

**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**March 5, 2024 | 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.**  
**Presidents Hall – Franklin Hall**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Ahlbrand, Ashley; Anderson, Dana; Asher, Sofiya; Brinda, Chelsea; Buggenhagen, Beth; Butters, Rebecca; Cavar, Damir; Chen, Xin; Daleke, David; Dalkilic, Mehmet; Dau-Schmidt, Kenneth; Dekydspotter, Lori; DeMaine, Susan; DeSawal, Danielle; Docherty, Carrie; Eskew, Kelly; 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; Kubow, Patricia; Lalwani, Ashok; Lammers, Sabine; Lanosga, Gerry; Lion, Margaret; Loring, Annette; McCoy, Chase; Michaelson, Jonathan; O'Brien, Travis; Paschal, Joshua; Raji, Aaliyah; Ramos, William; Reck, Cathrine; Rutkowski, Leslie; Sapp, Christopher; Sela, Ron; Shrivastav, Rahul; Siek, Jeremy; Silvester, Katie; Sinadinos, Alison; Steenblik, R. Spencer; Tanford, Alex; Terry, Herbert; Thomassen, Lisa; Torres, Vasti; Tracey, Dan; van der Elst, Louis; Walton, Christi; Whitworth, Cale

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Bala, Hillol; Bridges, Chandler; Cohen, Rachel; Cole, Shu; Dalkilic, Mehmet; Eaton, Kristine; Giordano, Anthony; Ivanovitch, Roman; Koda, Marsha; Lochmiller, Chad; Northcutt Bohmert, Miriam; Perry, Brea; Raymond, Angie; Terry, Herbert; White, Tameka; Wyrzynski, Stephen

**GUESTS:** Cumberland, Claire; Diekman, Amanda; Goodman, Jane; Graber, Kathryn; Hahn, Allen; Hardesty, Julie; Huber, Michael; Miles, Emily; Smith Jones, Angela

**Agenda**

1. **Approval of the minutes of February 13, 2024**
2. **Memorial Resolution for Jack Shiner**
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](mailto:bfcoff@indiana.edu). Questions should be submitted no less than two business days before the meeting.
6. **Report on COACHE Results (15 minutes)**  
Carrie Docherty, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs
7. **Questions/Comments on COACHE Results (10 minutes)**
8. **Annual Report from the Athletics Committee (15 minutes)**  
Scott Dolson, Vice President and Director of Intercollegiate Athletics  
Carrie Docherty, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs  
Marietta Simpson, Distinguished Rudy Professor of Music
9. **Questions/Comments on the Report from the Athletics Committee (10 minutes)**

10. **Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-A1, Academic Appointments, and BL-ACA-A5, Research Ranks at Indiana University** (15 minutes)  
Ben Kravitz, Co-chair, Research Affairs Committee  
[Discussion Item]
  - B27-2024: Background and Overview to Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-A1 and BL-ACA-A5
  - B28-2024: Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-A1, Academic Appointments
  - B29-2024: Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-A5, Research Ranks at Indiana University
11. **Questions/Comments on Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-A1 and BL-ACA-A5** (10 minutes)
12. **Report on Faculty-activity Reporting Tool** (5 minutes)  
Carrie Docherty, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs
13. **Questions/Comments on Faculty-activity Reporting Tool** (10 minutes)

### Transcript

Speaker 1 ([00:00:01](#)):

Good afternoon. I'm advised we have quorum, so let's get this meeting started as we always do, we begin first with the approval of minutes from our February 13th meeting, so somebody who's read it and is willing to put a motion to approve the minutes. Motion to approve. That's one. Anybody to second? Second. We have a second. All in favor all. Raise their hands and that's good. The minutes are approved. I will next ask Carrie to read out a memorial resolution for our colleague Jack Shiner

Speaker 2 ([00:00:41](#)):

Vernon Jack Shiner Jr. Aged 95, passed away peacefully at his home on May 26th, 2021 with children and grandchildren at his side. Jack was born in Texas in 1925. He began studying chemistry at Texas Western College of Mining, now utep, where he met his future wife Riva. He enlisted in the Navy during World War II and served as a radar technician on a destroyer in the Pacific after the war. He completed his BS in chemistry in 1947 and earned his PhD in organic chemistry at Cornell University in 1950. Jack joined the department of chemistry at Indiana University Bloomington in 1952 as an instructor and rapidly advanced to full professor in 1960. Based on his innovative research and developing area of physical organic chemistry, Jack was recognized as one of the world's experts in s leases and elimination reaction mechanisms where he used the effects of uncommon isotopes of the usual elements on reaction kinetics to elucidate detailed pictures of such transformations at the molecular level.

([00:02:05](#)):

His expertise in kinetic isotopes effects was of significant importance in collaborations with a number of other scientists in their studies, a variety of chemical, biochemical and geochemical reactions. Jack was known for training his numerous PhD students and postdoctoral associates in the rigors of detailed precise science at both the experimental and theoretical levels. From 1959 to 60, he held the coveted Sloan Research Fellowship and joined his international isotopes colleagues at the University of Zagreb as a fult, as a Fulbright distinguished scholar. In 1985, Jack served as chair of the Department of Chemistry twice first in 1962 to 1967, where he oversaw its unprecedented growth, a doubling of research faculty, a major increase in research facilities and most important to him the establishment of a superb set of electronic computational machine and glass blowing shops to enhance the new research programs. He was also called to serve chair again from 1982 to 1988 to supervise the construction of the east and west chemistry annex and the renovation of the original chemistry building and the 1964 edition, all of

which completed the current chemistry teaching and research complex. His administrative skill and vision were also employed by the College of Arts and Sciences where he served with distinction as dean. From 1973 to 1978, Jack continued to teach undergraduate courses until his retirement in 1995. He loved traveling, gardening, sports cards and was a wine enthusiast with his wife Reva. He appreciated the theater and fine arts. In particular the activities of the National Society of Arts and Letters and the Bloomington Playwright Projects.

Speaker 1 ([00:04:20](#)):

Thank you, Carrie. If you're able, please stand for a moment of Silas. Thank you. I now invite executive faculty president Colin Johnson for the executive committee business report.

Speaker 3 ([00:04:53](#)):

Okay, take it away, Colin. Thank you. Good afternoon. So I have some good news to report, which is that on Friday, as you may have seen, the board of trustees voted to endorse a proposal submitted to them by President Whitten to abandon earlier plans to separate part of the Kinsey Institute from IU in the service of trying to protect it and instead pursue efforts to prove compliance with state law through even more thorough and scrupulous accounting practices than are already practiced in order to demonstrate something that is already true, which is that Kinsey does not receive the benefit of state appropriations to support its crucial work and has not for a very long time. That was a win in my opinion, and it was a win that reflects, at least in part how the process of shared governance is supposed to work. While I'm sure that there are some who would argue the entire situation and the ensuing controversy that surrounded it could have been avoided in the first place, if the administration had initially approached the task of thinking about how best to safeguard kin a different way, I nevertheless appreciate the fact that the faculty were clearly able to influence the outcome, not least of all because of their very active and thoughtful engagement with the issue.

([00:06:03](#)):

I can tell you that board chair Quinn Buckner expressed his gratitude to everyone involved in the discussion surrounding the issue, including me personally, which I appreciated. He also seemed very conscious of the alarming and clearly intensifying pressures being directed at public institutions of higher education in the state by external forces including the general assembly, and seemed quite committed to facing those challenges head on. I believe his exact words were bring it on Saturday and Sunday, were therefore pretty good for me. Then on Monday morning, just as I was sitting down to begin to think about how we might be able to build on what struck me as a possible opening to collaborate more closely with campus and university leaders, including President Whitten and the trustees themselves on SB two on the SB 2 0 2 issue, I received notice that the Indiana University student government was slated to consider a bill expressing no confidence in President Whitten for a multitude of reasons and explicitly calling on this council and the UFC to follow suit by a specific date April 22nd.

([00:07:05](#)):

As you can probably imagine that imperative directed at this council in the UFC gave me considerable pause, mostly because it forced me to contemplate seriously how I might explain to any reasonable person, including members of the press, the logic of responding to President Whitten and the trustee's decision to do exactly what faculty, staff and students ultimately advise them to do, where the Kinsey is concerned by voting no confidence in them. The other alternative simply ignoring such a measure were to pass struck me as equally problematic like President Whitten, I actually take the concerns and

demands of our students quite seriously, so in thinking about how to prepare for the real, what seemed like the real possibility that we might find ourselves obliged to respond to the IUSG legislation being considered on short notice were to be adopted. What I decided to do was to draft a no confidence resolution of the sort called for in the IUSG measure and then take it to the BFC Executive Committee to seek provisional approval to have it added to our March 19th agenda for consideration.

[\(00:08:06\)](#):

If the IUSG decided to proceed with the measure with the exception of one person, me, the entire executive committee voted that contingent resolution down as I fully expected that they would and here's why, beyond the fact that it was arguably difficult to tell from the wording of the proposed legislation that I looked at Monday morning, whether the IUSG meant to charge this council with conducting a vote of no confidence in present witness's capacity to lead and administrate or whether they meant to charge us with voting no confidence in a broad swath of leaders and administrators at President Whitten has assembled or appointed since her arrival at iu. The language that was being considered at that point at least clearly reflected a limited understanding of how this council operates in a procedural sense and perhaps more importantly why it does so. For example, if anyone associated with drafting the legislation had contacted me before, including such language in the measure, I would've pointed out to them that it is not the custom of this council per se to conduct votes of no confidence at all.

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

Questions of that significance are traditionally entertained in special meetings of the faculty as a whole, both because such questions are indeed extremely weighty, ones that merit being discussed and debated from as many perspectives as possible and because such meetings facilitate vote by secret ballot for the purpose of allowing faculty the fullest latitude possible to vote, their conscience meetings of the BFC by contrast and the UFC as well are conducted using public voting indeed such meetings. In such meetings any member can move the votes be done by roll calls so that individual votes can be associated with specific voters. That may seem like a trivial formalistic consideration to many people and I can understand why, but on a council that includes a significant number of untenured and non-tenured eligible faculty who do not enjoy the protections of tenure such as they are at the moment, I can assure you it is not a minor concern.

[\(00:10:08\)](#):

Then there is the issue of the IUSG legislation as written, including a deadline of that organization's choosing for action by this council, an easy demand for anyone to make, but a very difficult one to respond to. Again, if they had contacted me to seek guidance, I certainly would've explained both the process by which meetings of the entire faculty are called and the logistical challenges involved in facilitating such meetings given the fact that there are somewhere north of 3000 of us, but more to the point I probably would've asked them in all sincerity if they really thought it was appropriate for them to be issuing read very much like an ultimatum for us to act at a speed prescribed by them irrespective of any priorities or procedural or strategic considerations we ourselves might be entertaining at the moment. On the most basic level, I suppose I probably would've asked them how it would feel if the situation was reversed, if this council passed a resolution calling upon that body to act in a manner that we prescribed in light of these concerns.

