

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
March 19, 2024 | 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Presidents Hall – Franklin Hall

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ahlbrand, Ashley; Anderson, Dana; Asher, Sofiya; Brinda, Chelsea; Butters, Rebecca; Chen, Xin; Cohen, Rachel; Cumberland, Claire; Daleke, David; deMaine, Susan; DeSawal, Danielle; Docherty, Carrie; Eskew, Kelly; Freedman, Seth; Gahl-Mills, Karen; Giordano, Anthony; Grogg, Jane Ann; Hamre, Kristin; Herrera, Israel; Hojas Carbonell, Virginia; Housworth, Elizabeth; Ivanovitch, Roman; Johnson, Colin; Kubow, Patricia; Lammers, Sabine; Lanosga, Gerry; Lion, Margaret; Lochmiller, Chad; Loring, Annette; McCoy, Chase; Michaelsen, Jonathan; O'Brien, Travis; Paschal, Joshua; Ramos, William; Sapp, Christopher; Sela, Ron; Shrivastav, Rahul; Silvester, Katie; Sinadinos, Alison; Steenblik, R. Spencer; Thomassen, Lisa; Tracey, Dan; van der Elst, Louis

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bala, Hillol; Bridges, Chandler; Buggenhagen, Beth; Cavar, Damir; Cole, Shu; Dalkilic, Mehmet; Dau-Schmidt, Kenneth; Dekydtspotter, Lori; Eaton, Kristine; Furey, Constance; Koda, Marsha; Kravitz, Ben; Lalwani, Ashok; Northcutt Bohmert, Miriam; Perry, Brea; Raji, Aaliyah; Raymond, Angie; Reck, Cathrine; Rutkowski, Leslie; Siek, Jeremy; Tanford, Alex; Terry, Herbert; Torres, Vasti; Walton, Christi; White, Tameka; Whitworth, Cale; Wyrzynski, Stephen

GUESTS: Brown, Abby Van Alstine; Bush, Abra; Dayhoff, DeeDee; Diekman, Amanda; Gayer, Jamie; Holden, Richard; Kelly, Ryan; Miles, Emily; Qi, Wen; Ryan, Colleen; Thomas, Janett

Agenda

1. **Approval of the minutes of March 5, 2024**
2. **Memorial Resolution for James Reilly**
3. **Executive Committee Business** (10 minutes)
Colin Johnson, Faculty President
4. **State of the Campus Report** (25 minutes)
Rahul Shrivastav, Provost
5. **Question/Comment Period** (10 minutes)
Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to Provost Shrivastav or President Johnson by emailing bfcoff@indiana.edu. Questions should be submitted no less than two business days before the meeting.
6. **Proposed Changes to the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, & Conduct** (15 minutes)
Bill Ramos, Co-chair, Student Affairs Committee
Janett Thomas, Assistant Director of Academic Misconduct Office of Student Conduct
[Discussion Item]
B31-2024: Changes to the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, & Conduct
7. **Questions/Comments on the Changes to the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, & Conduct** (10 minutes)
8. **Report on COACHE Results** (15 minutes)
Carrie Docherty, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs

Amanda Diekman, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs

Wen Qi, Director, Faculty Analytics

9. **Questions/Comments on COACHE Results** (10 minutes)

Transcript

Shrivastav ([00:02:58](#)):

In case you are. Why we haven't started. We don't have quorum yet, so we'll wait for enough people to show up and then we'll begin. Alright, Sabine has just signed on and therefore we have quorum. Yay. Come on. Okay, so I officially call this meeting to order and as we always begin, we will begin with the approval of minutes for the March 5th, 2024 meeting. Anybody raising their hands for calling for approval? You've got one, somebody second. We've got second from Bill. All in favor? We have a pretty unanimous approval. Thank you very much. Next order of business is a memorial resolution for our colleague James Reilly and usually it is Carrie Docherty. I know Carrie's here somewhere. There she is. Carrie, take it away.

Docherty ([00:04:13](#)):

Thank you. James Patrick Reilly. Jim died at Hospice house in Bloomington, Indiana on February 13th, 2022 at the age of 71 after a vigilant struggle with cancer. Jim was born on August 29th, 1950 in Mount Vernon, New York. He earned an AB in chemistry from Princeton University in 1972. He went on to Cambridge University as a Winston Churchill scholar gaining a certificate of postgraduate study in physical chemistry in 1973. He completed his graduate studies in physical chemistry at the University of California Berkeley, working with professors George Pimentel and Brad Moore pioneers in the use of lasers in electronic spectro microscopy. He earned, excuse me, he returned to Europe as a guest researcher as a Max Plank Institute where he researched the development of UV lasers and their applications. Jim joined the chemistry department at Indiana University Bloomington in 1979 receiving the Camille and Henry Dreyfuss Foundation Young Faculty Award the same year. In 1982 he was recognized as the Alfred P. Sloan fellow and in 1983 he was named the Camille and Henry Dreyfuss teacher scholar.

([00:05:40](#)):

He was truly beloved. He was a truly beloved instructor of physical chemistry and analytical chemistry. Indeed, he was an instructor of record at the time of his passing. Jim served as the department chair from 2007 to 2010. His time as chair was distinguished by a year during which five new faculty were hired, including two women. Over the course of his career at IU, Jim's research footprint expanded from his original area of inquiry, an electronic spectroscopy. Jim and his colleagues additionally advanced efforts in peptide sequencing using VUV photo fragmentation of biomolecules and creating cross linkers to pro protein structure. Jim published over 200 papers during his career and received approval of approximately 15 patents. Outside of work, Jim had many interests. He was an avid and competitive athlete participating in many sports, but especially track and field. He passed his love of sport and exercise to his sons and spent many happy years coaching little league baseball and traveling to track meets and baseball tournaments. Jim cycled to work most days even in the worst of weather. He also enjoyed camping at national parks, riding his motorcycles. If that wasn't enough, he could and did fix just about everything in his house. Jim has survived by his wife of 27 years, Mary, two sons, Colin and

Austin, his sister Anne and Brother-in-Law, Sandy, his niece Claire, his nephew Neil and wife, Becky and many friends past and present students and colleagues.

Shrivastav (00:07:30):

Thank you Carrie. If you are able, please stand for a moment to silence. Thank you. I now invite Colin Johnson, BFC precedent to begin with his report.

Johnson (00:07:59):

Good afternoon everyone. It's lovely to see you. Welcome back from spring break. I hope you all got an opportunity to get some well-deserved rest. I'm sure as you all know, the big entertainment today or the main event is the provost state of the campus address and so I'm going to try to keep my comments short because I think that ritual is a very important one and I think it will ultimately be the thing that most of us are focused on today primarily. I did want to just acknowledge a couple of things. As you are all probably aware, the much discussed Senate bill 202 is passed by the Indiana legislature and signed by the governor at the end of last week. I know that issue is very much on everyone's mind as it has been for quite some time. I will tell you that we have already been the BFC leadership and actually the UFC leadership have already started to be in conversation with various university and campus leaders about the kind of implications of that.

(00:09:05):

In fact, we just came from a university faculty council executive committee meeting earlier today and I will say that I was quite pleased to hear, I don't want to get ahead of things, but to hear President Whitten emphasize to us as she did in her message that was sent out yesterday, I believe, her intention to work very closely with faculty to figure out how that should be implemented and what we need to do in order to be in compliance with the law. So we are very much at the beginning of the process of figuring out what the implications of that recently adopted legislation will be for us, but I do want to assure everyone that we're on it and we are talking to people and I at least at this point have a great deal of confidence and sense of optimism about our ability to work with the administration to ensure that that's done in the least intrusive and most appropriate way possible. So for whatever that is worth. The other bit of information that I have to share today actually pertains to the upcoming election BFC election. I think I had mentioned earlier that our timeline calls for that election to sort of get underway in earnest now that the nomination process has been completed in fairly short order that will in fact happen I think probably maybe at the beginning or the end of this week or possibly the beginning of next week.

