):

Since it was approved by the BFC.

Lester ([01:16:15](#)):

Correct. And it was the handbook, we can go back to the actual date. It was approved on April 15th, 2015 as the principles and policies on tenure and promotion with no official policy number assigned to it. And it was spring of last year that Eliza Pavalko actually brought this to the FAC and encouraged FAC to turn this into an actual policy using the policy template versus for it to just be this handbook, which was a compilation of multiple policies and ideas related to promotion and tenure.

Housworth ([01:16:45](#)):

And when I went through it, the only thing I saw substantial was that paragraph deletion that shocked me. And I was going to ask you about it until you explained it. Is there anything else in there that I should be worried about?

Lester ([01:16:58](#)):

No. So as I said in the spirit of being transparent about what was changed from the handbook we did Red Line, the changes, the only substantial changes that also in place which were not redlined as all the appendices and footnotes, which are linked to policies. You'll notice in this redline piece here, there's a footnote there as well that was linked to BL ACA-E2, which when we went and explored further, we saw it was actual verbatim usage of other policies within the document, which historically makes sense since that document was meant to compile a lot of different policies together and serve as a guide.

Shrivastav (01:17:42):

Any other questions? Okay. Yep. Rachel,

Cohen (01:17:46):

Just checking. Are you guys going to lay this out a little bit more into the policy layout with A B C, that kind of structure? Right now it's kind of blocks of paragraphs instead of the policy structure, if that makes sense.

Lester (01:18:04):

Like procedurally? Yeah, we hadn't discussed that as a committee, but if that would be a recommendation, we can certainly bring it back to FAC and discuss it further.

Cohen (01:18:14):

I think the content's there, I think it just needs to be looked at the policy procedure like structure of how that was laid out a little bit. Okay,

Lester (01:18:23):

We can discuss that. Thank you Rachel. Thanks.

Shrivastav (01:18:28):

Thank you. Yes. One more.

O'Brien (01:18:31):

In the spirit of Collins comment just a moment ago about thinking this through, I'm wondering if it might be good to distribute also the, I assume there's a corresponding university level policy that supersedes this in some way. Excuse me. Sending that around so that everybody can get an eye on it to make sure that there's no unintended conflicts between the two.

Lester (01:18:57):

Thanks Travis. That's a great idea.

Johnson (01:19:01):

Well, if I can just jump in, I will say this. I think it's an excellent suggestion. I'm not actually sure that there is, and I mean it's kind of shocking when you think about it that up until this point we actually haven't had a campus level policy dealing with with tenure and promotion at the campus level. But you see it right here. We've technically not what we've had, and I would encourage everyone within the confines of their own units to ask questions about this as well. We have this kind of weird mishmash of practices where some units have guidelines, for example, that are somehow distinct from policies that are approved and that becomes customary within certain kinds of context and people accept that. And I do think, I'm not actually sure that we have a universe, do we? Alex, do you know

Tanford (01:19:49):

There is a university policy and it says because the standards and criteria are different on every campus, every campus could have a policy tenure is campus specific. The university policy is simply to delegate it

to the campus. The only thing that is in there, which is this removed paragraph there is in somewhere in university policy, maybe this statement repeats that if you have tenure and for some reason your department is eliminated or your program is eliminated, the university has an obligation to try and find you another place. Footnote, but not necessarily on another campus because every campus is different.

Johnson ([01:20:36](#)):

There are a lot of university level policies that say everyone should have policies. There are also a lot of campus level policies that say every school should have policies and many of them don't. So that's a different issue.

Thomassen ([01:20:48](#)):

If this is the committee that I was actually on when it was first created, the special policy review committee, that was actually the mandate of the committee was to make sure that we were in alignment with university policy. So that if I'm correct, that's one of the things that was looked at first and it was a good point is is there a university policy that we need to be in alignment with

Shrivastav ([01:21:11](#)):

In the interest of finishing the rest of the agenda? Let me move on. Please continue to send your feedback directly to the two co-chairs or to Lana and she can send it as appropriate. Thank you Jessica and Catherine. The next item is an update from the Diversity equity and Inclusion Committee. This conversation led by Julie Hardesty. I believe Erin is unable to join us, so the weights on your shoulders. Julie.