[\(00:11:17\)](#):

I have to admit that I was personally quite relieved to hear that the IUSG decided last night to refer the proposed legislation for additional consideration. I say this not because I disagree with its contents, with the concerns it seeks to give voice to. In fact, I actually share most of 'em and I have been just about as

pointed in giving voice to them as it is possible for any faculty member to be given the platform that I have at the moment as president of the faculty. But I do think we all students, faculty, staff, and administrators need to think very carefully and strategically at this moment about the approach we're taking to try to advocate on behalf of our interests, especially if our approach in doing so has implications for others who might be trying to achieve different IF related goals.

[\(00:12:05\)](#):

It sounds to me as if members of the IUSG are taking the time necessary to do precisely that kind of thinking, at least with respect to the BFCs involvement, potential involvement in the legislation they're considering, and I'm very glad to hear that. In closing, I would like to be clear about one thing. I understand that many people are frustrated about a lot of things at the moment. I have taken note of that I hope campus and university leaders are taking note of it and I hope campus and university leaders are also taking seriously the need to try to address such frustrations in a constructive way. Personally, I have seen signs to suggest that they are, but we obviously have a lot of work left to do if we want to do more than simply survive one another over the course of the next months and years, which promised to be enormously challenging on a number of fronts.

[\(00:12:56\)](#):

To that end, I would like to take this opportunity to officially invite Provost Soff to deliver the annual state of the campus address at our next meeting on March 19th and to do so in a way that aims primarily to initiate meaningful dialogue with faculty, staff and students at Indiana University Bloomington. I trust that he will take that invitation up seriously. I have one other bit of news to report under the sign of executive committee business. People may recall that last semester at the end of last semester, I reported that in response to issues or concerns raised by our NTT colleagues regarding the non-availability of sabbatical, like leaves as they're described in university level policy, that the executive committee had decided for various reasons not to try to pursue the establishment of some campus level policy mandating the existence of those, but rather to refer the matter to deans to draw their attention to the existing university level policy language and to strongly advocate that they may concerted efforts to be responsive to that policy in a meaningful sense in terms of establishing practices within their units to come as close as possible to honoring the spirit of that directive.

[\(00:14:18\)](#):

Today I managed to find time to do that. I specifically addressed all the deans and did precisely what I said I was going to do. I drew their attention to the existence of the policy vice provost. Dr and I talked to them a little bit about what we see as the potential utility of them trying to get ahead of things in terms of trying to own and define that and to work with their NTT colleagues in constructive ways, and my sense was that they were receptive to that input. So thank you all very much and if I don't have the opportunity to do so, have a lovely spring break. I fully intend to

Speaker 1 [\(00:14:57\)](#):

Thank you, Colin. Good afternoon everybody, and thank you for the invitation. I'm happy to accept. Let me begin by first thanking Colin for his update and his thoughtful and collaborative leadership at this particularly challenging time, and also to thank both Danielle and Kate and I know we talk extensively as I've often shared with other provosts. I don't think there's another provost in the Big 10 that spends as much time on a weekly basis with the faculty elected leadership than we do here, and I'm glad to see that working effectively to get to the future we all aspire to. It is clear we must continue to be willing to listen and collaborate with each other and with colleagues across the university and that we have to find solutions together for our toughest challenges because without that, we cannot realize the amazing

opportunities that lie ahead for us and as we move through the midterms of the semester and get ready for the fast break to come after spring break, thank you to all of you for everything you do to keep us moving forward constantly.

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

Let me start also by addressing the Kinsey Institute. As Colin mentioned, as I'm sure you've all seen late last week at the President's recommendation, the board of trustees have voted unanimously to forego the establishment of a separate nonprofit for the Kinsey Institute. Our next step will be to prepare a plan and submit it to the Indiana State Board of Accounts to see if they can ensure that no state appropriations fund the operations of the Kinsey Institute to the full extent allowed by law. We will continue to provide funding for faculty and staff so they can maintain their affiliation to work with the Kinsey Institute going forward. We remain committed to working with the IU Foundation to further enhance the philanthropic support that'll ensure a sustainable future for Kinsey Institute and once again, my sincere appreciation to all the members of the Kinsey Working Group and to the many individuals who came out to speak about their ideas and concerns about the Kinsey Institute, your feedback, your concerns, your comments significantly informed how we will proceed in protecting the Kinsey Institute here at IU.

[\(00:17:38\)](#):

Second, I want to update you on our efforts to acknowledge and honor the faculty, staff and students who have died in the past year. As you may remember, we had a robust discussion a year ago regarding creating a service called Remembering Hoosiers or honoring Hoosiers to recognize these individuals and our new annual ceremony called Remembering Hoosiers will take place at 4:00 PM on March 26th right here in the President's Hall. Our intention is that this ceremony will provide a space for friends and families to gather in remembrance of their loved ones. This ceremony honoring the relationship that those lost had with IU is the result of months of research and planning undertaken by a working group with representatives from across campus to all of them. Thank you very much. I hope this becomes an annual process for all of us to remember and honor the many individuals who are part of our community and who pass away to give you updates on various searches.

[\(00:18:46\)](#):

The final campus visits for the School of Education Dean candidates are happening this week including one candidate who's here today. I as always encourage you to attend the town hall meetings that are scheduled. They're open to everybody and please share your feedback on these candidates as that helps us identify the right leader for each school. We also have first round interviews for the executive director of the arts and humanities position. Those start this week and I look forward to bringing the finalist for to campus right after spring break. Finally, as many of you probably already know, the Hamilton Luger School does have a new dean. He's here on his second day on the job, John Charri and he officially started yesterday. John comes to us from the University of Michigan. Previously he served there as the Ford School Associate Dean for research and policy engagement.

[\(00:19:49\)](#):

He oversaw a record number of strategic faculty hires, contributed to fundraising strategies and outreach that led to a series of major gifts. He also led a new series of community dialogues, organized a new office to support policy engagement and engaged learning, and was part of the leadership team that saw unprecedented levels of reported staff satisfaction. He is a notable expert on international relations, particularly in the Indo-Pacific Region International Law and Institutions International Criminal Justice and Rule of law initiative in fragile states. When you get a chance, please welcome John to IU and

before I finish this one, I want to express my gratitude to Nick Cohor, who served almost two years as the interim dean for the Hamilton Luger School.

[\(00:20:43\)](#):

Before I open this discussion for questions for the room, there were a number of questions that came about this week, particularly around SB 2 0 2 as well as further questions and comments on the Halabi exhibit and invited guests. While there likely won't be time to address every detail here, let me try and cover as much as I can. First related to the exhibit, the Eskenazi Museum has a range of programming that was planned to exist complimentary to the exhibit, including a special section of the Family Art Lab series and an open meditation space. As a result of the cancellation, the open meditation space is now in the first floor featured exhibition space and will reoccur throughout March more frequently than it had otherwise been planned. In addition, the museum's chair of education facilitated an event late in February about Islamophobia and an foreign online EDD program specializing in art education.

[\(00:21:49\)](#):

There is also a program in the works with Amrita Raza, a sculpture and installation artist who was raised in Tehran. All public Eskenazi museum events are listed on the website's events calendar, and I encourage you to take a look at those events and participate as your interests and times allow because work to prepare the exhibit had already commenced internal public arts and humanities funds were used to support related curatorial research and produced the Centers of Energy catalog. While the exhibition was canceled, the research and catalog still stand to benefit readers prior to their public letter. I corresponded in writing and met in person with the faculty and staff at the Eskenazi School in early February to discuss their concerns, particularly around this event. At that time, I shared that although I know it may not offer reassurance in the short term, I believe our best course is to work together every day forth to uphold the role art and artists play on our campus and in our society, and to affirm our shared conviction that creative expression is vital to a healthy and open-minded society.

[\(00:23:04\)](#):

I also shared that I understand fully the best proof will be in our individual and collective actions to come, but I'm confident that together we can continue to boldly pursue knowledge and truth and art wherever they may lead. To that end, I am fully aware of the recent media coverage as I am aware of all IU media coverage and I encourage us all to see that coverage on balance, which leans towards highlighting all the great work that you and your colleagues do and the impact that you're having across IU and the world every single day. There were a series of questions around events and while there enough time to walk fully through event registration guidelines and policies, I would direct community members to our university wide registration process [available@universityevents.iu.edu](mailto:available@universityevents.iu.edu). These guidelines apply to non-academic IU sponsored events regardless of location both on campus and off campus and depending on the preferred venue, there may also be a parallel room reservation process with additional requirements.

[\(00:24:15\)](#):

I wholly encourage all members of our community to pursue guests and events that will enhance the full range of dialogue at IU. We had a number of questions on SB 2 0 2 and we have Michael Huber and Angela Smith Jones here and they'll address some of the work done on that front in a bit. A lot of these questions were also around the actual implementation and I know everybody's eager to understand what it means and how we will do it, but please remember this is still a bill. It still needs to go through the process and needs to be approved and signed into law, and this is one of many different bills that Michael and Angela are tracking and supporting, so while I can address some of the questions, a lot of the details remain to be decided. While I have not spoken directly to the bill sponsor personally, I know

that Michael and team continue to work extremely hard to promote IU best interests and those of higher education more broadly.

[\(00:25:26\)](#):

Several community members submitted very specific questions about the builds impacts and implementation as the bill is not yet finalized into law and no process for implementation has begun or guidance from the board or state officials provided. Nearly all answers are still to be determined. However, I have spoken with President Whitten and we are committed to working as closely, collaboratively and inclusively as possible with faculty, with our academic leaders and departments to review and implement any new measures in ways that best ensure faculty governance, the continued success of our faculty and the thriving academic community at IU. There was one final question about the appropriateness of a given sanction in a faculty disciplinary process as connected to certain actions. As I have shared before in this venue, the faculty disciplinary policies belong to you, the faculty, if you feel certain actions and indicate certain sanctions or not, I encourage you to have the policies reflect those perspectives. I understand that revisions are underway now with UFC, correct, Colin? Yes. So this is a wonderful time to raise these issues and I am sure there are several individuals here who would be happy to connect on that front. With that, if we have a couple of minutes, I can take some questions from the floor before I move on to the next item.

[\(00:26:58\)](#):

Yes.

Speaker 4 [\(00:27:01\)](#):

Hi. I don't know if everybody's seen Purdue's interesting response to the 202 bill, which took some nice swipes at us but also had proposed it was really pretty interesting if you've not read it, but also had kind of an interesting response to the faculty appointment and review position. I wonder if you have any comment about IU perhaps following a similar strategy. Should this come to pass

Speaker 1 [\(00:27:26\)](#):

About 202? Yeah, how about we wait for Michael and Angela's discussion because some of the things you're asking will probably become clear there. Great,

Speaker 4 [\(00:27:36\)](#):

Thank you.