(00:10:29):

The faculty will receive a ballot. I do have a bit of news to report on that front and I don't unfortunately don't see him here today in attendance, but Alex Sanford, who was one of the three candidates who had received nominations and originally been placed on the ballot, informed us that he had decided to withdraw his name from the ballot and so we will actually have two candidates. I was going to give him an opportunity if you wanted to just to say something about why he decided to do that. I don't want to put words in his mouth, so I just am reporting that to you so that you all have an opportunity to take into account the shifted nature of the ballot that you're going to be presented with. The good news is even though, I mean Alex is a wonderful colleague and a very experienced one, the good news is we still have two phenomenally qualified candidates on the ballot. Chase McCoy and Bill Ramos who have both graciously agreed to stand for election as well. So we're still in pretty good shape where that's concerned despite Alex's withdrawal of his name for consideration. And with that, with no further ado, I

wanted to go ahead and turn the floor over to Provost Shrivastav so that he can deliver the much wanted and hotly anticipated state of the campus address for 2024.

Shrivastav (00:11:45):

Thank you. Welcome. Good afternoon everybody, and in keeping with a strong IU tradition, pleased to offer an update on state of the campus at IU Bloomington today. In our last meeting, Colin urged me to use this time to inspire a meaningful dialogue with all of you and the faculty at large and I'm hoping this is the beginning of that conversation, but before we get into any details, I want to level set and I apologize in advance because this is not the uplifting part of the campus state of the campus address. I know it is a tumultuous time for many of you as faculty, staff and students. A decade ago polls showed nearly every family in America saw higher education as the pathway to a brighter future, less than half do so today state funding for public higher education has either shrunk or stayed flat in many states over that time and now comprises just under 17% of our budget here at IU Bloomington as across higher ed, the number of students majoring in liberal arts and humanities, a centerpiece of our campus has dropped steadily in the last decade as students seek out business technology and professional fields. Artificial intelligence, new online technologies, trainings and different kinds of credentials aim to recast what's needed to reach the top jobs and to access a fulfilling career.

(00:13:27):

Geopolitical strife including in Ukraine and the Middle East and trade wars has put the world and campuses across America on an edge. And then there are consequential elections, not just in the state but nationally and beyond. This year our societal discourse has splintered into like-minded groups fed by algorithms that reinforce rather than challenge what we already know and believe often pulling us apart rather than getting us together. The very values of higher education also feel under attack. Colleges and us included are regularly critiqued in public discourse today for costing too much and offering too little practical value and return on investment. We are seen as bastions of the elite replicating privilege and holding judgment over those less educated. We are regularly accused of advancing sharply political and ideological agendas and excluding and suppressing those voices who may disagree. In our state Colin just referred to, we find new laws that seek to reshape core values of tenure and academic freedom, which threaten our ability to recruit the best and brightest to IU.

(00:14:54):

On campus, we find situations that confront our values from the cancellation of the art exhibit to uncertainty about the future of a world renowned research institute. For our faculty and staff, this is not only a moment of rapid evolution, it hits close to home in ways to which Bloomington and our colleagues here may have previously felt immune. If it feels like it's a trying time, it's because it is. I get it and I feel it too and I hear the concerns that you all have shared both formally and informally, but we are where we are and only the choices that we make both as individuals and collectively as an IU Bloomington community will help us move forward. So while I know it isn't easy, I urge us to choose to embrace the possibilities held in our present moment and to see that moment as home. I ask you today for the grace to allow me to reframe this current moment we are in because for all its messiness and for all its challenges I believe today and tomorrow there are glorious opportunities ahead for IU Bloomington if we are bold enough and resolved enough to pursue them and to pursue them collectively.

(00:16:22):

To begin the importance of college education has never been greater or a better pathway to a brighter future. College graduates earn 84% more on average than high school graduates annually and more so

develop the real skills to succeed. Whatever challenges may come in the future. Public flagships are in particular thriving in this moment. Undergraduate applications to IU Bloomington are up a 25% increase over the same point in time last year, a record of more than 67,000 applications as of this week. We are also seeing more academically ambitious students. A record 40% of our incoming class last fall graduated high school with a 4.0 GPA or better on average, students are arriving with nearly a semester of college, college credit already in hand. So while the public narrative may be challenging for now, we remain a true destination for top students all over the world and we have to continue to tell our story that way when it comes to funding and external support.

[\(00:17:42\):](#)

I know faculty aren't always excited to think of higher education or IU as a business, but as a \$2 billion enterprise annually or almost four and a half billion for IU as a whole business or not, we face many of the same pressures as every other organization does today because much of our funding in Bloomington is spent on people, mostly faculty and staff. Almost every financial decision we make has a human impact Today it is true we'd receive less by percentage from the state than we did a decade ago, but it is still nearly a quarter of a billion dollars along with additional capital investments, which this year includes renovations in the School of Public Health and the Jacobs School of Music and our most recent appropriations from the state marked the largest increased in IU state budget in about a decade. As a public university, we are and must be very much attuned to the costs we are asking and the value we provide for our students and families.

[\(00:18:54\):](#)

That's why we have eliminated nearly eight and a half million dollars in student fees. We are now covering all mandatory and course fees for graduate students who are academic appointees. Though we have a strong financial foundation in terms of growing revenue, the reality is that our recent strategy of adding undergraduate resident enrollment is no longer a viable option. We are over 5,000 more students today than we were a decade ago, but there is simply no more campus housing or classroom space or faculty or student support services or infrastructure in the city of Bloomington to have the same kind of growth in the next 10 years that we did in the past decade to find new revenues and to enable the growth and future we would like to see, we must prioritize investments in academic programs with high growth potential, particularly on the graduate side as well as in hybrid and online spaces.

[\(00:19:59\):](#)

New programs proposed in microelectronics or semiconductors or nano fabrication hold great promise. We are also exploring new programs in interdisciplinary spaces where fields are converging in new and exciting ways like quantum information science or economics and data sciences. New master's programs and design leadership or geographic information systems and legal studies are also in the works efforts to create access to graduate degree programs has led to more than 50 accelerated master's path programs in response to industry demand. I see David Daleke smiling when I say this to free up resources in our other priorities. We also need to increase our externally funded research including funding from both NIH and NSF as well as other federal agencies and to allocate more of our research costs to external grants. The good news is that research expenditures are up this year in both Bloomington and across IU as a whole and our faculty has sent out proposals for new grants totaling millions more than it has been in previous years.

[\(00:21:15\):](#)

We also need to improve our fundraising along with corporate and grant support and at IU Bloomington in partnership with the foundation, our fundraising total today is up more than 30% point in time than it

was the same time last year and we are expecting to approach a fairly ambitious goal we set for ourselves a year ago. As we look towards our future, we are redoing our budget models at both the university level as well as our campus level to break the old habits of units looking out mostly for themselves and to incentivize the most important outcomes of the work we do for our students and for our state. And that includes focus on metrics like retention or graduation rates or discovery and collaboration and the impact we made on the state. I know there will be much uncertainty as we make this transition over the next few years, but I'm also confident that it is the right thing to do and it will create a stronger culture of collaboration and interdisciplinarity that will benefit us all.