Hardesty ([01:21:42](#)):

Hi. Thank you very much for inviting us, inviting me here today. So yeah, I'm Julie Hardesty. I'm a metadata analyst librarian over in Wells Library and Erin Wyatt from the School of Nursing we're the co-chairs for the BFC Diversity Equity and Inclusion Committee and Erin's not able to be here today, so bear with me as I try to go through all of this. So the BFC Diversity Committee proposes policies and advises the BFC on issues related to campus diversity. And what I'm going to be doing today is sharing with you work that has occurred based on some of the charges we have as a committee this year and here we go. So first is land acknowledgement guidance. So the diversity committee has been charged to provide an update on the committee's previous work, discussing the possibility of developing a land acknowledgement statement and make a definitive recommendation to the BFC on how to proceed.

([01:22:40](#)):

Where this issue is concerned, this committee has done some work, but it is based on a deep set of information and resources from others on campus and I encourage everyone to explore these resources further, there's guidance from the First Nations educational and Cultural Center, including sample land acknowledgement statements and ways to consider using them. There's also a research guide from IU Libraries on the history and impact of land acknowledgement use and that is from a former and current BFC Diversity Committee member Nicholae Cline. In addition, in spring of 2022, the BFC Diversity Committee and the First Nations Educational and Cultural Center held a campus-wide conversation, a panel discussion that was recorded and that is also available. I'll be providing links to all of these in the slides here to share those with you if you're interested in looking into those. Further land acknowledgements in the United States are statements made to recognize the land on which an event is occurring and acknowledge the people who were previously caring for this land and who were forcibly

removed from this land so that we can be present in this space having the event that is occurring right now, those communities and nations still exist but are likely located elsewhere.

[\(01:24:01\)](#):

Now if you're not familiar with these communities and nations in our context for Indiana University in Bloomington, I invite you to explore those resources available from the First Nations Educational and Cultural Center and the IU Libraries to learn more. And as part of considering the context of an event, there is a difference that I want to make between saying some words as part of a format to, for example, begin every meeting you conduct versus providing a land acknowledgement as a way to actually engage in something to do with the land or the people you are acknowledging as more specific guidance for the Bloomington Faculty Council, let's consider the example of offering a land acknowledgement at the beginning of every BFC meeting. So BFC meetings are meetings that happen regularly. There are multiple meetings throughout the year and many of the same people are in the room at each of those meetings.

[\(01:24:53\)](#):

Presidents Hall where we are having this meeting today where these meetings have been occurring for quite some time is filled with the reminders of the privileged white male and colonial history of IU. You can see this in the numerous framed paintings that are looking down on us right now. So acknowledging the land and people who were here before IU could be useful as a longer view framing of what has taken place in order for us to be meeting in this space with its reminders of IU specific history. But it is, is it in fact engaging with this history to simply say a land acknowledgement at the beginning of every BFC meeting as a way of beginning every BFC meeting? Consider how the impacts and engagement with a land acknowledgement statement might be different if it is purposefully made at the first meeting of the year with a new council seated in this room.

[\(01:25:39\)](#):

It could be used to introduce the perspective of native faculty, students and staff at IU and provide the council and staff at IU, sorry, provide scaffolding for the council members to consider actions and policies for that year or consider the impact of a land acknowledgement statement if it's made before a particular meeting with an agenda item that addresses policies that impact native students, faculty and staff at IU. The use of a land acknowledgement statement then frames that agenda item with context and gravity. The Diversity committee's guidance here is to avoid being performative with land acknowledgement statements. The intent of acknowledging the land we are on and the people who are displaced for us to be here today is to center those concerns and perspectives in the actions that you're taking as the faculty council at IU Bloomington. In essence, unless there are actions, a land acknowledgement statement likely does a little more than reinforcing the lack of diversity inclusion that we see framed on these walls and there's no impact with that. I acknowledge and honor the Miami, Delaware, Potawatomi and Shawnee people on whose ancestral homelands and resources Indiana University of Bloomington is built. There isn't a campus wide land acknowledgement statement from Indiana University. Instead the Indiana University First Nations Educational and Cultural Center encourages offices and individuals to create a statement that connects yourself and your work to the communities you were acknowledging. So with that, the diversity committee proposes that the Bloomington Faculty Council be dedicated to taking at least one action per year to improve the conditions for native faculty, students and staff at Indiana University.