Speaker 1 [\(00:27:38\)](#):

Anything else? Okay. Oh yeah, we have one more. Thank

Speaker 5 [\(00:27:44\)](#):

You. So in terms of, as you say, thinking about press coverage and the way in which we should think about it in the big picture, and I don't follow press coverage closely, but could you help me understand, has the central, have you been on record in media coverage explaining the process by which the cancellation came about and helping? Sorry, I'm thinking about this in relation to the difficulties that the museum faces sort of in the court of public opinion in terms of how it is that they can regain a kind of positive press, and I'm just wondering if I've missed it, where the university, where you've been quoted in terms of explaining and defending the decision.



Speaker 1 ([00:28:33](#)):

I think there has been coverage in various higher ed publications. The initial coverage was not talking about the details because they weren't available. The more recent ones have, again, it's as I have explained here and I've talked to faculty in the Eskenazi School of Art, these are largely related to security issues. People are asking, what's the straw that broke the camel's back? There isn't one. There are constant demands. Just last week we had major events Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and the needs were enough that our security team had people come in from Indianapolis and regional campuses. We have hundreds, literally hundreds of events constantly and we don't have enough people to cover everything all the time. So it was done on the balance of those decisions. Some recent coverage has identified those, but others have not, and this is continuously evolving. I'm sure there'll be other stories about this in the coming weeks. So Elizabeth,

Speaker 6 ([00:29:49](#)):

You've pointed us to university events for arranging events on campus, but considering that Hallee was canceled and that other events haven't been allowed to happen, are you afraid that IU might become irrelevant and that more of us might seek private settings for events of interest to the community?

Speaker 1 ([00:30:14](#)):

I don't see that as much as, as we get headlines around one event, no event has been canceled, even that one event was not canceled. What we do, what our policies allow us to do is to control place and time in order to manage security. We do not cancel events based on the content of the events. Again, I can count four events just in the last five days that have had people passionately on one side or the other and each of those went through a process they were navigated. We had when the event it was deemed necessary to have security presence, security was made available to those. When events, when we do not have the ability to have the appropriate level of security, we recommend a different location or a different time, but we do not censor events based on the topic of the event. Seeing no other questions, we can move on with the next item in the agenda and the next one is discussions around Senate bill 2 0 2 and we have probably for the first time joining this meeting, our new vice president for university relations, Michael Huber and Angela Smith Jones. Michael, take it away.

Speaker 7 ([00:31:48](#)):

Thank you to this council for giving us the opportunity to be here this afternoon. We know you have a busy agenda and we will be brief and one of the reasons we'll be brief is because Angela and I will after at the council's discretion when this ends, we will drive back to Indianapolis and watch the floor of the house and the Senate because some of the bills we're going to mention today are still being debated, perhaps amended, so we've still got a few days, possibly a week. We think that the short session this year will be over on Friday. Before I do that though, I want to share a little bit because it is, my name's Michael Huber, vice President of University relations. I've been with IU since October of 22, so this would be just my second time going through a legislative session as an employee of IU.

([00:32:35](#)):

I do want to introduce my colleague Angela Smith, who just started in December and I could recite Angela's bio by heart and I won't do that because we've worked together for many years, but most recently some of Angela, she served as the head of government affairs and diversity equity inclusion for the Indianapolis Marion County Health and Hospital Corporation, which includes Eskenazi Hospital previous to that five years as deputy mayor for economic development for the city of Indianapolis. And

yes, she and I have worked together in a few different roles including for the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce several years ago. So I'm not going to go through your full bio Angela, but just please,

Speaker 8 ([00:33:12](#)):

That's plenty. We'll get to the meat of things, but so nice to be here and meet you all. Thank you so much for the time and the opportunity to share with you what's been occurring in this legislative session. So thank you.

Speaker 7 ([00:33:23](#)):

So as has been mentioned just in the 20 minutes or so that we've been here, these are difficult times, but we're also incredibly honored to get to do this work on behalf of IU and work with you more and more before we go through a brief legislative update. I do want to express personal gratitude to Colin Johnson and Kate Rec from the BFC for their communication, especially over the last month for providing intel and information, representing the perspectives of a wide variety of faculty and just helping us stay in communication and really understand the perspectives of faculty on some pretty complex issues. Those many of you I know because several of you have reached out to us sharing your perspectives, many of you follow the legislature, the general assembly in Indiana very closely. For those of you who might be new faculty or don't, of course every other year, the odd numbered years in Indiana are a budget session in the general assembly where they develop the biennial budget for the state and higher ed institutions and typically that session lasts from January to May in the even numbered years. We're in what's called a short session and short sessions can, Angela and I have worked a lot of sessions including a lot of sessions together, although it's unique to be able to get to do this for IU short sessions typically January to February, January to mid-March. Is that about

Speaker 8 ([00:34:46](#)):

Right to mid-March the day before my birthday? We'll talk about that later.

Speaker 7 ([00:34:53](#)):

I hate to joke because we're talking about some really important things today, but I've been doing this for about 20 years and every other year the legislators say, oh, short session, it's going to be an easy in and out. There's going to be no controversy. We have people running in primary elections, there's going to be no controversy. And every year there's controversy, and this year has been no exception and apologies for those of you who've seen a version of this presentation before. We do like to level set when we show with this map a about the balance of power in Indiana, the partisan balance of power because it's just a fact. We have super majorities in the state, particularly in the Senate with 40 Republicans and 10 Democrats and then a different balance of power in house, but then all of the state elected offices currently held by Republicans.

([00:35:40](#)):

And I never assume that everyone in the room is of the same political persuasion. It's always a mix. But this is just to say that when Angela and I on behalf of you are representing the positions of Indiana University and in life it's more fun to play offense, we're going to tell you about how we've been playing some defense in this session when you're trying to get policies passed or occasionally playing defense in Indiana, it's just math. You need enough Republican votes to win the game and that is just a fact of where we are. And this is, I'll editorialize for a second. This is a personal comment. The Indiana maps reflect an American I'll say problem, and that is the polarization that's happening in the country. And so

it is a sad fact. This is my personal opinion that you've seen rural areas in many parts of America go solidly red and then urban areas and college towns go blue. But that is just a fact of where we are in 2024 and we've always got to be aware of those dynamics. Now Angela's got a perspective on this in terms of the importance of long-term relationship building. I'm not going to put words in your mouth I'll ask you to share.

Speaker 8 ([00:36:47](#)):

So as Michael indicated, this is what it looks like now and this has been a shift over time. What I have learned in my many years of working with the legislatures, the most important thing is to develop relationships in that from the very beginning you may be on opposite sides of a situation, but when you find that thread of commonality of humanity and each person, regardless of how far right or left they are from where you are, then they see the humanity in you and they are able to hear your message better, relate it to their own situation or extrapolate it, extrapolate it out to a human situation. And that is where you have opportunity to come to a meeting of the mind and then possibly shift where they are from where they were in the beginning if they were in opposition to you. And they also will tell you where they are, which sometimes is to your benefit, even if they're against you, you want them to tell you in the beginning so you can kind of just move accordingly with respect again to the human that's representing that current district.

Speaker 7 ([00:37:49](#)):

So we're going to provide a quick snapshot of bills impacting IU and higher education in general, but we've listed them really in order of what we think is impact and urgency. So we know there've been questions about Senate Bill 202 and we've received many questions from people in this room again and thank you to Colin and to Kate and others for helping us to organize that feedback at a stressful time. 202 was introduced by Senator Spencer Dery who represents an area around West Lafayette. Senator De is also an employee of the Purdue Research Foundation and brought this bill forward and it does a lot of different things. It's got multiple factors that in the judgment of President Whitten are disruptive to Indiana University. She's on record saying that, but we won't go through every single bullet, but we will say as we have heard from you and from others, the most disruptive thing that this bill would do is the introduction of this review, which would occur every five years for tenured faculty.

([00:38:54](#)):

And I won't quote the language exactly, but to determine the extent to which a faculty member has fostered a culturally and intellectually diverse learning environment in that professor's teaching. If those terms seem vague, it's because they are, and as the bill has gone through amendments and minor changes, that language remains vague. It remains in my opinion somewhat ambiguous. Now again, the other thing, if you work with Angela and myself, Angela is a lawyer, I am not. So I defer to her on all legal questions. But Angela, in terms of the five-year review, which we've received, I mean certainly hundreds of inputs from faculty, vast majority has been negative feedback saying this is disruptive, it's not needed. What other context would be important on this concept of the five-year review?

Speaker 8 ([00:39:47](#)):

So the concept as Michael indicated is so and not to be disrespectful, but it is poorly written. So if you look at it from either a legal or a policy or logical implementation perspective, it is practically impossible to implement the way it is written. The best thing that has come out of that component is that now there is authority that's been delegated that the board of trustees have that power of delegation and that is the best thing because then it becomes the hands of the university and it is not as it was

originally, which was more heavy handed on the legislature or the board of trustees. So that's the best thing. I don't know how you test whether a professor is keeping free expression in their classroom or not, when that is usually what the foundation is of higher ed anyway. And so it's by its nature, it's contradictory in application to the reality in which we live. So that's some of the challenge with the way the legislation is written.

Speaker 7 ([00:40:53](#)):

The other factor that we'll mention, which I believe is on this fourth bullet, which is we're still trying to understand where this came from and what the intent is, is the Indiana a new role for the Indiana Commission on higher ed? So the Indiana Commission on Higher Education historically has had authority over well guidelines on development of university budgets, guidelines on curricula being developed at universities so that universities could be working in concert and not always competitively and things like that. The bill contemplates an unprecedented role for the commission on higher ed, which would mean faculty, staff and students who are unsatisfied with that. Maybe their complaint has not been heard within. Say if it was a faculty member, staff member, a student within Indiana University can appeal that to the commission on higher ed. To date, the commission on higher ed hasn't had that capability to be able to hear or adjudicate those complaints. I say

Speaker 8 ([00:41:49](#)):

That that is correct, and the way it is currently written, there are no standards. So what is the standard of murder? What is the standard of robbery? So there is no standard, and so therefore, again, going back to being extremely ambiguous and the other challenges dissatisfied is the only language in there. So it doesn't matter if it's true, there is no other standard and then any and all of us, even at the end of the day, if I hit Michael right now and you all witness it, but at the end of the day you're the jurors and you say she hit Michael and that's against university policy. Well, I'm dissatisfied with that because I don't want anyone to say I hit Michael, but it is factual and that is the problem. So when you look at state universities, just say on average there's five complaints a week, a week, and you multiply that by the number of state institutions and the commission of higher ed just simply does not have that capacity.

([00:42:46](#)):

The one positive change to that over this time is that they did originally say that the commission would issue an order. So whatever that order was of me hitting Michael, I could file that complaint and they would issue an order even though they don't have authority to do so. But then we would have to comply. I would have to comply with whatever that I'd have to apologize to Michael in a public setting, whatever they ordered. Now it is simply an opinion which is better, but still the ability to get there is extremely ambiguous and legally, again, to me, an opportunity to be challenged.