[\(00:22:28\):](#)

Turning to student expectations across the country, students are progressively pursuing majors they expect to yield more direct career pathways. IUB has clearly benefited from this trend as the Kelley School of Business has become a world renowned leader in business education boasting top rank programs in accounting, entrepreneurship, marketing, management, and plenty more. Thanks to Dean Ash Soni and Vice Dean Pat Hopkins and our entire Kelly team for their excellent leadership. The Luddy School, the medical school, public health, the O'Neill School among others also stand at the forefront of fields of the future and the demand from students continues to grow in each of these disciplines. We must do all we can to help these promising areas flourish. Yet sometimes I hear colleagues across our campus describe our priorities at IU as a zero sum game, one area gains at the cost of another. Being renowned in business means we can't also invest in theater.

[\(00:23:39\):](#)

That is very much an RCM mindset, but to me, investing in the arts and the humanities is a crucial end. In Bloomington, we have always excelled in the arts and humanities and we always will. These fields endure as a core part of our existence as human beings enriching our lives and our students' lives in innumerable ways, but just because we have planted a thousand seeds or offer hundreds of majors or programs does not mean they're all blooming. In these areas too, we must continue to invent and not merely stagnant or wilt. Resources, especially in the college, are not infinite and we must innovate in what and how we cultivate to see our programs grow. The question will never be whether the liberal arts have a central role in the future of IU, but how we will support the arts, the humanities and sciences in new and more innovative ways.

[\(00:24:44\):](#)

We need to create common experiences, foster new discoveries and ensure we equip all our students to be critical thinkers, exceptional writers and better human beings. I understand well that not every major or every program will have hundreds of students, but we've been inventing in these fields for hundreds of years and we must urgently recommit ourselves to doing so again. I look forward to working with our academic deans and department chairs and faculty and every one of you here today to do just that. In the months to come, I express this urgency because the future won't wait. With ever present technological changes to me there are two responsibilities. We work to preserve the old ways where there is good reason to do so and we lean in to change and lead the way. At IUB, I'm proud we are doing both. We remain one of the few major universities to maintain their focus on the arts language and languages and humanities as we do.

[\(00:25:55\):](#)

While we are also accelerating imagination through leading edge use of AI, there are examples everywhere, unique interdisciplinary research partnerships like between David Crandall, a professor at the Luddy School and Linda Smith and Rowan Candy, professors in psychological and brain sciences and the School of optometry linked fields of study. While one lab examines the behaviors of toddlers

wearing head-mounted cameras as they play another uses the data generated to better understand challenges in computer vision and artificial intelligence. Faculty members from Kelley and Luddy are co-leading IU's involvement in the US AI Safety Institute consortium. More than 200 organizations working towards improving AI safety across the world. The Media School, the Eskenazi School, the College, Luddy, optometry, public Health, and the Jacob School. Thank you Abra. She's sitting there in the audience behind have collaborated to propose the kicks lab, which will create innovative projects at the intersection of technology and arts and humanities to elevate research in gaming, animation, sports, assistive devices and high tech imagery.

[\(00:27:15\):](#)

Special thanks to Media School Dean David Tolchinsky and his many collaborators who are leading this innovative effort. At IUB today, we are not only excited about the potential of future technology, we are helping to create it. I think the same is true for when we consider the competition to ensure learners are ready to join the workforce of the future while a number of companies or online startups package new trainings and credentials that may work around traditional college models. I see these as additions rather than a replacement for IU Bloomington. What we provide students today at IU goes far beyond transmitting a discreet knowledge base or technical skills. This is why or this is what makes our ongoing efforts like re-Imagining the first year experience at IU Bloomington, looking at the possibilities of general education in the future, expanding experiential learning or finding ways to build a stronger IU identity for our students.

[\(00:28:23\):](#)

So vital, we have the ability to offer students an experience so distinctive and so distinctively IU that they literally cannot get it anywhere else. As we prepare our students for an increasingly complex and interconnected world, we are expanding access for academically motivated individuals of all backgrounds and identities. We have now added 62 Bloomington based new faculty through the Presidential Diversity Hiring Initiative in less than three years now. This academic year we launched our first cohort of Empower a faculty mentoring program developed by IU Research and OVPDEI that aims to support the personal growth and professional success of minoritized faculty. Among students, enrollment of underrepresented students of color and first generation students continues to climb our semester to semester. Persistence rate is improving across populations including underrepresented students of color, Pell recipients, 21st century scholars, and first generation students. In the latest Indiana College completion report, IUB was recognized by Indiana's Commission for higher Education for having the highest four year completion rate for 21st century scholars in the state and that's just beginning an upward trend.

[\(00:29:56\):](#)

This year our LA Casa Latino Cultural Center celebrated its 50th anniversary and the Asian Culture Center celebrated is 25th. Through our cultural centers and across campus, we are living our commitment to support all students, all faculty and all staff to make sure they have what it takes to thrive and flourish at iu. And central to that is human connection. I recognize the experience of the pandemic brought new challenges, but it also pushed us to develop and make new connections and ways of doing that continue to benefit us. Today. It is more critical now than ever that we continue to come together intentionally and build relationships and interconnections within our community. Two of this year's staff Merit award winners provide great examples of that. Barbara Brighton, a fiscal officer for international studies and John Walker, a maintenance tech on the IMU facilities team have both been held up by their colleagues as exemplars of mentorship and for their nimble collaborative attitudes towards problem solving.

[\(00:31:14\):](#)

Barbara and John, along with so many staff colleagues across campus enhance our teaching service and learning experiences daily to be our best. We must know and work together. It is on all of us to create the community we want us to see to the practical values we offer to students at IU. One of our biggest efforts we have underway through our IUB 2030 plan is to ensure the success of every student we admit and the faculty who teach them in the classroom. Through Project Inspire, we have dedicated up to \$5 million per year to enhance campus learning spaces, including biology and chemistry, teaching labs that serve more than 2,400 students every semester. We have added new workshops and resources through Faculty Affairs and Center and the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning to improve teaching and to renew our emphasis on student success. Selected IUB schools began participating this year in a new initiative called the Crimson Course Transformation to revisit pedagogy in classes that have higher rates of students receiving a D and F or a withdrawal.

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

And we are seeing early progress with our lowest DFW rate in at least a decade, a 1.7% improvement this fall semester with significantly greater improvement in select classes that have been targeted for improvement in these metrics. We have also enhanced the campus wide faculty initiated early alert system to identify challenges for students before they derail progress. And today with the leadership of Interim Vice Provost Vasti Torres and Assistant Vice Provost Dan Turner, I'm excited to announce that we are transforming the current academic advising structure, including required academic advising of all undergraduate students Each semester. This effort will connect students more readily to their intended majors and ensure that advising considers not only what courses are required but how they fit in to a student's life and career path. We have also launched the Office of Student Life this year to help create a premier and thriving student experience connecting curricular and co-curricular life towards all around student development.

[\(00:33:52\):](#)

And those experiences go beyond Bloomington. More IU students study abroad than those from any other Big 10 university and our campus ranked second in the nation for midterm study abroad programs with our most academically driven students in mind. Hutton Honors College in Interim Dean Rebecca Spang has worked with colleagues and students to redesign our honor structure. Ensuring honor students across campus can choose the best path forward that is aligned with their personal ambitions. Exceptional students like Kelley first year student Carrie Howell and Jacob's doctoral student Charlie Edmonds are taking their studies to the next level by creating resources that serve their peers. Carrie has created a financial literacy platform for young people. While Charlie has developed a tool that offers black music band and orchestra curriculum, they've not only become deeply involved in campus programs but have received international attention for their efforts and promise.