[\(01:27:15\)](#):

And here are the links to those resources from the First Nations Educational and Cultural Center from the IU libraries and the recording of the panel discussion from 2022 with members of the BFC Diversity

Committee and First Nations Educational and Cultural Center. So the next charge that I'm going to be talking about is the status of the work of the Diversity subcommittee on Critical Race theory. And you might remember that as something of a headline making topic in the news a couple of years ago. And the work that occurred regarding that topic on the committee was in fact years ago. Critical Race Theory is a theoretical framework used in higher education courses. So it is in use in various resources and programs on campus as a lens for discussion and research. It's a framework that analyzes how social, political and legal structures shape and are shaped by conceptions of race and ethnicity.

[\(01:28:10\)](#):

The diversity committee from the 2020-2021 academic year compiled a list of teaching resources related to critical race theory on campus at that time and most resources listed in 2020 were on the office of the vice President for diversity equity inclusion on their website. But there were also some resources through the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning and the Center for Research on Race and Ethnicity in Society. After evaluating that list, the committee during that year found that the office of the Vice President for Diversity, equity and inclusion is the best place for faculty to contact for current help or questions including a current inventory of these kinds of resources. So in the committee for this year is considering this charge fulfilled based on that previous work and the final charge that I'm going to talk about is the Inclusive Excellence Awards program. So the BFC Diversity Committee accepts nominations, evaluates and selects award winners annually to recognize faculty members who display exceptional leadership in fostering diversity and inclusion on campus and in the surrounding Bloomington community.

[\(01:29:20\)](#):

The award was established in 2021 by this committee and the office of the vice president for diversity, equity and inclusion. Nominations for the award are made by faculty, staff, and students and self nominations are accepted as well. IU Bloomington's, office of the Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion provides stipends of 1,500 to up to \$5,000 to honorees. Since the award was started during the pandemic, we were not able to host any in-person event to recognize and celebrate the award winners. So this fall, this past fall in November, the office of the Vice President for Diversity, equity and Inclusion and the BFC office hosted a really wonderful reception at the Cook Center in Maxwell Hall to recognize the 18 recipients who received this award in 2021, 2022 and 2023 and to continue celebrating these outstanding faculty. Here are the recipients for 2021. It's Kevin Brown, Arlene Diaz, Marla Hamilton Abegunde, Jennifer C. Lee, and Maresa Murray. And these are the recipients for 2022. Raquel Anderson. Amrita Chakrabarti Myers, Colin Johnson, Mary Murphy and Amanda Rutherford. And these are the recipients for 2023. Tom James, Sonia Lee, Sylvia Martinez, Eric Allen Sader, Malcolm Smith, Jon Urhelm, Garfield Warren and Ellen Wu.

[\(01:30:46\)](#):

Yeah, that's pretty great nominations for 2024. The 2024 Inclusive Excellence Award recipients. The nomination form will open at the end of this month, beginning of February and our hope is to host a campus-wide event this year that not only recognizes these faculty for their exceptional work but also engages conversations about inclusivity and faculty research and teaching on campus. So this award has received funding from the provost office and IU research through 2026. So we will be able to recognize and reward this work on campus for at least two more years. So I want to end here with my thanks to the BFC diversity committee members this year, including my co-chair, Erin Wyatt who is not able to join me today. So thank you.

Shrivastav [\(01:31:33\)](#):

Thank you Julie. Questions, suggestions? Anything for Julie? Elizabeth?

Housworth ([01:31:42](#)):

I can't help myself. I'm sorry. Has the committee ever considered the suggestion that we pay rent to the Native Americans who on whose land we are sitting?

Hardesty ([01:32:01](#)):

There've been various discussions about things that we could do over the years, so land acknowledgements as a topic was one thing that's been discussed. There's also been, I know last year we were looking at if there were any ways to encourage fee remission or tuition reduction, but no, we have not considered suggesting rent payments but that, I mean

Tanford ([01:32:34](#)):

I wonder why land acknowledgement rather than something else. In part because my understanding of a lot of the local indigenous culture was they didn't consider that they owned the land, nobody owned the land. So that the idea of rent and land acknowledgement, it just seems to me a little bit, I wonder if there's something else like reparations. I don't know. It means something else

Hardesty ([01:33:06](#)):

In doing a land acknowledgement where I don't think it tends to be a thing where it's saying that it was anybody's land. There's a different relationship to land for indigenous communities versus what IU would consider a land that they have. So it's a land acknowledgement statement I think is recognizing more about the events that took place and what occurred.