Speaker 7 ([00:43:25](#)):

So some of you will be aware that there was an amendment added to the bill that would have provided two trustees, and this would be I believe unprecedented for our state nominated by the Indiana General Assembly by the legislature, one from the house and one from the Senate and those two trustees to all state institutions. And again, the lesson I think for both of us is all our state institutions trustees are nominated a little bit differently. No one has the exact same governance structure as it would have impacted in. Those two trustees would have replaced two of our three alumni elected trustees. That amendment was defeated, that language was taken out in the house deliberation. Now we're still, this is

one reason we will go back tonight and watch the bills. Those of you who follow the legislature, just because that provision is out of this bill doesn't mean that it has no chance of coming back.

[\(00:44:22\)](#):

Sometimes things like that might get tacked onto another bill, but the odds of the trustee governance model of IU changing just went down significantly by virtue of the trustee provision taken out of this bill. The five-year review remains, and we've had, it's not over till it's over, but one thing for those of you who haven't followed the bill closely, the trustees of each state university set the terms for that review. Now, president Whitten a few weeks ago went on record saying we're opposed to 202, it's not needed, it's not helpful. And she really took the line of argument, which we felt was the best line of argument to try to win support from Republican elected officials that it create among other things. It creates a huge competitive disadvantage when you in all your fields are in a very competitive environment to recruit and retain and grow diverse faculty here at Indiana University.

[\(00:45:22\)](#):

So she's on record opposing it. Now, we had hoped that other university presidents would come on board in opposition to 202 and so far they have not to our knowledge unless that's changed. So we had hopes that that would make it easier for other universities to oppose and they did not, which is frustrating. So anyway, just the facts on 202, it passed both the house and the Senate. The Senate voted last Thursday and it is on the governor's desk awaiting signature. We are lobbying the governor's office. We are communicating with the governor's office since the minute this passed to make the case in more detail than what we've been able to share with you. Now, I'm just going to say this, we get this question a lot in Indiana, you only need 51% to override a governor's veto. So it's not in every case, but there have been many cases in the last several sessions where the governor uses the veto and then both houses come back and we'll override the veto. We still think in this case it would be meaningful, at least on principle for the governor be wing in because there are times when the general assembly says, we're not going to bother to try to override a veto. That's right.

Speaker 8 [\(00:46:31\)](#):

And it could in the event because it's not over until it's over and you have to run this race like that. It could be that the governor issuing a veto could signal to other elected officials that it is okay to stand against this bill. Yes, where they may have felt pressure previously to tack along with their caucus. So that's why you always keep fighting until the end.

Speaker 7 [\(00:46:54\)](#):

We have a few other updates, but we won't be nearly as long on the others. This has been the big one, if that's okay to the counsel. Okay. So HB 1179 does a couple of things which are not ideal. The one that several folks we've heard from multiple people in this room has been regarding public statements of employees by public universities. And as the bill stands today, it essentially says, I'll defer to Angela on the legal, but it essentially says that the president of our state universities may only make public statements on those issues that are directly related to operating the university. That other statements that do not pertain to directly operating, operating the university must be approved by the board of trustees privately. President Whitten has weighed in with, she didn't make a public statement on this one. She was using her public political capital on 202 privately. She has weighed in with a number of legislators and we have in turn at her direction by saying it's not helpful. This is my hypothetical. What if the president of a university needs to weigh in on something like mental health and addictions? Would

the president get her hand slapped saying, oh, you've violated 1179. So we feel it's not helpful, it's not needed.

(00:48:15):

So that's one. There's a second part to this though, which, and it's a little bit odd that it got tacked onto this bill, but it's there and it's regarding the transfer and licensing of IP developed by the university. I'll defer to Angela on this one. You need to know that this is in there as well.

Speaker 8 (00:48:29):

Yeah, so I've been working with our general counsel's office on this, worked diligently to try and get amended language because the way it's written again is so broad and so vague. It would be impossible to implement because there's a component of it that says any intellectual property, which also means copyrighted, which also means the moment you write a book, start to draw a picture, publish an article, whatever it is, that's when you're right to copyright attaches and are you utilizing university resources Well, is that a copier? Is that a laptop? Is that whatever a skid machine is? I don't know all the science stuff, but you know what I mean. You know what I mean? Is it a billion dollar asset or is it a hundred dollars asset? And because it is written so vaguely, it is concerning. I am still working with our general counsel throughout this whole process to understand what it really means and how we would or would not implement it.

Speaker 7 (00:49:28):

And I forgot to mention the language is around foreign

Speaker 8 (00:49:32):

Adversaries. Foreign adversaries, yes.

Speaker 7 (00:49:34):

And if that seems general, it's because it is. So we're trying to figure that out. And also, I mean ideally we're working with other universities to try to get it taken out, but if it's going to remain in there to become much more specific because it's hard to get a read on what is meant. Sorry, go ahead.

Speaker 8 (00:49:48):

Yeah, they did change it to foreign adversaries originally. It just said China now. Yeah, now it says foreign adversaries as defined by the federal government or the governor of the state of Indiana. I'm not sure what we do with foreign adversaries, however, that is how the language is currently

Speaker 7 (00:50:08):

Written. This one we're tracking tonight because I believe it just passed. It just

Speaker 8 (00:50:11):

Passed

Speaker 7 (00:50:12):

The Senate, and so it was third reading and then we're waiting to see if there'd be a conference committee. Is that right? Right. That would be ideal. It's kind of a moving target. Yes. Some others, and

we'll go over these closely, there was HB 10 0 1, which, and this is President Whitten has said it does some pretty good things. It's trying to find funding streams for things like apprenticeships. The part where we opposed in private is that it would've diverted funding from a couple of different funds that are really important to IU and other state universities for four year college students. They will continue to fund apprenticeships, but they've determined they'll find other funding sources essentially, and they won't go to 21st Century scholars and other four year college funds.

Speaker 8 ([00:50:54](#)):

I do want to put a pin in this for you, although just in case you're unaware. Last year the legislature implemented a law that said there's an automatic draw down. So if you are eligible, you are automatically enrolled to receive your 21st Century Scholars and Franco Bandon dollars. So we have no idea what that drawdown looks like, and yet the original form of this bill said that we're going to take monies out of that bucket and give it to students who want to get an apprenticeship. Obvious. Absolutely. Certificates, trades, apprenticeships are highly valued, but we don't want to take dollars from students and families who want a four year bachelor's degree and divert it. We want to have enough dollars for both so that everybody can get exactly the type of education and workforce training that they desire for themselves. And also, by the way, why don't we make it where it is credit bearing so that if today I want to be a plumber, but now I realize I like engineering, I want to become an engineer, it makes more sense for that to be put in this bill as well. It's been stripped pretty severely by the Senate, and so it's more than likely going to go to conference committee, which is another reason why we have to stay on it to make sure they can keep those points that I just made to you in perspective when they're editing the bill or maybe it dies.

Speaker 7 ([00:52:14](#)):

We'll go quickly because if we have time, take questions or comments. But the other one, you can kind of sum these up, SB eight and SB 48 and two 70, I won't spend a lot of time. There will be some new reporting requirements that we will have to comply with as the university. Some of them you can understand where they're coming from. They're measures for us to be more transparent about graduation rates and costs and things like that. The biggest one though, remains 2 0 2 is the most disruptive. And so that one as sits on the governor's desk as we wait to, and again, there's been a lot of back and forth communication substantial since Friday, and so we're going to continue to take our best shot. What I would like to say though, before we take questions, assuming we have time, is we've had a lot of discussions and particularly in the last couple of weeks with Colin. Again, Colin, thank you for taking the time.

([00:53:20](#)):

Some of these bills, especially 2 0 2, beg the question of where do we go from here? And it's a good question. It's one we've been thinking about a lot. We need to create a better engagement strategy, especially to reach these newer legislators, some of whom just they don't have a complete view of IU and that is being kind because they don't, and I will say what I'm about to say is part of public testimony. You can see it on the video at a day when Colin and many others, I think some people in this room came down to testify against 2 0 2 along with faculty that we at the direction of President Whitten and Rahul recruited. Thank you for taking the time to do that. The sponsor of the bill, Senator Dery says, college going rates are down. And he believes that college going rates are down because conservative students feel like they're not heard and they're not being treated fairly.

([00:54:15](#)):

I have my own personal views on whether on the validity of that premise, but it's just a fact that there are a lot of our elected representatives around the state, and a lot of them tend to be newer who believe that, and a lot of them are operating with a very incomplete picture of IU that doesn't represent the full diversity of all the programs and the political diversity that exists at IU. And they're not going to know unless we tell them. So this is a big part of Angela and my responsibility, but it's also something we can't do alone and we wouldn't try. So our typical mode of political outreach is not going to be enough. Now we're going to go back, we're going to watch some bills tonight. We're going to put the analysis together for all of you and see where we land before we start developing those plans. But I'll just personally, that's been a wake up call of this session because when you have bills like 202 and you organize opposition from a diverse set of people and you only make a little bit of ground, you've got to do, excuse me, we know we knew we have to do a better job telling our story.

Speaker 8 ([00:55:18](#)):

Angela, I did want to put a pin in one thing Michael said about understanding how diverse we are as an institution, a system also recognizing the economic impact. All of you are bringing in research dollars in some capacity at some level, and they are not aware of that. How rich our university is. Not only that you live and work in the state of Indiana. So the benefit of us remaining all of us is also another positive economic impact to the state. And that goes back to Michael's point about why we need to get out to our elected officials and share those stories with them. So they see we are residents of the state of Indiana as well as professors and every administrators, every employee that we are. So thank you.

Speaker 1 ([00:56:06](#)):

Thank you, Michael. Thank you, Angela. We have time for a couple of questions. Shall we start there?

Speaker 9 ([00:56:14](#)):

Thank you very much for that presentation. I'm curious about in HB 1179 and in a policy I think that already exists, that currently restricts faculty speech in various ways and in HB 79, it would require universities to further restrict faculty speech. You mentioned that it would restrict President Whitten, but as I read it, it also restricts faculty speech. And what plans does your office have to ensure that faculty speech is protected

Speaker 7 ([00:56:50](#)):

Consistent

Speaker 9 ([00:56:50](#)):

With academic freedom?

Speaker 7 ([00:56:51](#)):

Yeah, so we will have to work with the general counsel's office to make sure that we have a policy that is compliant, number one. And now the other thing is too, Angela and I have heard Angela is very new. I'm not that new anymore. A lot of concerns about the longstanding GO one policy, which I assume you're referring to. We need to look at how do we comply with HB 1179 and then how can we essentially improve upon and create a clearer policy. I also get questions about the policy on a regular basis there. Some people have questions about what are the parameters of it, and so I can't answer your question yet in terms of where that lands, but we need to use the compliance review of 1179 as the event to



essentially create a new policy. And then maybe in doing so, we can address some of the concerns of GO one that people have brought forward in the past several months.