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

The new graduate school led by Dean David Daleke continues to make great progress and enhancement for graduate and professional student life, including dramatically growing. Its one-to-one coaching program and improving resources to help graduates and professional students succeed on campus and in their chosen careers. Initiatives like the Preparing Future Faculty Conference, career Diversity Symposium and the Big 10 Academic Alliance postdoc organization allow for greater support and clarity for students in identifying desirable paths. The graduate school is also adding new ombuds person to help students resolve challenges in their learning and assistantship spaces. Stipends for students with assistantships will increase again this summer to a campus-wide minimum of \$23,000 for halftime or 20 hour per week appointments. Remember now that's more than 50% higher than the lowest stipend barely three years ago and we'll be benchmarking this through BFCs SAA academic SAA affairs committee this fall to ensure we continue to stay in the top half of Big 10 on stipends Moving forward.

[\(00:36:21\)](#):

I encourage all schools and departments to celebrate our graduate and professional students and their successes during the upcoming National Graduate and Professional Student Appreciation week, which is from April 1st to the fifth. This year across all students we remain keenly attuned to outcomes. Our six year graduation rate continues a steady upward trend and our four year graduation rate is increasing for the first time since the pandemic across disciplines, about 95% of our undergraduates find full-time employment, graduate school or other successful paths soon after graduation. These students join our alumni in making incredible differences for IU and across the globe and increasing our impact across the state and beyond is a core part of our strategic plan. And to me the best possible way to counter potential misunderstandings about IU from our state and elected leaders. When leaders and residents across Indiana know us personally and see the investment we are making in our local communities and the region, we all benefit. As Vice President Michael Huber shared with this council at our last meeting, our impact will grow through our efforts and the intentional relationships that we continue to build on an almost daily basis.

[\(00:37:52\)](#):

And while there will definitely be more challenges ahead, I really do not want to sugarcoat the polarized political moment we are in. I firmly believe in engaging fully and finding more ways to be a part of the solution. We have tremendous opportunities in the IU Indianapolis and in advancing the I-69 corridor between Indianapolis and Crane as well as the trades district and innovation in Bloomington and Monroe County. We also have tremendous opportunities to work with Bloomington's new mayor Kerry Thompson, council leaders, local and regional businesses, community and residents to create a sustainable vision for Bloomington that IU can be a part of in helping realize. IU Center for Rural Engagement, under new interim leader, Denny Spinner continues to engage widely across the state and is poised for renewed focus and engagement between the campus and local communities. Their collaborators include the Environmental Resilience Institute, the Arts and Humanities Council, and many schools and departments.

[\(00:39:07\)](#):

Our new IU Innovates initiatives with Julie Heath at the helm has already blown past its goals to incubate 30 student and faculty business startup businesses and launched 25 founder groups. We are now looking to double the square footage of the IU Innovate space in the Von Lee building to meet this remarkable growth and with expectations of much more to come in the future. Looking at health outcomes, Sarah Farmer and John Keesler in social work have developed a partnership in which masters of social work students help school children self-regulate and work through challenges. School of Public Health Professor Richard Holden and School of Medicine Professor Malaz Boustani have created a telehealth app called Brain Care Notes, which helps informal caregivers of dementia patients better manage both their own health and the many symptoms of dementia. We also see incredible examples of service from the School of Nursing from the Maher School of Law and IU Corps.

[\(00:40:15\)](#):

It is clear that we have tremendous expertise and energy in our faculty and students on campus. From service learning to volunteerism to healthcare to economic development, and a lot more to add to our expertise and energy. We continue to be busy with recruitment through the Faculty 100 initiative, focusing on key priority areas. We expect these new colleagues to expand capacity in areas of strategic importance while sparking more impactful collaboration within and among departments. But to recruit and retain world-class faculty, we need cutting edge lab spaces for faculty and students to work. In. Last November, the board of trustees approved \$45 million in research construction and renovation for

Bloomington part of university level investments that strengthen our leadership and impact in biosciences as well as advanced microelectronics and nanotechnology. Our intention is to steward these renovation funds strategically creating opportunities to pursue new research, funding new partnerships and collaborations in key areas of investment projects will include the high base shelf space at the multidisciplinary engineering and science hall, new lab facilities at a former office building on Ellis Road and upgrades to existing spaces in Swain West, the biology building, chemistry building, geological sciences building and MSBII along with Simon Hall.

[\(00:41:51\):](#)

Our campus has also committed funding for new faculty hires in arts, humanities and cultural areas including music, business, songwriting and video game composition and association. And in association we have begun arts connected renovations that so far have included updates in the Jacobs School of Music's recital Hall, Ford Hall, and Auer Hall. As we make exciting hires and invest in physical infrastructure, we are also pursuing a comprehensive research incentive plan which will aim to increase the volume and scope of high impact research and creativity by rewarding faculty who ambitiously pursue external grants and awards. Meanwhile, IU Research and the steering committee for the Aging and Environment transformational areas are exploring opportunities for large grants and developing teams to pursue them. Additionally, the pre-award services team part of a new proposal development team that I announced here a year ago is now fully staffed and has begun serving many units across campus. Finding solutions to society's most pressing needs require the creativity and talents of our faculty and staff. We know very often you are stretched thin, so we are acting to reduce administrative burden while increasing the resources, support and recognition for your important work.

[\(00:43:30\):](#)

From the point of a campus leadership, I can say personally we are fortunate to have an amazing team of deans and vice provosts who value the increasing interconnectedness of our efforts. This year we welcome two new and highly capable deans to campus. David Tolchinsky in the media school and John Ciorciari in the Hamilton Luger School. Though John just started this month, both David and John have jumped in and proven themselves as bold and collaborative leaders with a fresh energy and perspective to IU Bloomington. Suresh Viswanathan will begin his service as dean in the School of optometry later this summer and we will extend our search for the Dean of the School of Education to ensure we find the best possible candidate to lead that school. This year our leadership team also added vice provost for research, Brea Perry, who has played a critical role in the actualization of our strategic plan goals.

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

And Lamar Hylton in student life has already had a huge impact in creating a more vibrant student experience. We will soon also be welcoming a colleague in the reimagined leadership role of executive director for arts and humanities. Across campus, the work of all these colleagues ongoing and upcoming is well plentiful. However it is not popular or not always popular. Taking on criticisms as a leader today at all levels simply comes with the territory. We are a campus of 60,000 humans and a university of more than a hundred thousand we will disagree, which I think is fantastically healthy in an academic community. There is also an exceptional amount of pride in our campus as there should be. IU Bloomington is the incredibly special place it is today because of the leadership and the care from so many who came before us and the longtime colleagues who continue to lead today.

[\(00:45:48\):](#)

Our challenge in making this present moment home is simultaneously honoring and cherishing the best of the grand traditions and historic practices we share while also embracing new ways of doing bridging a tomorrow that may seem fundamentally different from yesterday. We know and love, I'm fully aware

that not everyone will agree with or understand or like every decision and while trust in the process is hard, I ask that we grant each other the grace of assuming the best intentions and work towards shared understanding. I assure you I want only the best for IU Bloomington and for us to lead boldly into a brilliant future. And I know you do as well. I continue to learn every day. Even the most challenging circumstances are chances to see a new perspective as we try to ensure all our community members are equitably served and well-served. I know that you work exceptionally hard and care deeply.

[\(00:46:58\)](#):

Please know that I and every leader at IU wants you to have a meaningful, healthy and productive experience in your work here and a fulfilling life beyond so inspired together we can chase our highest ambitions together as a community. So in chorus, together we can recast the narratives about higher education that we know we aspire to so we can be the best IU possible today. And for many tomorrows, Colin, I hope I have made good on my charge to open a meaningful dialogue. I truly welcome all ideas and collaboration on how we create a stronger learning community and support each other more fully in the process while the path ahead will not be easy and may get more difficult before it gets light. We each have a critical role to play and I'm assured that we all will. So today I say the state of the campus is up for the challenge, resilient as ever and resolved to lead boldly. Together we are determined to make the present moment home and bring on tomorrow in a brighter future for IU Bloomington in the state of Indiana and our world. Thanks for everything you do to make IUB. Great and let's bring on tomorrow. Thank you.