Shrivastav ([01:33:36](#)):

I want this group to be aware that we have added significantly to the number of scholarships available to Native American students this year. So if you have students you're trying to recruit, make sure you're sharing that information with them. Other questions for Julie, Israel?

Herrera ([01:34:00](#)):

Yeah, so there is a range between \$1,500 and \$5,000 and I could see that there were more recipients last year. So one year the recipients can receive \$5,000 or what's the criteria for receiving \$1,500 in the top?

Hardesty ([01:34:21](#)):

We basically have a total amount per year that we are able to award and we have a rubric that we use and try to evaluate. And so we've been kind of gathering applications as we go and I think you can see as we go, there's more and more people that we're wanting to award. I think that's kind of what's happening.

Herrera ([01:34:40](#)):

So in one year all the recipients can receive 5,000

Hardesty ([01:34:45](#)):

With the budget that we have. It would depend to be fewer number of recipients, but yeah, it could. Yeah.

Shrivastav (01:34:55):

Other questions? Seeing none. Thank you Julie. The next item is updates from graduate school and I invite David Daleke, Dean of graduate schools and graduate school at IU Bloomington.

Daleke (01:35:09):

Thank you very much. I want to thank President Colin Johnson to the executive committee and Provost Shrivastav for the opportunity to give you an update on the new IU Bloomington Graduate School. I have been dean since last May. Prior to that I was interim dean and I have to say that we have focused a lot on our mission and on addressing the aims of the strategic plan. I don't think I have the time today to give you an update on everything that we do in the graduate school, but I thought I would just highlight a few things that were relevant to both of those issues. The graduate school, like other schools, has a representative group of faculty that are our faculty governance body and that for us is the graduate faculty council. And so we administer the policies that are approved by the graduate faculty council and we do this in collaboration with the faculty. We do it in collaboration with academic staff and all of our academic units and also with student organizations such as the GPSG, my colleagues to the left. So much of what I'm about to talk about, again skims through the work that we do, but just understand that there's a lot of faculty and staff and students that are engaged in all of these activities and again, it's my great pleasure to do so. I need a clicker, sir,

(01:36:37):

As the clicker comes down. Thank you. Cooperative group. Thank you very much. So first of all, the graduate school in Bloomington was established in 1904. It has a bit of a history before that, but again I won't go into that detail and for many years it passed through a lot of different phases. It was once part of research and then it became separated from the Office of research and then it became a university-wide organization that was formerly recognized as such. And the biggest recent change happened in the spring of 2022 when the graduate school was transitioned from a university-wide school to campus-based schools and we created two graduate schools, one in Indianapolis and one in Bloomington. Also in that spring the provost and the BFC charged the task force in the future of graduate education to look into the status of graduate education and the graduate experience at Indiana University of Bloomington. We began that in April of that year and then that fed into in the fall of 2022, the IUB 2030 strategic plans and merged together.

(01:37:50):

A formal name for the graduate school is the Indiana University Graduate School Bloomington. That is what the commission higher education gave us, not necessarily the one we would've chosen, but that's the one we're going with. We're responsible for conferring the PhD and research-based masters on this campus, but we also have responsibilities in all areas of what we do for all graduate education at IU Bloomington to the edges of the campus. In addition to that, we have some oversight for regional graduate campus programs since there is no single graduate school that serves all of them. We have traditionally had that responsibility in the past and we decided to or offer to continue to do so.

(01:38:33):

The three missions of the graduate school are listed here. That is excellence in academics, diversity, equity and inclusion and in professional and career development for students. Each of those areas are led by senior staff in the office and I'll refer to each of those two and I'm just going to point out here just

a few of the areas of work that we do under each of those three different missions and then I'll come back to some more details about those in just a second. I'll start first with academic excellence. We are the office of record for all graduate admissions in the Bloomington campus, which means we have the responsibility for the common application that all graduate students apply for. It's currently a product by a company named liaison. It's their unicast problem application, which is a centralized application system. We then all that information then feeds into the schools and they have secondary applications and for some of them do, and then it also feeds into our SIS, but we are actually the ones that receive the information and initiate the process. As I mentioned before, we record and confer the PhD and research-based master's degrees as well.