Speaker 10 ([00:57:58](#)):

Karen, thank you so much for the presentation. And as a former, very minor public official myself, thank you for encouraging us to get engaged and involved. They won't know unless we tell them, right? My question is to do with 2 0 2 and the way it describes tenured faculty as a lay person reading that, I see it as they say tenure, but do they mean what we mean by tenure or do they mean all faculty? I am a non-tenured faculty member here, and my non-tenured colleagues are reading that and saying, does this apply to us? Number one, I know it's not done yet, but the question about how will non-tenured faculty be affected here and what does that look like? Do you read the bill seeing tenure the way a university describes it, or do you think they mean all faculty?

Speaker 8 ([00:58:48](#)):

I'm trying to be appropriate. I'm not sure they knew what they meant and not being disrespectful to the author, but that's what we meant by extremely ambiguous and vague.

Speaker 7 ([00:59:03](#)):

His intent was certainly tenured faculty. Correct. We know that

Speaker 8 ([00:59:06](#)):

That was his intent, but to your point, when it comes to application, we are literally going to have to work so closely with our general counsel's office to ensure that we're following the law, but also making it applicable to the way we actually operate and live in university life. So I appreciate your question, but we don't have the exact answer because it is so ambiguously written. You are correct. So thank you for that though.

Speaker 1 ([00:59:35](#)):

I think we have time for one more question, Elizabeth.

Speaker 6 ([00:59:40](#)):

This is a legal question. So there's this part of it that has to do with DEI statements and it says something like, you can't require a faculty member to write a statement and require an oath to do something that I don't think we do anyways, which is to treat groups specially. And then it says that you cannot use that to hire somebody. It's a positive. But is there anything stopping us from requiring a DEI type statement that says that everybody's required to describe how they foster an inclusive environment in their classroom and then use it not affirmatively to hire people who say that they treat people differently but negatively, so that if I say I only believe in the classics and white men reign supreme, that you could use it to negatively hire someone? It's a legal question because it's written one way and I know what English means, but I don't know whether what the law means.

Speaker 8 ([01:00:52](#)):

Again, the challenge is that not only is it ambiguous, it's also contradictory in that section. So I don't know because we'll have to work with general counsel, but you may have shone the light on something in that utilizing the exact language from the bill might be a protection for us because then that way

we're following the author's intent. But again, a very challenging area to apply because of the vagueness of the way the law and the contradictory aspect.

Speaker 7 ([01:01:23](#)):

But as the non-lawyer, I will say, what will happen is session ends. We'll provide the review of what's in the bills, work with the general counsel's office for their interpretation. These are the types of questions though that we won't be overseeing, but these are the types of questions in terms of implementation that will become very relevant. Yeah, par.

Speaker 1 ([01:01:45](#)):

Okay. Thank you Michael. Thank you Angela. As somebody who's seen them work up close and personal day in and day out, I appreciate everything you're doing, so thank you. Thank you very much. Okay, time for one more. Is there more? Can we answer one more question, Michael? Yeah,

Speaker 11 ([01:02:06](#)):

Sorry about that. I was a little invisible. This is less a question, but I thank you for the presentation and more of a comment and it goes to the question about who is tenured. That's actually not the issue in the bill that we should be concerned with. The issue is who is a faculty member, especially since in Article 39.5, chapter one, section three faculty member means an employee of an institution whose employment duties include teaching students of the institution. So a bill that ostensibly looks to protect the political viewpoints of students also opens graduate instructors to every one of the ills that could assault faculty. I just haven't heard that point made yet and I thought it was important. Thank you.

Speaker 1 ([01:02:45](#)):

Thank you, thank you. Okay, let's move on to the next item, which is our annual report from the athletics committee and to present that as the world's best athletic director, Scott Dolson, supported by Carrie Dockerty and Marietta Simpson, who we haven't seen in almost a year. Welcome back, Marietta.

Speaker 11 ([01:03:06](#)):

Well, thank you so much, president Johnson and the rest of the Bloomington Faculty Council for allowing us to give report today. And thank you for allowing us to follow Michael and Angela because I believe our report will be much lighter and I think we have a lot of big stuff going on in IU athletics, a lot of heavy stuff, but it feels so much lighter after being here for this meeting. But again, thank you so much for this opportunity. We always look forward to it. And I do want to start by recognizing Marietta as our big 10 faculty athletic rep. She's done an amazing job and I'm not sure how familiar all of you are with the governance of the Big 10, but the faculty reps, the athletic directors and the senior women administrators really formed the governance and Marietta represents you in our university in a first class fashion and couldn't imagine going through all the things we go through without her support.

([01:03:54](#)):

So I want to thank her at the same time to thank Carrie Dockerty who serves as the chair of our faculty athletics committee, again relative to us here on the Bloomington campus with all she has going on. Just does a phenomenal job of helping lead us in making certain that all of the checks and balances, all the things that are important to you are shared or collaborated with within our department. So thanks so much to Marietta and Carrie. I'd also like to thank Provost Shasta and President Whitten because again, at the same time with all the things that are going on, much, much more important in athletics than

university. We do have several to transformative time and it's something I think you'll hear a lot about during my report, but I just can't thank Raul and President Whitten for their unwavering support and guidance as we navigate these waters.

[\(01:04:40\):](#)

So what I plan to do is go through, and I'm going to watch our time here. I know we are limited, but what we like to do is make certain we give you a report on where we are relative to our priorities. And the priorities that you see up on the screen are really our foundation of IU athletics and they really are playing by the rules. I mean, that should go unstated, but certainly we want to make certain that we're always following all big 10 NCA university policies and we're in a highly regulated business that it sounds sometimes easier said than done. We do a lot of rules education and make certain that we're monitoring on a regular basis as well. Second priority is our personal development of all of our student athletes. Third is academic excellence should go without saying, but in this day and age, that's something that's really, really important in college athletics, that we continually beat that drum, we know why we're here.

[\(01:05:30\):](#)

Fourth is athletic excellence. If we want to compete, we want to try to win, and that's certainly part of our student athlete experience and then certainly integrating with university. So that's really the bedrock of IU athletics and what I'll take you through in this report is give you how are we doing in those areas? What's the last year look like since I've been here? As it relates to priority number one, again, our top priority, we've had no major infractions in 16 years. Again, monitoring is certainly very important, but we would look at it as a high priority in the Department of a year round rules education program for all of our student athletes and staff. And as I mentioned, and I'll probably say changing landscape and transformative time and another 20 times during this report, but there's so much change going on in college athletics, it puts an even larger emphasis on our top priority to make certain we're keeping up with all the changes.

[\(01:06:23\):](#)

Number two, student athlete wellbeing again, which is our personal development of our student athletes. The best way to think about this is everything outside of academics and outside of athletics. What are we doing for the whole person? I'm really proud of our efforts. I think this is something that puts us on the cutting edge as it relates to college athletics in general. We have what's called our excellence academy where we focus on several areas including leadership and life skills, make certain community service, a lot of areas, mental health, wellbeing and physical health. And the two examples, I won't go through every bullet point in the interest of time, but we formed a mental health task force. I'm really, really proud of in our department. Honestly, I don't know where we'd be if we hadn't really focused on mental health as the mental health challenges seem to just grow exponentially.

[\(01:07:09\):](#)

We focus on the resources for our student athletes, but probably more importantly, we focus on the training of all of our student facing staff in the department. So if you have a role where you're student facing, you're required annually to go through a training program where you could recognize the telltale signs of mental health issues. And we've had countless examples where maybe a strength coach will come forward to one of our mental health professionals and say, I'm worried about so-and-so they don't seem right. And those things are really helping us get in front of maybe major issues. So I'm really proud of this effort. The second area that I wanted to highlight is our anti hate anti-racism coalition. We've changed the name of that to Beyond Cream and Crimson. We've said all along that inclusion is something that's a marathon. It's not a 50 yard dash.

[\(01:07:53\)](#):

It's not just something we put on our website and then think we've checked the box. We're continually working on programming within our department. It's promote inclusion and through the list it gives you examples. One of the areas I'm most proud of, we've got an athletic director's council on diversity and inclusion inclusivity. And in that we have one student athlete representative from each sport where we meet monthly and just talk about topics that are going on in the university, in the community, in the United States. And it's amazing how we can get so many things done just talking through what's happening. And I think it's something that then they go back to their teammates and talk about that. So I'm really, really proud of our personal development program. I wish we could spend more time on that as it relates to academic excellence, and this is again why we're here, and I'm extremely proud of the efforts of our senior associate AD for academics, Laurie and Price and that whole area because our student athletes have continued to exceed all of our expectations in terms of our graduation success rate was 90% last year.

[\(01:08:55\)](#):

It's a fifth time in six years, it was 90%. Our academic progress rate, which is a rate that's set by the NCAA formula to make certain that all of our student athletes are progressing. We're well above what the standard is in that. And we had 11 programs have a perfect score in that area. And I think the two most important stats that I think you'll be most interested in, we had 339 academic, all big 10 student athletes. That would be student athletes with a 3.0 or higher GPA, which was the second most in school history last year. And then last year as well, last academic year, we had 115 Big 10 distinguished scholars, which is a 3.7 or higher GPA, which is an all time record for our department. So again, extremely proud of the academic progress of our student athletes, the dedication they have to the programming.

[\(01:09:42\)](#):

Again, Marietta starting with her, with me, with all of our leadership on down, it's why we're here and we keep that priority in perspective. Last year we had 141 student athletes earn their degrees at IU, which again we're so proud of in terms of athletic excellence. As I said earlier, if we're going to compete, we're going to compete to win. And when I talk about winning a lot in our department, and it's not because that's what we're supposed to do, it's not because that it's IU and we just need to try to win for alumni for any other reason. For me, it's a part of our student athlete experience. If we really want to maximize our student athlete experience in every way, winning is a part of that. I think they learn through the ability to win, the ability to learn how to win, and we have exit interviews with all of our student athletes as they finish their time here at IU.

[\(01:10:31\)](#):

And I can tell you without question that the student athletes who've had an opportunity to be a part of a program that has maybe turned the corner, maybe had some big wins, have learned how to overcome adversity. Those student athlete experiences are way higher than student athletes who have not been a part of a program that has developed a way to learn how to win. So this just gives you examples of how we've done that and the success we've had. In fact, in this fiscal year and fiscal year 24, we are leading the Big 10. We have four big 10 championships, which is more than any other school with men's soccer, having two of those a regular season and postseason and then men swimming and diving and women's swimming and diving, just in the last week each one, their perspective, big 10 championships and I might add the women's swimming and diving, big 10 championship was one of the most dramatic victories maybe in our team sport history in terms of the way they came back.

[\(01:11:22\)](#):

It was a four day event. It was kind of against all odds in that fourth day to even have a chance to compete for the championship, everything had to go right. We had a platform diver in the second to last event, have to attempt one of the most highest degree difficulty of dives a handstand from the platform. I think it was a quadruple rotation, and she nailed that, which enabled her to go from third to first. She won the event and subsequently we had our four by 400 relay team have to finish ahead of Ohio State to win the meet. And we were down going into the fourth leg and our fastest swimmer caught up past Ohio State, ended up touching the wall before and we won by 0.5 points to win the Big 10 championships. So again, that's great that we won, but the way our team came together and their experience was just phenomenal.