[\(00:48:31\)](#):

We well thank you. We have some time for questions. I'll be happy to answer your questions. We have received one question this week on the programming at the art museum. I really do not have much more to add than I shared before, so I would refer colleagues to that and to the museum directly for any other follow up. But really I'm happy to take questions from the room. Elizabeth,

Housworth [\(00:49:15\)](#):

Am I correct in understanding that first year experiences now are optional for students and that they're about to become required? So that's the first question and then if that's true, I was wondering which faculty committee was involved in the decision to make them required.

Shrivastav [\(00:49:38\)](#):

There is a committee, it has not officially formed, I know this is a conversation that's still ongoing. I think it still needs refinement and approval. So you're on top of the emerging discussion, but it's not formally done yet. Other questions? Yes.

Paschal [\(00:50:05\)](#):

What exact kinds of initiatives are being done to reduce the DFW rate?

Shrivastav [\(00:50:10\)](#):

There are, well everything from advising changes to pedagogical changes, looking at class sizes, looking at outside of classroom support for tutoring for instance. It varies by discipline, by the area. Again, there is no silver bullet that'll reduce that and there are multifaceted steps to address that issue. But great question Israel.

Herrera [\(00:50:46\)](#):

So yeah, thank you for all the information and for sharing some of the changes that you have done. I really appreciate the changes in advising and also thank you for supporting the experiential learning that is very important for our students. And this is not a question, but just a call to attention on behalf of some colleagues in the world language area is regarding the support and the funding for two important world language centers that we have. They are very recognized and wellknown in the Big 10 and also nationally. And it's very important to take into account that many students, many AI faculty, they need those centers that is the Center for Language Technology and also the Center for Language Excellence. They have been having some situation regarding the budget and I just hope that the university could support, could see the importance these two centers have in our campus for Hamilton Lugar School, for the college and other schools that they have any kind of interaction with world languages.

Shrivastav (00:52:03):

Yep. Thank you for highlighting that. The new dean at HLS has been here two weeks I think and has already, if you read his last message to his community, had some very positive words about the language center, so I'm sure it's on his radar as well. But thank you for that as well. Other questions, Colin?

Johnson (00:52:30):

First of all, I would like to take an opportunity to thank you. I feel like you provided a genuinely substantive state of the campus address and I really appreciate the acknowledgement of the challenges that we're facing in addition to kind of the opportunities we have. I think that's something that faculty especially feel like they need to be able to talk to their leaders about and talk with them about. And I feel like you have created an opening for that. So I guess my question is this, which is over spring break I had the opportunity or I took the opportunity to read, I think it's David Epstein's new book Range. And one of the things which I know is getting a lot of discussion in various quarters, and one of the things that book, which again it's a New York Times bestseller, grain of salt, whatever for that reason, but not to be too dismissive of nutrient, but one of the kind of conceit of that book is that what often passes as common wisdom in the general population about what's ultimately going to be most for people in the longterm, not only in terms of their pursuing their goals, but also in terms of what's actually going to allow them to contribute substantively to the world is mistaken.

(00:53:35):

That there's a kind of common sensical notion that specialization and kind of chasing after whatever is seems to be most current is there's an incentive structure that's been built up around that at least he contends does not prove to actually shake out in the end. And I think one of the concerns that a lot that I and many of my colleagues have about institutional change is the fear that we sometimes might be chasing the wrong things, right? That with the best of intentions we might be trying to be responsive to a world and investing too deeply in a kind of common sense understanding of what beneficial change might look like. And that in fact, rather than leading, we're lagging behind because, so I'm just wondering if you have any thoughts about that and if you have any thoughts about what it means to sort of create an incentive structure where we're responding to a world that is what it is and is consequential, but is often motivated by fairly questionable assessments of its own needs. In many respects, I think there is a concern that we might be complicit unintentionally by being more responsive and less kind of insistent about our own sense of what's important, at least where education is concerned.

Shrivastav (00:54:54):

How much time do you have, Colin?

Johnson ([00:54:57](#)):

Five weeks and then I'm done.

Shrivastav ([00:55:00](#)):

No, it's a really important point and I think you've articulated it well. I talk to a lot of business leaders, I talk to a lot of elected officials and I reinforce the message that when you are in higher ed, you don't measure outcomes in quarterly reports or shareholder values. You measure success in decades and multi-decades sometimes, and it's not easy to connect A to B 10, 20, 30 years out. And that's why a holistic perspective is what is really essential. I'll give you one example, a real conversation with an elected official a couple of years ago who said, higher ed is too slow to change. And I said, yes, we get criticized all the time, but is that a bad thing? Because you think about the oldest longest serving company, private company that you can think of, and this gentleman could give me something that had been in business for 30, 40, 50 years.

([00:56:10](#)):

I said, think about the oldest university in town or in the country or in the world. And there are dozens that are hundreds of years old. There are a few that go into a thousand years old. And the point I made there was being slow is not always bad as long as it's intentional. The example I gave there was a decade ago, everybody was making apps for smartphones and we could say, let's change our gen ed so everybody learns to make apps. And we could have done that and we could have had five years of students go through learning how to make apps. Today, if you want to make an app, you download an app that makes apps for you. So that's an example where if we change too quickly, it serves as a negative for us. But the flip is true too. If we don't change at all, that's a problem as well.

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

We have to have the right balance and it needs a lot more conversation, a lot more thought, a lot more intentionality to decide what are the right outcomes, what are the changes that get us there, what are also the benchmarks? So when you see a change you're making, is it delivering what you wanted it to deliver? If not, we shouldn't be afraid to course correct and reshape what it is, but inertia for the sake of inertia is not good either. So it's a tough balance. But I know we have a lot of smart people on this campus and I think if we all put our minds to it, we can achieve it. Other questions? Okay, thank you very much. Let us move on with the rest of the meeting. The next item on our agenda is proposed changes to the court of student rights, responsibilities and conduct. This is being presented by Bill Ramos and Janett Thomas. Bill, you want to take it away?

Ramos ([00:58:16](#)):

Absolutely tough act to follow, but we'll try to make this as exciting as possible. So Bill Rams, co-chair of the student affairs committee and Catherine Sherwood Loughlin was going to join us. I don't know if she snuck in. Okay, she may be coming in and then I'll have our guest introduce herself.

Thomas ([00:58:33](#)):

Good afternoon everyone. My name is Janett Thomas pronouns she her. I have the pleasure of being the assistant director of academic misconduct in the Office of Student Conduct. And thank you for letting me be here.

Ramos ([00:58:44](#)):

And Janett's here to help us field any questions. Is there a clicker? Is that,

([00:58:54](#)):

Thank you.

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

All right, so we're coming to you based on a charge that we received in the fall. And I can tell you we're going to hit several parts of this. There are still some that are in need of work. We found part of it a little more challenging than expected. So the committee will continue to work and what you'll see here is the six areas of charge and the areas we'll be focusing on today. There's really two primary pieces. One was changing where graduate misconduct cases would fall. And I think we have approval from both sides to make that move. We'll talk about that shortly. And then a piece about resizing the faculty student ratio for hearing committees. Some of the slides will be a little bit redundant, but we wanted to make sure we covered all the pieces. So the first slide, the general principles, this is the change you'll see throughout most of the slides. And again, the redundancy where we'll see that we're moving the graduate cases from OVPFSA to the new graduate school. So that verbiage has changed. Same in the next slide and an additional change. We noticed that the word serious procedural error was in there and we really don't have a process for making a distinction of severity. So we took it out just for clarification. Same change here as we move along.