[\(01:39:49\):](#)

And a large part of the work that we do under this category is to help develop and to implement new academic credentials at the graduate level, but also to approve curricula related to those credentials. Assistant Dean, Jeff Rutherford is the person who manages that. And if any of you have ever created new credentials, graduate credentials in this campus, you probably know Jeff. He's fantastic and does a terrific job. I also should point out since his spouse was mentioned, he is a spouse to Amanda Rutherford in the O'Neill School. Our second mission is diversity equity inclusion, and Dr. Howard Sims had that position for about two years, a little over two and a half years actually before he recently left for a position in the Indiana State House. So working moved into the government sector, I'll put it that way. So we lost a really good staff member, but we're currently in searching for someone in that position is currently vacant.

[\(01:40:54\):](#)

The search is ongoing. If you know of anyone who might be interested and would be really good, please let me know. I'd be happy to take any nominations. Our role in this area is primarily twofold. We assist in the recruitment of underrepresented minority students to into all the programs in the Bloomington campus. And we do this as we do everything else in collaboration with all of the academic units. And so we connect with the recruiting council, which exists on campus for recruiting underrepresented students. We connect with individual schools and help them with specific programs to do the same. We also provide programming and support for current students, existing students for their retention and completion. And that's where a significant amount of our effort goes, but it's also the area that we're going to focus on more in the future because we think this is where we have the most opportunities for improvement.

[\(01:41:52\):](#)

The third area is in student development and we recently hired assistant Dean Trevor Verrot to take over this area. It encompasses both professional and career development and there's a lot of activities we have going on in this area and I'll mention a couple of them here in just a moment. In addition to that, we've also hired a graduate career coach or director of graduate career coaching Brandi Smith. We were very fortunate to hire her after she led a system-wide implementation of a career coaching system with Ivy Tech. And then we also assist with funding and support. So we have a small amount of fellowship funds that we provide through our office, but then we also help graduate students seek out and apply for and acquire external funding. So I'll touch on each of these in a little bit more detail here in a second. I'm not sure whether you look at our enrollment numbers on the graduate space much, but in surprise to some people.

[\(01:42:59\):](#)

But half of our enrollment at the graduate level, we have approximately 10,000 students, four that have enrolled this year, beginning of fall 23, about half of them are 53% are professional master's students.

These are MBA students, MPA students, MPH students. And so a substantial portion, in fact the majority of our students are master's students. We have a smaller fraction of students that what we call research-based master's degrees, the primary, the master's that are in the college for master's degrees that are cognate with a PhD program, that's another 5%. So roughly 60% of our students are master's students. About 25 are PhD students, is represented in the wedge to the right. About 14% are professional doctorates and those are like the AUD for example in the OD. And then the smaller, there's a smaller fraction of specialist certificates and diplomas. We follow and monitor enrollment trends.

[\(01:43:59\):](#)

Ever since I became vice provost, I've been doing this since 2012 to track where each of the different broad areas of a graduate degree seekers are moving towards. And the trends that we see are pretty much similar to what is seen in all campuses that are like ours. Research-based masters and PhDs have shown a slow decline over many years. This is 11 years, and so that is not atypical. It's actually quite typical. On the other hand, that has been countered by an increase in the number of students seeking professional masters and professional doctorate degrees, specifically from the professional master's area. And the pandemic caused a spike that you see in those last three bars there for students seeking professional masters. But primarily those are online students. And we anticipated that after the pandemic has waned a bit that we would see a decline in the number those enrollments.

[\(01:45:04\):](#)

In fact, that's what we're seeing. You can see with the black bar, whichever since this last fall, we're starting to see a bit of a decline and I think we'll return to the trend that we saw before that. So when you look at this, our opportunities for enrollments potentially at the master's level, this is something that we have we've been working on, been charged to do that by the provost in fact. But I also think that that spike that we saw during the pandemic is a lesson for us is that we have a possibility of, for example, we had a thousand student increase in some of those programs.

[\(01:45:37\):](#)

So I mentioned that we also process and assist in applications, the application process. This is the current trend for our admissions applications. I'm sorry, this is a little bit small, but the orange line is fall of 22, the red line is fall of 23, and then the aqua is fall of 24. And this graph shows the number of applications as a function of the days to census. And census happens of course in the second week in this fall semester. So as you can see, we've been leading last year's enrollment numbers, so we're actually up about 14% over this time last year. This is data from yesterday. I pulled it for the slides. Interesting though, if you just look at doctorate and that includes both professional doctorate and the PhDs, you find that we are actually above where we ended up last year. So we're going to see the collective efforts of all of the faculty. All of you and your colleagues in your programs have really the amount of interest in doctoral programs here in Bloomington, so thank you for that.