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

So I would be remiss if I didn't mention our women's basketball program. Again, I think I've talked about that the past couple of years I've been here. Couldn't be more proud of our women and what they're doing, not just in terms of the success they've had on the corporate, but how they brought the university together, the community together. We just finished our last home game this past weekend. We are averaging over 10,000 fans a game, which is only the fourth time in Big 10 history, not IU history, the fourth time in Big 10 history that a women's basketball program has averaged 10,000 more fans. So again, just a lot of great things happening from an athletic standpoint as well. Integrating with the university is our fifth priority and it's something that I'm extremely proud of. We talk about it a lot. We know we're a part of something much bigger than ourselves.

[\(01:13:00\):](#)

Me being here today, I'm proud to represent athletics, but I am more proud that I represent the university as a whole, not just athletics. And we take a great amount of pride in representing the athletic department and integrating with the university. The area that I wanted to highlight, I think this is one of the more unsung heroes of the department in terms of what we do with partnering with the media school and Dr. Galen Klaviyo to form the Big 10 Network student U partnership. With that partnership, we provide over a hundred students, regular students. These aren't student athletes. There might be a few sprinkled in there, but a hundred students with real life experience working for the Big 10 network in TV production on air talent. And if you look at the list on the screen, the amount of jobs that have come out of this, whether it's C-N-N-E-S-P-N, Fox Sports that we have, either it's on air talent or people holding the camera behind the scenes that while they were a student here had real time experience.

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

It's one of the things I think is unique to us and really puts the media school on the map in terms of attracting prospective students and we couldn't be more happy with that partnership. We have several partnerships across campuses and I would want to highlight that with the Kelly School, the school and the Myer School of Law, how they've helped us through the name, image and likeness situation as well. Couldn't be more proud of those partnerships. A couple more initiatives, I think it's important to report to you on our Women's Excellence initiative. I mentioned this last year. It's something that we formed that we really wanted to elevate our women's sports programming and really enhanced the experience of our female student athletes. And actually it succeeded our expectations. It was a fundraising priority, but that fundraising initiative was going to really be put towards specifically our women's programs and our female student athletes.

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

Our goal and our first year, this program's two and a half years old, we thought an aspirational goal was to raise a million dollars in the first year where we've raised almost eight and a half million dollars in two and a half years and all that money's been put into our women's programs to provide unique

experiences, foreign trips. We had our volleyball program and our women's basketball program during the summer going foreign trips. Just all kinds of great experiences for them. And I'm not trying to take credit for the success of women's basketball or our volleyball program out, they're on the upswing, softball, women's swimming and diving. But I do think there's a correlation there that we have said at Indiana University that we want broad-based program and we're committed to Title IX and we put our money where our mouth is and our donors have stepped up.

[\(01:15:26\)](#):

And I think this initiative has really made an impact, not just because of the success of the programs, but more importantly for our female student athletes and what that means beyond it. So we're extremely proud of this project as well. We're also a big 10 leader in diversity, and I wanted to update these numbers. I had mentioned these last year during our report, we've got the most diverse and our most diverse group of head coaches in the Big 10, both by people of color and people by black head coaches as well. We have of our 19 head coaches, five our people of color, which is really important to us that we're a leader in that area. In our department right now, almost 17% of our full-time staff are people of color, 18 and a half percent of our full and part-time staff. And then I'm most proud of as well, 40% of our full-time and part-time staff are females. So I think back to when I talked about the importance of inclusivity in our department, importance of our broad-based programming. I think these numbers really speak for themselves. I'm really proud of the representation we have in our department.

[\(01:16:32\)](#):

The last slide, I think I just will touch on these. I don't have a lot of solutions here, it's just more that makes certain, I think it's important that you know what's going on when I talk about it's a transformative time in college athletics. Marietta attends Big 10 meetings with me regularly up in Chicago at Big 10 offices with the rest of the schools. And she hears about this at length, just all the different things that are happening. Conference realignment, not just happening in the Big 10, but around the country. We've added four new schools with U-S-C-U-L-A, Oregon and Washington, and to really help with this changing landscape, one of the things I think is important that you know that those four schools not have been added if they didn't enhance the academic reputation of the Big 10 and what they could bring to the table as we contemplated that.

[\(01:17:16\)](#):

There's lots of changes going on with the college football playoffs and what's going to happen there. And as it expands and you may think, well, what's that? Why is that a big transformative issue? It's a big issue because 85% of the revenue generated throughout college athletics comes from football. And where is that? Then ultimately as the college football playoff changes, what's going to happen with the governance of that, the access to that and most importantly, where does the money go from that and how does it impact our student athletes here in Bloomington? And so we're keeping a close pulse on that. There's a lot of talk about governance in the NCA. Where is that going? How are we going to make certain we're adapting to the modern days that we're in today? Revenue sharing is a hot topic. You'll hear that as revenues have increased, there's lots of lawsuits going on around the country.

[\(01:18:02\)](#):

You may have read that Dartmouth had student athletes on their basketball program vote to form a union. What does that mean? Ultimately, we're trying to keep our fingers on the pulse. How does revenue share impact us at some point and where's that going to go? How are additional benefits going to be handed out to student athletes if it happens? The name, image and likeness program, NIL, we've really done I think a great job of balancing that and with what we do in terms of all of our priorities, where is that going and how can we make certain we keep that in perspective while at the same time

making an extremely positive situation for our student athletes where they can maximize that opportunity. And finally, just what we call student athlete mobility or the transfer policy. Marietta and our Big 10 faculty reps talk about this a lot and what happens with the NNC rules relative to student athlete movement, how does that impact their academic progress and how can we monitor that to make certain that we give them the right to go where they want to go, but at the same time, don't lose sight on why they're here and we don't impact their academics in a negative way.

[\(01:19:00\)](#):

So having said all that, there are more questions and answers than when the future of college athletics is going to look like. But what I can tell you for certain is as I started out, our priorities haven't changed. And I want you as our most important group of faculty members to know, we know why we're here, we know what our priorities are, and while we try to adapt to all the changing landscape in college athletics, we're not going to lose sight on those priorities and what they are. So with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions that you have.

Speaker 1 [\(01:19:27\)](#):

Thank you, Scott. We have some time for a few questions. Bill

Speaker 12 [\(01:19:33\)](#):

A few years into NIL kind of wondered how this might play out, and this was brought up as part of the Dartmouth case to make sure everybody that was playing had an opportunity to get something. If this works out, do we experience anything where people that higher profiles or just have a position like quarterback that lends itself more to name, image and likeness, is that causing any internal problem with other players saying, I just don't have that visibility or that opportunity.

Speaker 11 [\(01:20:04\)](#):

I know our head coaches, all of our coaches have worried about that. How does that impact the locker room if you have student athletes, as you're saying, because of the high profile nature of either their position or their sport, who they maybe are earning more from an NIL perspective? The reality is I think they do understand that NIL is a marketplace and that it is driven by those factors, not just what maybe is fair or equal. So we've monitored that. We've kept a finger on that, the pulse of that, but right now I have not noticed in our head coaches, although they're aware of it, a real negative impact from that perspective. That's a good question.

Speaker 13 [\(01:20:41\)](#):

I wondered on that same topic then, not NIL, but could you speak about paying players where we stand on that?

Speaker 11 [\(01:20:51\)](#):

Yeah, so really what I like to refer to that too is additional benefits for student athletes because the reality is right now through athletic scholarships, through the cost of attendance, through what we call our AL award, which are academic awards that we have student athletes, you could argue that student athletes get paid now, it might just not be as paid as an employee or as a direct benefit from that perspective. I think there will be additional benefits as the revenue continues to grow. And I think there's a movement out there for that. I'm not opposed to that as long as to me. And I think for us that we keep the education-based program is our priority that we make certain that we believe in broad-

based programming. We believe in gender equity and Title ix. Additional benefits I think aren't a negative thing. I think they can be a positive thing if we keep things in perspective. And in my view, I think we will keep heading that way, but we have to, and I think my big 10 colleagues would share the same thing. We have to keep the main thing the main thing and not lose sight while we're here.

Speaker 1 ([01:21:57](#)):

Other questions? Seeing none. Thank you very much, Scott.

Speaker 11 ([01:22:02](#)):

Thank you again for the opportunity.

Speaker 1 ([01:22:03](#)):

Thank you. Let's move on to the next item on the agenda. It has proposed changes to aca, a one academic appointments and aca, a five research ranks at iu. Ben Kravitz co-chair of research affairs committee. We'll lead this. This is a discussion item. Does not need a vote. At least not today. So take it away Ben.

Speaker 14 ([01:22:26](#)):

Alright, thanks everyone. Hopefully this will be quick because you all got a copy of the policy and read every word of it. Of course. So I want to talk about what we've been working on in the research affairs committee in collaboration with the Faculty affairs committee about research ranks. So what we're proposing is to add three new titles, assistant research professor, associate research professor and research professor as available titles for research faculty. These are faculty whose job is primarily research. So that's the first step. Step two, differentiating the research track from the research professor track. So right now we have research scientists, assistant, associate, and full. And research is pretty diverse on this campus and the university as a whole and that simply doesn't work. So for example, there are people who are acting as independent PIs and conducting their own research. There are also people who are supporting others' research.

([01:23:29](#)):

And we want people like that here because we have large facilities. We need people who have 20 years of expertise to know how to run them, but they shouldn't necessarily be responsible for publishing their own work and getting their own grants and leading their own research programs. So it's important to differentiate the two, and this is something that a lot of our big 10 colleagues do. They have a research professor and a research scientist. Also, while we were updating the policy, we added descriptions of postdocs and research associates because somehow there wasn't a lot in there. So again, why are we proposing this? It's because research and creative activity are so diverse. It's really hard to judge everyone based on what we had in terms of the tenure and promotion criteria. I've also heard from many people who are research scientists or manage research scientists granting agencies don't always know what a research scientist is. We have missed out on grants because of this. And again, many of our peer institutions already do this.

([01:24:39](#)):

So are we allowed to do this? And the answer is if Rahul or his delegate says so, yes, a C 12 allows us to create titles for special needs of units. This is exactly what at the time I-U-P-U-I did in 2005. So they've had this title for a really long time and they have been using it to great success. So getting into the details, there are two things that we're doing. Number one, we're going to modify proposing to modify



BL ACA A one to add in the new titles as options and then I'll get to BL ACA a one in a minute. If you've read it, you know what I'm talking about. I wanted to touch it as little as possible. It's kind of a disaster. So I removed duplicate descriptions from it and referred to BL ACA a five where we did a lot of the heavy lifting.

[\(01:25:34\)](#):

So in bbl ACA A five one of some of the major changes we made updating the qualifications for these new titles slash ranks. This was important. The arts and humanities do have research scholars, not as many as in the natural scientists but sciences, but they do have them and the policy needs to apply to everybody. So making sure it applies to research and creative activity, clarifying appointment and promotion criteria for these titles. B-L-A-C-A five was about 45 years old and it was created at the time when we only had research associates. So there were a lot of things that were added at the time that were basically the first time research faculty had ever been described. So there were things like what benefits should they have? Are they considered actual faculty? A lot has changed in 45 years except for this policy and we now have a lot of those specifications in other university level policies.