([01:00:29](#)):

Same change. And on this slide at the bottom is where you'll see the proposed change for the ratio for faculty to student on hearing boards. So we'll be changing or the request is to change it from three faculty and two students to two faculty and one student. And this was based on part of the process that we still need to work on to make the whole process in general more smooth for students and expedite it. But it's also brings us in line with other committee ratios that are used throughout the system. And again, just changing the verbiage of where the graduate programs will land. Same and same. And I believe this is the same except for if you look at the end of the first paragraph, this was a alignment that was asked for by student government that in the case that somebody needs to be replaced, they would be replaced by the originating body. So if a student needed to be replaced, it would be replaced through student government. Same verbiage, and I believe that is it. So again, two major changes, moving the position of the graduate cases and then changing the ratio of faculty to students for hearing boards.

Shrivastav ([01:02:03](#)):

Thank you. Bill. This is a discussion item. Does not need a vote, but it is open for questions. Elizabeth,

Housworth ([01:02:11](#)):

You keep referring to ratio and I was wondering whether the other boards that you were referring to had the same 3% size or whether it's just the ratio of two to one that you're referring to. I'm a little bit worried about decreasing the size in the sense that committees can get easily dominated by one member and having a slightly larger size. You don't want it too large. I understand, but I was personally worried about the decrease in the size.

Ramos ([01:02:52](#)):

And I'll let Janett talk to that. And that was a conversation that went on the whole power balance and balancing that with the ability to schedule and take some of the hitches out of the system. I dunno if you want to comment.

Thomas ([01:03:06](#)):

Yeah. Wow, that was spicy. My bad. So part of the reasoning for going to from a five to a three is because it will be in line with all of the other processes with organizational misconduct, title ix, hearing piano's, personal misconduct. Academic misconduct is the only conduct hearing process that has five. And so we're actually out of alignment with the rest of the processes across the board. But to your point of the possibly one person dominating or not, students brought that up when we talked about it the last time. And we empower our students. Everyone has equal vote, we train them well to be able to say, Hey, I disagree here or I agree here, or I have this question in a way that no one person's opinion will outweigh the group in that training. And we do several trainings of that across the year. So that, does that answer your question?

Housworth ([01:04:07](#)):

I think so you're saying that for all other student misconduct type things, there's a three person board for faculty processes, the boards are larger, but for student processes, the board are three. And so you're bringing it into alignment with the other ones. And that basically answers my question. Thank you.

Thomas ([01:04:24](#)):

Awesome. Thank you.

Johnson ([01:04:27](#)):

I just had a, it's a kind of superficial issue, but it also speaks I think to the question of the graduate schools kind of transformed status, which is I understand for the purpose of maintaining parity between references to the vice Provost for undergraduate education and the vice Provost for Graduate Education and Health Sciences, why you might have chosen to use that title for the person in David's position. But I actually think partly because David has another title, which is Dean of the Graduate School, and I actually think in some regard partly because the construction of your vice provost title is a bit idiosyncratic relative to your own expertise and professional expertise. Like the next person who's the incumbent in this position is unlikely to be the vice Provost for Graduate Education and Health Sciences, but they will be the dean of the graduate school regardless. And so my suggestion would actually be to, rather than using Vice Provost for graduate education and health sciences, which is not going to make sense probably to a lot of grad, I mean it'll make sense because you work with them closely. I actually think using Dean of the graduate school would be more appropriate in this context. David can correct me, but that would be my suggestion.

Daleke ([01:05:32](#)):

Thanks Colin. I think that one other option is to just remove the and health sciences. I mean those are two separate Vice Provostial titles and they're just summarized because there's one person in those roles. That's another option if you want to keep the vice provost parity between undergrad and grad. Otherwise, of course, the dean of the graduate school may be a good choice. Sometimes though, people limit that to thinking that the purview of the graduate school are for the degrees that it confers, which are the PhD and research masters, whereas the Vice provost has responsibilities for all graduate

education in the Bloomington campus. So there's an argument made that I think could be made that just on the grounds of responsibility that maybe the vice provost title should stay the same. But your suggestion as I was, and thanks for bringing this up, is I think that it might be worthwhile just taking out the Anhill sciences in all instances because it is a separate title.

Ramos ([01:06:36](#)):

Yeah, understood. And I can take that back to the committee. That's easy change for the second reading.

([01:06:39](#)):

Shrivastav: Yes, Rachel?

Cohen ([01:06:42](#)):

Ironically, as the person who's probably chaired 75% of the campus review board hearings in the last three years, I would disagree with reducing the board to a two to one ratio. I also have chaired personal misconduct cases and serve on Title IX cases. So I've seen all of the different hearing types before for several years. And I will say, especially for academic mis hearing, not only is this the third level, there is no level of appeal above this board. This is the last line you can go to, but you're often, by the time you get to this board, this isn't just a one time academic misconduct. This is usually two or three levels of academic misconduct. And so the stakes are much higher for students. And so having people who really understand the nuances of academic misconduct and who can talk about them in different areas has been very helpful. I worry losing that. It's just a different type of board compared to our other student conduct boards. It's a hard to explain nuance, but I think it would be really detrimental to that board to drop down the faculty members from that. And the students, the students are actually great as Jen said, but I think the importance of this board really needs to have this kind of size to it. So

Shrivastav ([01:08:35](#)):

Yes,

Grogg ([01:08:37](#)):

I completely support what Rachel said. I actually sit on this committee and I've also been on the campus review board and I actually voiced this exact concern when we were putting this document together and actually voted to not change the numbers. And I'm fairly new to the campus review board. I've been on, I don't know, maybe a year or so. We've also made some efforts in scheduling difference differently to make it a bit more cohesive and planned ahead, which I think is going to help. But we're dealing with students that are oftentimes dismissed for a semester or a year from the university. And these hearings are contentious and emotional and grave potentially for patients or patients. You can tell I'm a clinician for students, so I agree with Rachel that this really should remain a three to two faculty to student ratio. And I do agree the students are marvelously trained and bring so much to the committee, but I think that it's important to have that higher ratio.

Ramos ([01:09:55](#)):

Yeah, that vote wasn't unanimous. So it was a talked about item in the committee. It did come out in favor of presenting it this way. Would it be possible to do a straw vote on that item just so I can take that back?

Shrivastav ([01:10:11](#)):

Parliamentarian. What's our procedure for a straw vote?

Ramos ([01:10:16](#)):

Sorry.

Shrivastav ([01:10:18](#)):

Can we just do it informally? That's what Bill's asking for. Simple show of hands on reducing the size versus keeping it bigger. I

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

Would say simple straw of hand. You're not bound by what you vote today.

Shrivastav ([01:10:32](#)):

Correct. It's not change your mind. The whole thing will come back for a formal vote, so you'll have opportunities again to correct it if needed.

DeSawal ([01:10:46](#)):

What was the rationale for reducing it in addition to just alignment? Were there other, obviously if it was a highly discussed, there were probably some arguments on the other side too was the of a process curious.

Ramos ([01:10:59](#)):

It was the start of a process and the remainder of the process didn't get done, which was to make the process more efficient and beneficial for the students. It is a cumbersome process. So that was a piece of it. So maybe in a sense this is a little cart before the horse since we didn't get to that part, which also included entire summer policy as well. But that was the other piece of it

Shrivastav ([01:11:26](#)):

From our students.