[\(01:46:58\):](#)

As I mentioned before, we have been charged to also increase our master's enrollment, partly because we are to increase overall graduate enrollments, but also as potential revenue drivers for our programs in the face of declining tuition revenue from the undergraduate side. And so there's three different areas that I'll talk about. One is we have an office of multidisciplinary graduate programs that serves three as an administrative home for three different master's degrees. This office was set up because of an interest in establishing a master's degree in cybersecurity risk management. That was a collaboration between three academic schools. It was difficult to figure out where the home would be when you have three partners. And so we volunteered to be that administrative home leaving the faculty of those three units to have full control, of course over the program. So we're literally just administratively managing

these that has sent spawned to other programs, the MMA and curatorship and an MS, and Quantum Information Science.

[\(01:48:02\):](#)

And I mentioned all this because I think this is a great opportunity for interdisciplinary master's programming. If you have an interest that crosses over to your colleagues in other schools that you think may particularly innovative, that could draw students to a very unique degree to follow a specific kind of career path, we'd be more than happy to chat with you about how you might establish one of these multidisciplinary graduate programs. I think we've already talked about in previous meetings about the accelerated master's degree programs. These are combinations of bachelor's and master's where there's a bit of overlap of credit, but essentially in the bachelor's level, the students can apply master's to credit towards their bachelor's degree and then complete a bachelor's and master's in less time than they could if they did them sequentially. We had 24 existing master's programs last year, AMP programs last year.

[\(01:49:04\):](#)

We have 39 in development and 15 of them we expect to have fully approved by the end of this year and hopefully more by the fall. So we're moving pretty quickly on this. This is a great opportunity for students to combine two very different types of credentials, a bachelor's degree in one field and a master's degree in another. For example, you might combine English with business and that might give you a particular skillset that for a particular career path. So we're collaborating with David Johnson, vice Provost David Johnson, on using this as a means of promoting undergraduates to come to IU to purposely take one of these AMP programs. And then lastly, we're also working on promoting new online and hybrid programs in the Bloomington campus. There's been some dissatisfaction with the collaborative graduate master's and certificate programs that was offered by IU online, but we think that there's a lot of opportunity here in the Bloomington campus to develop new online and hybrid programs that are unique to the skills of the faculty here, the interest of the faculty and research of the faculty. And so we're working on, we're working with a number of different groups of faculty on developing these programs. I don't have any to mention today, but I'll keep you posted on those as we go forward.

[\(01:50:31\):](#)

The last second area is diversity and inclusion. As you know, the Supreme Court decision of last January 28th has prevented us from using race and admissions. So as a result of that, we had to respond and we did so as the undergraduate side did too, with masking race and ethnicity and applications as they go to the admissions committees. Any of you who are on admissions committees have probably seen that. What we do is once an admissions decision is made, then we release that race and ethnicity information to the faculty so that you can use it for recruiting fellowships, which are perfectly allowable to be used under that decision. So I just want to make sure if that point hasn't gotten across that that's true. Our recruiting efforts and our fellowship funding is unaffected by the Supreme Court decision, at least for now. We're still being cautious about that and keeping track of all of our resources that are going for DEI.

[\(01:51:26\):](#)

Going forward. We've also increased our capacity for diversity recruiting. We have one and a half FTE in the office who help with that. And as I mentioned before, we are, we have an open position for an assistant dean for diversity and inclusion. The third area of our focus is student development, and this is one in which we spent a lot of time, the past five years growing. We actually had no activities in this area, and I thought that this was, was a huge hole in the services we could provide through our office. So

there's three different areas under student development. I just want to point out today. One is in the area of career and professional development. We have participated in a number of different national programs that were sponsored by the AAU Council of Graduate Schools, which is our professional group to be able to explore what we can do to help promote and identify diverse career paths for graduate students, particularly for PhD students. Those projects culminated in a career diversity symposium that we offer each fall. We've had two instances of it now, and we plan to make that a regular item. We also have a future faculty teaching fellowship program that provides advanced PhD students the opportunity to teach for a year on another campus of Indiana University or a small college in the state of Indiana. It's been a very successful program going on for decades, and I again encourage you to encourage your students to apply.