[\(01:26:34\)](#):

So there was a lot in this that we didn't really need and was frankly out of date. So a lot of that has been removed. There's a section in there on research tenure. So it used to be called research project tenure. I think we changed it to research tenure just for a little more flexibility. The idea is if a research faculty member is here and employed on a longstanding project, we want to keep them and we want them to not have to worry about their jobs. So in principle, they could be granted what's called research tenure, which basically says you have a job as long as you want one, assuming the funding stays here. So we didn't do too much to that. There was just some reorganization, removing gendered pronouns. It is 2024. And then for both of them there were lines about affirmative action thanks to the recent Supreme Court case. I just changed that to established procedures so that can be defined elsewhere.

[\(01:27:37\)](#):

So if these pass, what happens? We tried very hard not to make these campus level policies overly prescriptive because research and creative activity look so different. So some of this will have to be left up to the units. So units that use research appointments will need to establish policies. And I have draft language sitting here that we can discuss. So who gets to use research scientists versus research professor? The different criteria for appointment and promotion for the ranks. These are things that we already do for tenure and promotion in the units. Just we need to add this too and can research faculty move between the research scientist and research professor tracks. So for example, if someone is an independent PI and they decide, I don't want to do that anymore, I just want to be support for this large center or unit, can they do that? And what does that look like? Ultimately this has to be a conversation. Research faculty should discuss with their unit heads and what those job descriptions and duties might look like.

[\(01:28:47\)](#):

Some things we're not doing. So I sent this out to a lot of people. I received a lot of comments. One of the comments that I received, quite frankly more than I thought I would, was, okay, if we've got teaching professor and now research professor and clinical professor and professor of practice, what does a professor mean? What does it mean to be faculty? I'm not touching that one. That is not the job of the research affairs committee. That'd be a really interesting conversation, but I'm not going to do that. The point that I wanted to make is research faculty are here right now and they have been here. And so that's what this policy is for. It's to support them and if we want to have future conversations, we

can providing a minimum termination period. We went back and forth on this one a lot because in principle, if you're faculty you would like a long-term job.

[\(01:29:42\)](#):

The problem is so much of this is tied to soft money in so many cases that it strongly depends on grants. And so we couldn't say, alright, you have to give such and such position three years minimum notice because what if the funding runs out? Before then, I have been in conversations with the office of the vice president for research about bridge funding and what that might look like and maybe establishing a bridge funding program to allow for these sorts of things, but it's not in place yet. So it didn't make sense to have a policy for something that doesn't exist.

[\(01:30:21\)](#):

There are some of our big 10 colleagues who provide a maximum percentage of their time that they can devote to teaching. We didn't really want to go there either. Sort of my own personal view is if you're doing your job and you think you can also teach on top of that and do it well, whatever makes you happy in practice, different units will do different things. They may decide to do that, but it didn't make sense to me for a campus policy. The one about whether service counts for promotion. So this comes up a lot for research faculty. We opted not to say anything about that and we did that to protect research faculty. So the reason is if we say for example, research faculty are only evaluated on research and then a department chair says to them, well, we want you to serve on this committee. That puts people in a really awkward position because number one, if they say no because it doesn't help them, then they're not seen as a good citizen. Or if they say yes, then they're doing things that don't help them and not spending that time on research. And so we didn't want to corner people essentially. That last point, we're not touching B-L-A-C-A one. I strongly suspect that almost everything in there is said in other policies and we could repeal it someday, but I didn't want to do that yet just to make sure.

[\(01:31:56\)](#):

That's all I've got. So happy to take questions.

Speaker 1 [\(01:32:00\)](#):

Thank you Ben. It's open for questions. Yep. Israel,

Speaker 15 [\(01:32:08\)](#):

Right. Thank you Ben. So I totally support the proposal because it was something similar with what happened with the title teaching professor and the question about why professor for a entity. And as Ben mentioned, the all categories in the entity. Entity, they already have the title professor. And the other thing that you mentioned, Ben, is that IUPY passed this into 1,005, but when we were doing the work with the title for teaching professor, we could also realize that the title for research professor, professor was also presented in other Big 10 and other universities in the nation. So I totally support the proposal.

Speaker 14 [\(01:32:56\)](#):

Thank you. And there's a long document that I included on the agenda that has a page in it or on what our peer institutions are doing if you want to look.

Speaker 1 [\(01:33:09\)](#):

Any other questions? Bill?

Speaker 12 ([01:33:11](#)):

This might be Rahul Moore for you. Do we see compensation for this line differently since it sort of rides off a soft money world

Speaker 1 ([01:33:21](#)):

Again at other universities? Typically, yes. There's a different compensation strategy. They very often are more highly paid, but it comes,

Speaker 12 ([01:33:29](#)):

They're taking a risk. Soft

Speaker 1 ([01:33:31](#)):

Money, yes. Yeah,

Speaker 12 ([01:33:31](#)):

There's

Speaker 1 ([01:33:32](#)):

A chance you're out, a grants, you're out of a job. Okay.

Speaker 12 ([01:33:35](#)):

And then is somebody in a current role who maybe was hired in a traditional faculty role, but this really is the fit for them? How does that transition work or could it work?

Speaker 14 ([01:33:49](#)):

So are you referring to a staff research position instead

Speaker 12 ([01:33:52](#)):

Of somebody was hired in a typical tenure track role, a faculty role with teaching research and service and the whole mix, but really they probably should have been in what we're creating now?

Speaker 14 ([01:34:09](#)):

I don't know. That is a really important question and I have heard multiple conversations from various people about should there be a more flexible faculty role? Like if you want to do more teaching or more service, what's the way that you can be rewarded for that if you're in a tenure track position? We didn't go there. We probably could. I want to defer to Carrie before I said anything though.

Speaker 1 ([01:34:40](#)):

Do you want to address that, Carrie?

Speaker 2 ([01:34:42](#)):

Well, I can say we already have faculty on our campus that move from a tenure track line to maybe a clinical line or a professor, a practice position to, so we have that permeability that happens. They are

exceptions and I think they need to be justified and supported and they need to make sure we're going through OIE to make sure any hiring practices are followed with the movement between. But I will say just generally, that movement's already happening.

Speaker 1 ([01:35:23](#)):

David,

Speaker 16 ([01:35:27](#)):

I'm in favor of this as well and thanks for working on it. I was in Collins chair in 2005 and when this came before the UFC and I remember the school of medicine gave a lot of the arguments that I know that you have heard about the creation of this position, the reasons for it. One of the things that came out of that conversation, if my memory is right, is that they asked the school of medicine to report back on the effect that the title had on the ability of research scientist track individuals to acquire external funding. That was the primary rationale for the creation of the position. I'm just curious whether it ever did get reported back to the UFC and whether we have any data on any effect that it might have. The second point I just want to make a mention of what Bill just brought up is that I do recall I'm the school of medicine faculty that there are faculty that have moved from tenure track professor positions to the research professor track, at least in the school in my memory.

Speaker 14 ([01:36:33](#)):

Great. I won't tell you where I was in 2005, but it wasn't here. So I don't know. But if it does exist, I will track it down.

Speaker 1 ([01:36:45](#)):

Okay. Elizabeth,

Speaker 6 ([01:36:48](#)):

This is more of a comment, so I certainly support this, but I think it would, and this is not for research affairs, I realize, but it would be nice if this council went back and revisited the titles for the teaching faculty. It's the titles matter and a lot of institutions have also gone to assistant teaching professor, associate teaching professor and teaching professor. And I think it would be nice if we revisited that.

Speaker 1 ([01:37:26](#)):

Thank you. Any other questions for Ben? One more? Yes.

Speaker 17 ([01:37:30](#)):

These positions will all have full faculty voting rights, is that correct? Within the unit

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

That is up to the units, but in some units, non-tenure track faculty have different rights than others and there are campus level policies that govern, for example, our NTTs to serve on BFC. And so that won't change.

Speaker 1 ([01:38:01](#)):

Okay, Israel.

Speaker 15 ([01:38:03](#)):

So then the intention is in two meetings we are going to vote for the proposal. That's the track that we want with the proposal.

Speaker 14 ([01:38:13](#)):

This is a first reading, so we will vote in the future. I'm still trying to gather comments. It's not March 19th because I'm not here, it's April 2nd.

Speaker 15 ([01:38:25](#)):

So it means this semester, right? Is the proposal for voting would be either next meeting or in two meetings?

Speaker 14 ([01:38:33](#)):

It will be voted on this semester and it will be implemented as soon as Carrie's able to do so.

Speaker 1 ([01:38:44](#)):

Okay, well thank you Ben. Seeing no other questions, we'll move on to the last item on the agenda and that is a report on faculty activity reporting tool. Carrie Dockerty. She's been busy today.

Speaker 2 ([01:39:00](#)):

Alright, so unfortunately Logan is in beautiful Mexico creating relationships and doing things. So I am here alone today, but I'm definitely thankful for him and all the work he's done related to the faculty activity reporting that we've done. So we presented a little bit earlier in the semester and promised to come back with an update. So here it's, as you all know, we've received a lot of feedback about DMAI for a long time. So the fact that this was revisited at this point probably doesn't come as a surprise for many, but over the summer we had a group of faculty across the university really looking at this and trying to identify first and foremost are there any better options out there? And I think what we found is yes, there has been additional systems that have been created. So an RFP selection process started when we were back last, we were reporting on that process and making sure that we were aligned with our current Bloomington policies that talks about the role of this council and the faculty representatives on looking at these changes and approving those.

[\(01:40:27\)](#):

So we wanted to make sure we had all of our ducks in a row before the RFP process started. We went through that process and there ended up being two systems, pardon me, two systems that really rose to the top as far as options. So again, it wasn't great timing, but we were in a bit of a time crunch. So if you recall in December and early January we had those companies come forward and provide demos. They met with the committee charge with this, I know BFC exec participated in this. We videotaped all of those and gave you all an opportunity and all of our faculty an opportunity to review these. And then I'm thankful for BFC to be the repository of all of that feedback that was solicited and received and then shared that back to the committee and then a recommendation went forward to the A LC, which again was really the intersecting bodies of all of the campus units that were looking at this.

[\(01:41:49\)](#):

So the recommendation, hopefully this doesn't come as a surprise for any of you, but it was simplistic, which was identified as sort of the preferred vendor. And I think what we heard is sort of the usability, not only the look of it was more appealing, but the options that it afforded us. And I'll go through some of those, but I want to make sure that I share that that recommendation was really based upon input from all of you. They did a lot of work on peer institution. No one's a better resource as to if you want to implement someone than talking to folks that have sort of lived through it. So the group did a lot of discussion on that.