Paschal ([01:11:27](#)):

Yeah. I have a brief comment and then a question. It's actually my undergraduate institution. The academic integrity was all student run and we always had five. I'm actually surprised as a suggestion to reduce it. That's just cross institutional context though. My question is what's the approximate caseload for the different paths here? How many graduate cases roughly would we see in a year versus how many undergraduate cases would we see roughly in a year?

Ramos ([01:11:52](#)):

Graduate is about 10 and undergraduate.

Thomas ([01:11:55](#)):

I don't have that information off you. I don't have that statistic, but I'm happy to give it back to you. Okay, sounds good.

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

Thank you.

Thomas ([01:12:02](#)):

What's

([01:12:02](#)):

Your name?

Paschal ([01:12:03](#)):

Joshua Pascal. Thank you.

Cohen ([01:12:05](#)):

If it helps, I serve on about 20 a year and I probably serve on three fourths of them, but this hearing board does not normally hear the graduate ones. So the ones I serve on are not graduate.

Ramos ([01:12:24](#)):

And I will say that was the challenge that brought this throughout the year was how do we balance fairness to the students trying to make it more expedited for the students, but yet not losing any value to the students. And we would get so close to something and then someone would bring up and we say, okay, back to the drawing board. So we're bringing you what we voted on our best at the moment, but happy to take it back. That's why we have the first reading.

Shrivastav ([01:12:51](#)):

One last question before a straw vote. We are running out of time too,

Thomassen ([01:12:56](#)):

Right? This is just a request to, if we're going to have the straw vote to please put the slides back to the question that we're asking about, which is the numbers, just so we can see the policy. And also thank you so much for using the big screens. I find that very helpful. It's great.

Ramos ([01:13:11](#)):

It's a little, it's tilted, so I'm going to have to figure out which one that was. There you go there at the very bottom, the last line again, no, sorry to throw the straw out at you, but it gives me information to take back, so no obligation here.

Shrivastav ([01:13:26](#)):

Okay, so let's just do a show of hands first. Let's raise your hands if support as stated on the screen that the hearing board will be composed of two faculty and one student. All in favor of that, raise your hands. Just Ron. Two

Ramos ([01:13:50](#)):

That helps.

Shrivastav (01:13:51):

Four and all in favor of going back to the three to two ratio. Please raise your hands. You got a lot more?

Ramos (01:13:58):

Okay, thank you. I'll count them.

Shrivastav (01:14:01):

You good Bill?

Ramos (01:14:01):

Back to the drawing board. Yes. Thank you very much. So we will still have discussion. We'll make changes and then we'll plan to do a second reading. Okay, thank you.

Johnson (01:14:12):

If I can just make one comment as we move ahead into the era of people volunteering to serve on committees and be standing like this is all fine and good, but one of the challenges that we often face is if you're going to have processes that demand high levels of faculty involvement and student involvement, you better show up. And I'll go back to the plea I made around the election, which is I think this is great. I think the integrity is very important, but we also need to be mindful of the fact that if we're going to do this, if we're going to stick to, we have an obligation to make sure that we're staffing these committees because it's great in theory, but now we need to do it in practice. So that's part of the cultural change that's on us is we can't just leave these matters to other people to undertake.

Shrivastav (01:15:01):

Okay, thank you very much Bill and Janett, let's move on to the next item on the agenda, which is a report on coach results. This is Carrie Docherty, Amanda Diekman, and Wen Qi. Who's taking it away? Carrie,

Docherty (01:15:15):

Thank you so much. We are super excited to be here to present the 2023 coach data. Carrie Docherty, vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs.

Diekman (01:15:26):

Amanda Diekman, associate Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs.

Qi (01:15:32):

Hi, I'm Wen Qi. I'm the director of faculty Analytics at VPFA

Docherty (01:15:38):

And I have to start just by saying how grateful I am to both of you for all of the amazing work that you do in this space. So thank you, thank you, thank you. I think most of us are familiar with the coach survey, but for those who aren't, I want to just provide a brief overview here. The coach data is collected directly from IUB faculty and this includes tenure track faculty and librarians, lecturers, research scientists, clinical faculty, as well as professors of practice. This started back in 2005 and these data are

typically collected every three years. The decision was made in 2022, which was the time that it should have occurred just based on the pandemic and everything that's happening to postpone that timing by a year. So these data were captured in the spring of 2023. As you know, all these responses are anonymous and confidential.

[\(01:16:52\)](#):

I think what the great thing about these coach data are the fact that it allows us to look at things over time longitudinally so we can see what things are going up, what things are going down, and make some of our decisions based upon that. Additionally, we can look at our peers and we can look to see what's happening across the country and those faculty are taking the very same survey. The other thing that's wonderful is it allows us to make comparisons around certain demographics. So you'll see that you can look at the responses based upon rank or gender, race and ethnicity or discipline. So again, as we're looking at all of these data, both at the campus level and at the unit level, we can really design programming or make decisions or start new initiatives or see an area of opportunity based upon these data. I will also say that at the very end of the slide deck, we have a link to the dashboard that again, Wen did an amazing job creating for us. And so those data are all there for your viewing pleasure as you would like, and again, you can dissect things based upon whatever might be of interest or concern to you.

[\(01:18:22\)](#):

The other thing that both this office has done as well as the campus in general, and we just had the opportunity to meet with all the deans this morning to really have them look at both the strengths and the areas of opportunity and use these data to make decisions, right? It's a wonderful opportunity to hear directly from our colleagues what's going well and what maybe isn't going as well. And I will celebrate those that came before me and you all who have served on the council as in 2016 it was identified a real weakness was lack of clarity in the promotion and tenure process. And so we took that finding or they took that finding, you all took that finding and said, okay, we need to make this better. And VPFAA worked on workshops and other professional development opportunities and the BFC looked at our policies and our guidelines and really made significant changes.

[\(01:19:24\)](#):

Lo and behold, in 2023, this became a strength. So I think we can see that if we treat these data with that lens, we have real opportunities for improvement. The other thing that I will say is that we have an opportunity in some of the data that we'll be presenting here is based upon peer comparisons. These are the five peers that we selected and we can talk about the pros and cons of whether these are the right ones or the wrong ones or what, but these were the five peers that were identified and these will be the graphs that you'll be seeing forthcoming.

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

So one thing to note is, as Carrie said, this survey is offered to the faculty on our campus have an opportunity to respond. We had over 2000 faculty who were invited to do so and 844 valid responses, which is about a 37% valid response rate, which is fairly good for a survey of this nature. So as Carrie noted, these data were collected in 2023, and so they give us just a snapshot of where our faculty were at that point in time. But this is important because we are able to compare it to ourselves in previous years and to those peers, those five selected peers that Carrie noted. This slide gives you the range of different benchmark assessments that are collected and available to us. We will not dig into all of these today, but on the dashboard or in conversations with us, we're happy to go into these in more detail.

[\(01:20:55\)](#):

Just gives you a sense of the kinds of items that the coach survey assesses. So we'll start with thinking about global satisfaction and we'll start by looking at data over a decade. So since 2013, the top row here are going to be faculty satisfaction with IU Bloomington. So I would again choose to work at IUB, the percentage who strongly agree or agree and how satisfied people are with IUB as a place to work. And what you see there is a lot of stability, particularly given the tumultuous times that happened as of 2020. And so there's a slight downturn as we would expect, but overall stability that the majority of our faculty are satisfied with our campus. When we ask faculty about their departments where they spend most of their time, we again see a very high level of satisfaction. And again, this stability given everything that has happened is really I think wonderful news. So most faculty on our campus are satisfied with their departments as a place to work and would recommend that department to a colleague.