[\(01:53:00\):](#)

The Preparing Future Faculty Conference, which is not listed here, is sponsored by the Department of Sociology each year. That is going to happen January 26th. It's a great conference for students who are interested in academic careers. It's also a great conference for faculty. If you want to go just hear from students what are some of their concerns about their future as academicians. We also sponsor a three minute thesis competition. Everybody know what a three minute thesis competition is. This is a student is given three minutes of one slide, no props, no transitions to be able to present their work to a lay audience. It's a lot of fun. We have some amazing researchers here as graduate students on this campus, and they just do a terrific job of conveying the importance of their work in an entertaining way. So we're trying to amp up the three minute thesis competition this year.

[\(01:53:56\):](#)

It will be February 15th. The deadline for submitting an application is February 2nd. So if you have any of your students who are interested, please encourage them to do it right away. I mentioned we are expanding our one-on-one Career coaching services with an FTE in our office, but we also do this in collaboration with the Walter Center in particular, which has a career coach, graduate career coach that we have helped support financially. We also collaborate with all the campus career offices as well. So collaboration is the theme for the graduate school. We also provide funding and support, and I put this under student development for a number of different fellowships and awards, especially external fellowships. We help to manage a number of them, and I don't have the time to go through them all today, but I do encourage you to explore that on our website or just send me a note and I'll be able to help you.

[\(01:54:47\):](#)

In particular, I think we're a little bit short on some of these prestigious national fellowships that our graduate students that I know can earn. As the provost mentioned, we also have been asked to advise on student academic appointee stipends, and we do that. We also have been charged to summarize average essay stipends by discipline. By next fall, we were charged to do this ally and next fall will be the first instance of that. My approach is to approach the Student Academic Affairs Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council for help in this regard. Joshua Paschal is the co-chair, and we will be working through the process this spring to try to develop something that will be sustainable so that we won't have to remake the wheel every year. So there's a lot of data will be collected. We'll do analysis on that data, but also deciding what's the best way to present it to the provost and to the BFC in the fall of next year. We've also expanded our grad grant center, which is a center of peer consultants for graduate students, interested in finding funding to four consultants. Again, it's a great center and they're very successful in getting their students funded.

[\(01:56:07\):](#)

I think I'm running out of time here, so I think I might stop with this slide, but also one other important center in our office is the Graduate Mentoring Center. Currently it is run by Professor Sean Nicholson-Crotty of the O'Neill School. It provides mentorship, training, and resources for good mentorship. Again, you'll see notices through our newsletter, through emails or whatever. I do encourage you to engage in some of them, but I wanted to just point out today as an update that the call to create a graduate ombudsman or ombuds person by three different of our working groups for the task force, it was really a strong signal for us to move forward as quickly as we can on the creation of this position. We have a position that has been written. I've asked Sean to chair the committee. He's got a committee together that was ready to evaluate it, and that person we have decided will be affiliated with the center, although not a direct report to the center, we're trying our best to structure this position so that it will be independent of the center and also of the graduate school, and yet we have to have a home for the person and we have to pay them.

[\(01:57:14\)](#):

So there will be some connections to the work that we do. It's also connected to an effort by Vice Provost Docherty's office in creating a conflict resolution group or person for faculty as well.

[\(01:57:31\)](#):

I won't go through IUB 2030 in a lot of detail here. I just want to point out goal number two under the student success and opportunity pillar was on the graduate experience. I'm putting together two different workforces, implementation, not workforces, implementation teams, one focused on the academics, one focused on student success for all of the objectives that were listed there. And these objectives are on the website. I've just grouped them together differently. And then also we're collaborating with the undergraduate site on Goal three, which is inclusion, wellness, and student support, since it affects both undergrads and grads. So there's our home and the East Tower of the Wells Library. If you read Slavic languages or are interested in looking at the Tibetan collection, come on by, it's right outside our door. And I have to say, it's really, and I'm serious about the Tibetan collection, it's really fascinating to look at. I can't read it, but it's interesting. But thank you all very much for your attention today, and I hope I left enough time for a question or two.

Shrivastav [\(01:58:30\)](#):

Thank you, David. We have 90 seconds for one question. I see Elizabeth has already put her cap and gloves on. So before I open it up for one question, let me reemphasize the minute thesis. Please send your students, but more importantly, if you can attend it because I learned more in that 90 minutes or so than I could learn by reading dozens and dozens of papers. So it's just a fascinating event. One, maybe two questions. Seeing none, you got off easy, David. Well, thank you everybody. Thanks for being last. Thank you everybody for joining us. The meeting is now adjourned.