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

The A LC did accept that recommendation. But really as our last stand here, we wanted to bring it to you all and make sure that Logan and the BFC group has weighed in on this. But again, we wanted to make sure getting that final stamp of approval from you all as well. I'll also say that a big voice in this process was our librarian. The libraries use these data in ways that I think a lot of people don't realize. And I think when they first heard that we were potentially making this change, they really had a very strong voice at the table. So if any of our librarian colleagues are around the table, thank you, thank you, thank you. And I will say that they are also supportive of tic, which was important to us. Let's see.

[\(01:43:47\):](#)

So in some ways this is the beginning, not the end of process. So we're really going to have to think about the implementation of this and I think that's where a lot of the questions are. So the contract for DMAI ends October of 24 and that was really after a year extension to allow us to do this work to see if we wanted to transition. So assuming everyone's on board with this change, the work will really begin now. And I think many of you are familiar with Akash who is in faculty affairs, but he has really been the leader in implementing and stewarding all of our systems that we work through. He will be our campus sort of driving force on this. And what we would really like to start doing informally, formally in any which way that you all want is to start talking about this and thinking about what we want this to look like, how we want it to look, what are things are important.

[\(01:44:59\):](#)

The committee who looked at this really did not look for a system that could just do what we were already doing better. We were looking for a system that could really incorporate all the things that we wanted a faculty reporting system to do. So that could be generating cvs, that could be generating faculty profiles, it could be creating dossiers for internal awards that we're trying to do. It could be our annual merit route reviews that we do. It could be promotion and tenure. So this has the potential of being sort of a one-stop shop where we as faculty aren't having to update this and putting this together and that together and this system and that system. But if we think about the integration of this, it could serve many of those roles and others that might be specific for you all. Some of you, the school of medicine has very specific needs that they have to have.

[\(01:46:17\):](#)

Other of you are in schools that have specific accreditations. So those are the granular level detail that we want to sort of dive into to figure out what can this look like. We've already received lots of questions and the first one is always will my DMAI data be imported into this new system? And there's controversy around this. Some people haven't even been using DMAI, so they don't even care if it's going to be imported. Others I think have taken a lot of time to, and some schools and some departments use DMAI a lot. So they're trying to figure out what's going to be imported, how it's going to be imported. I don't think we know, well I can tell you the data can be imported and we're setting systems up that will allow that to happen. But I encourage us all to really think about do we want that data imported or are there other sources of data that might actually be better, more all inclusive again.

[\(01:47:27\)](#):

And I don't know, I'm just simply posing to you all the conversations. The exact right answer might be we want all DMAI data to be imported into this or we may say, hey, there are other systems that we have in place that this new system can pull from that may benefit us in different and better ways. But that's really the goal. We're trying to create something that reduces the burden, increases the ease and us doing and reporting the work that we're doing. We're trying to see how we can leverage our campus accreditation. All of our reporting, let's work smarter, not harder to try and get these data together. So again, we'll keep reporting back on this. This is going to be a project for us and I just want to pause and kind of refer to Colin and see what formal steps do you feel like we need to do or I can take any questions or how you'd like to proceed.

Speaker 3 [\(01:48:31\)](#):

Well I think if you can answer any questions that people have or would be willing to take some, I think that's quite important right now. Yes,

Speaker 1 [\(01:48:44\)](#):

I Alex Yeah, go ahead Alex.

Speaker 18 [\(01:48:48\)](#):

Is this going through a formal faculty process such as the UFC Faculty Affairs committee?

Speaker 3 [\(01:48:57\)](#):

So we have a campus level policy that actually requires Bloomington specifically to have faculty involvement in the evaluation of it. The other campuses don't necessarily have that, but I think under Cassidy's leadership implemented one. So in the process of originally when this started, the RFI group was kind of moving ahead and a discussion kind of launched at that point about how we specifically involve people from the BFC in that. And they were then added to a university level committee at the RFP stage. And so now Carrie's bringing their recommendation back to us for presentation.

Speaker 18 [\(01:49:44\)](#):

So this will be, its application will be campus specific and not university wide. I thought I heard Carrie say that it was going to be a university wide.

Speaker 2 [\(01:49:54\)](#):

It is.

Speaker 18 [\(01:49:56\)](#):

So that was my question. Why UFC rather than B, FC?

Speaker 3 [\(01:50:02\)](#):

Well, so UFC is dealing with it, but Bloomington is the only campus that has a specific policy that basically gives us the right, according to us to reject the common system if we want to.

Speaker 1 [\(01:50:18\)](#):

Bottom line is both UFC and BFC are engaged,

Speaker 3 ([01:50:21](#)):

Which I would note our colleagues on other campuses found quite stunning when we pointed that out to them. But it is nevertheless the case and they've now all adopted policies or several of them are working on policies to allow them to reject systems they don't like.

Speaker 2 ([01:50:36](#)):

Yes. The UFC has been engaged in this process throughout.

Speaker 1 ([01:50:42](#)):

Yes. On that side of,

Speaker 19 ([01:50:46](#)):

Well actually as a follow up on that, I was wanting to say this is a really good example of positive shared governance as a person who was on the faculty affairs committee, representative on that committee really appreciated having how many broad areas of the university were involved in providing input? One. So I have a follow-up comment and a question I suppose. So the follow-up comment is one part in the shared governance process that didn't work as well as I had hoped it would have was getting broad feedback from the form from all the faculty. And I think part of what didn't go great there was that the communication was delegated to deans who then communicated to faculty. And I don't think that in my conversations with my colleagues, I don't think that people understood how big of a decision this was, how impactful this would be. And so I think people didn't take the form seriously and look through the videos and actually think ahead, how could this maybe be impacting my year to year life in five years or something? So that's just a point for future feedback. You asked some questions that I think were really good ones about how we implement DMAI importing information and all that. How do you view the shared governance process going forward in answering those questions? I haven't heard anything one way or another on this yet.

Speaker 2 ([01:52:08](#)):

Yeah, again, we're looking for this body to assist in informing that, right? So I think it should and can take multiple levels. I think the standing committee of the BFC that helped up until this point could play a really big role in doing that. I think we could stand up a separate working group of faculty that could do that. Again, we are open to whatever's going to be most effective and hear as many voices as possible. I echo your concern of sometimes when we filter things through the deans they don't always get, and again no judgment towards that, but they just don't always get. So I think the more conduits of communication and sharing of this the better because the decisions we make early on, all of them can be tweaked and changed and undone. But the better we do out of the gate, I think the better the system will be moving forward. I can tell you that we would already, it's on the agenda that we're going to talk to the deans about. It's on the agenda to talk to the associate deans about, but I think this body also can play a critical role in whatever form you all recommend.

Speaker 3 ([01:53:37](#)):

Just to add to that response, partly I think particularly as we think about adding new functionalities or trying to unify them, things like moving from dossier to potentially unified system like this, that's really



where I think it's absolutely essential that particularly faculty affairs be involved because in principle and in substance there are things reflected in our team P policies that are entirely important on their own terms, but they're also inflected with certain assumptions about the kind of media in which they facilitated that process. And I do think there's an opportunity to kind of look at what technologies are now available to us and how if those technologies lower the burden, which is already fairly significant in terms of preparing those kinds of documents, we might actually be able to get more robust documentation that would help people make more nuanced and thoughtful decisions about approaching t and P cases. So I think that's really important and I think faculty fairs, especially as a committee, the ones who have kind of the responsibility and the authority to generate particular policy proposal changes that take those kinds of things into account. I don't think they can do all of this though. Tech policy is going to have something to do with that. I'm sure Other things.

Speaker 2 ([01:54:51](#)):

And I'll also say if you take nothing else away, E dossier won't be going away immediately. We're not going to make that promotion in tenure switch. I mean we're talking five years down the road. So anyone that's thinking about going up for promotion or tenure next year and already working, let's not give anybody a heart attack. So that's like future us thinking about how we can make our lives easier.

Speaker 20 ([01:55:17](#)):

Yes, go ahead. Just a small question, maybe you said this, can you clarify what's the first annual review cycle where we would use this system instead of the old system?

Speaker 2 ([01:55:27](#)):

Yeah, so again, I think flexibility is going to have to be the name of the game, but DMAI is going away on October. In October, so I know we can do our collective happy dance. So we will have to do something for the next annual review,

Speaker 1 ([01:55:47](#)):

Ben.

Speaker 14 ([01:55:49](#)):

Yeah. So first thank you for doing all of this work. So a worry of mine is if we start using this for annual reviews and then bring in E dossier and et cetera, et cetera, and have a one-stop shop, will we get locked in and be in the same situation that we are with DMAI now?

Speaker 2 ([01:56:10](#)):

Yeah, my technology friends who are smarter than me can speak to that. It's constantly evolving and so we hope these systems will evolve with us. But yeah, I agree it's a concern.

Speaker 1 ([01:56:26](#)):

Yes,

Speaker 21 ([01:56:31](#)):

It would be so important to be able to import materials from your faculty reporting system into e dossier because it can take months if not longer for faculty members to prepare their dossier for promotion and tenure time that could be spent on research or teaching.

Speaker 2 ([01:56:50](#)):

And I think that was one of the things that people liked most about simpl because it did have that ability like to be the dossier, be the repository. So everything you did from the moment you got here, that would all already be part of a promotion or a tenure dossier.

Speaker 1 ([01:57:13](#)):

Follow up.

Speaker 21 ([01:57:15](#)):

I'd like to follow up and clarify that being able to download and upload is essential because if you have to recreate the documents, it's months of your life.

Speaker 2 ([01:57:25](#)):

So I want to make sure I understand. So simplistic importing into E dossier, right? So what I am saying is as we evolve, e dossier will go away and it will be simplistic will be that software system.

Speaker 1 ([01:57:42](#)):

Thanks. Any other questions? Yes, Kate?

Speaker 22 ([01:57:49](#)):

I don't have a question but I just really want to thank Logan and Akash. They spent endless amount of time on this project so I think without them this wouldn't have come off. So I just really want to echo your earlier words. They were crucial to the success, so thank them.

Speaker 1 ([01:58:05](#)):

And can I thank the whole team as well because not only did they find a good product, it's actually a lot cheaper than the other ones. Yay.

Speaker 2 ([01:58:15](#)):

That was not part of the decision making. No, I'm kidding. I think

Speaker 9 ([01:58:21](#)):

Thank you. So does simplistic and maybe this is one of those things you're referring to, we'll figure out later. But does it talk or can it talk to outside sources of data like Orchid and, okay, thank you. That's exciting.

Speaker 2 ([01:58:36](#)):

I know it's super exciting. What we're also thinking a lot about for some disciplines there are those repositories already that can be easily imported. Yes, we want to definitely make sure and they did make sure those systems talk to Plti. But I also would love for my colleagues in the arts and humanities

and other areas that don't have those repository, we need those voices at the table as well to make sure it's meeting those needs. And we know what systems that folks might not be aware of that. Is it possible to import from something system. So Orchid I'm familiar with, but

Speaker 1 ([01:59:21](#)):

Thank you very much. We are one minute from four 30, so I will give you that minute back. Thank you very much. Meeting adjourned.