[\(01:22:03\):](#)

When we look at our peers, again, this gives us a different comparison. We all are members of this campus. We are not members of other campuses at this point in time. And so these data are uniquely important to understand our own context. And again, we see that we are faring well given these highly selected peers. We're in the midst of our peers in terms of both those campus level global satisfaction but also departmental satisfaction. We'll then focus in on a few strengths and weaknesses for most of those benchmarks. Those big slide of items that I provided earlier. We see some small declines since 2019 and we're within the range of the peers that we have close data on. So what we'll focus on in the next few slides are areas that diverge either from ourselves in 2019 where we've seen ourselves go up or down or where we are towards the bottom or the top of our peers.

[\(01:23:02\):](#)

In terms of strengths, there are three that are noted. One is in terms of personal and family policies and health and retirement benefits. This includes things like institutional support for family care and elder care work-life balance. And so these are things that provide an excellent foundation for faculty to do the very important work that faculty do. Clarity of tenure policies, as Carrie noted before, this was an area of major investment on the part of BFC and OVPFAA and we're starting to see that emerge in our faculty sentiment and then effectiveness of faculty leadership, which is this council. So thank you for the work that you do and the difficult work of going back and forth and having the conversations and working through the policies that you all do, but this is an area of true strength on our campus. We see it, we want to build on it and we look forward to your partnership in everything that we will try to do to turn now and think more specifically about some items that underlie that strength of tenure policies and expectations.

[\(01:24:04\):](#)

We just wanted to give you a flavor of some of the items that faculty responded to. And so these are all things the Gray bar gives IUB in 2019, and the Crimson bar is 2023. So you'll see there are either slight or larger increases across this period of time. So the tenure standards and the performance thresholds in my department, for example, is one where faculty were more satisfied over time. So overall, a picture that those investments that have been made across levels on our campus are reaping benefits. So then to think about where we might improve. Again, the data are important not because they tell us all of the answers, but because they can point the way to where we are most likely to make the biggest improvements by investing. So first is leadership and governance. We'll go into this in more detail in a moment.

[\(01:24:56\):](#)

Departmental factors including collegiality, engagement and quality. I think we've all felt this as a response to the pandemic that natures of interaction have shifted and we're finding our way back from that. And then mentorship, which includes both faculty's perception of how much they are being mentored within the department and on the campus, but also institutional supports for mentorship. When we look at leadership across levels, this includes faculty items, multiple items at each level, but thinking about departmental leadership, divisional leadership, and senior leadership, I'm going to show you two forms of data for each of these three areas of improvement. One looks at our comparison to ourselves over time, so that 2019 to 2023 comparison. And the other gives you where we are in the mix of those five selected peers. So when we look at leadership across levels, we see that there is a mixed picture there when we're thinking about departmental or divisional or senior leadership over time.

[\(01:25:56\)](#):

And this is something I think that is not a surprise to people in the room because many of us have lived through this. What might be newer information though is looking at where we are in terms of our peers. And so there can be a tendency to think that the grass is always greener on some other lawn. And what we see from the data is that we are in the mid range, we're among the mix of our peers, and I think that's important to consider how we operate as we move forward. When we look at governance, and again, these are items that ask about faculty's perception and satisfaction with the way that governance decisions are made. The business of the university is conducted across levels, so not in any one specific body, but just generally in faculty experience on campus. And what we see here are some declines since 2019.

[\(01:26:49\)](#):

So a shared sense of purpose, a sense of trust, sense of adaptability that we have the procedures and policies and practice in place to deal with unusual circumstances or emerging context and understanding the issue at hand. So I'll say that these data are our data that our office takes very seriously in terms of thinking through how can we create channels of communication so that faculty across campus are more likely to feel this shared sense of purpose and trust in our institution. Thinking more locally in terms of faculty perceptions at the department level here, again, when we look at comparisons to 2019, we see a slight decrease in terms of departmental quality, engagement and collegiality. When we look in terms of where we are compared to our peers, we are towards the bottom in terms of faculty perceptions of departments. So again, thinking through what are the actions we can take to enable department chairs and departmental processes to bring more of this forward. Here are a few items within that departmental quality metric. And here we can see the largest decrease here is in my department, is successful at retaining high quality faculty members. And so again, gives us a sense of where we might need to devote some efforts.

[\(01:28:11\)](#):

The final area of improvement that we'll show some data on is mentoring effectiveness. And so again, this is IUB, providing support for faculty to be good members in terms of institutional support, but also effectiveness of mentoring outside of the department and within the department. And compared to our peers, again, we're towards the bottom. So areas to improve here as well. Faculty were then asked to identify two of the best or worst aspects of working at IUB. And one of the remarkable things about these data is that despite all the changes that have occurred, these top five responses on each are exactly the same again. So remarkable stability given the landscape that has shifted what we see in terms of what faculty are reporting for best aspects of working at IUB, quality of academic freedom, supportive colleagues, cost of living and quality of graduate students, and the worst aspects being compensation, quality of leadership, too much service or too many assignments, geographic location

and lack of diversity. So again, we see these as strengths that can help us understand what we need to build on and to grow and our weaknesses in terms of where we might need to direct our efforts.

Docherty ([01:29:27](#)):

Thank you. So Colin's charge to me was very clear. He said, yes, present the data, but also tell us the things that you're actively going to do and work on based upon these data. So here we go, Colin. Of course, we want to continue to amplify the things that we're doing really well and celebrate the things that we're doing well. However, we want to acknowledge the weaknesses and purposefully identify ways in which that those can improve. So when we look at those three weaknesses that Amanda identified, we also put up some guiding questions of how can we think about this? And I would say, we want your partnership in thinking through this. We need your partnership and identifying what are the best ways to think about these weaknesses and create programming or priority communication strategies, all of the things to see how we can do better in each of these areas.

([01:30:36](#)):

So around leadership, we're thinking about how to better support our leaders at all levels. How do we create emerging leaders? How do we motivate associate professors to think about if they want to take on leadership positions and what that might look like at the department? How can we expand faculty development to serve different career goals? How can we think about the different ranks and stages of career and uniquely meet those faculty where they are and help support them over time and mentorship? How can we integrate mentorship into our organizational practices? And we've already started work in each of these areas, but again, looking to scale and expand each one of those. So our current action items, as we sat down as a team and really thought about these things, here are things that we are already dreaming about for the future, and the first is around leadership resources.

([01:31:48](#)):

So we really want to think about our current leaders and what type of training and professional development, how can we modernize the way we are doing this work to meet the unique needs of this changing landscape in higher education and really make it more accessible for our current leaders. We also think it would be really beneficial to create a cohort model here. We've examined different models across the country to really think about how can we knit together new department chairs who are just entering this experience versus our more experienced chairs and what are the unique needs that each of them might need or how can we create some mentorship between those groups? We have a plan, again, we're just in the early stages of development, so all suggestions and advice are welcome to really think about what sort of a formalized professional development for leaders at all levels could look like at iu.

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

The second is really focused on faculty development. We know there are some things that we're doing really, really well. How can we invest more in those? How can we scale those to a larger capacity? And two of them that I'll just highlight first is the scholarly writing program. Whenever I talk to people about what are things that we're doing that we just need to keep doing, the scholarly writing program is always amongst the first that people mention. So we're thinking about that. How can we continue to build upon those strengths, reach more individuals, scale it in a way, think about it based on the needs of different ranks of faculty in different areas of focus. Additionally, just this year in partnership with the vice Pam Jackson in the Vice President's office of DEI, we're thinking about the faculty to faculty program and mentoring. That was really based on a specific demographic.

([01:34:03](#)):

And we were like, but wait a minute. There are all kinds of faculty that want these opportunities. So we provided some investment to open that up to more schools, to different types of faculty. And I think that has also gleaned positive results already. We do want to begin to focus and be flexible on our cohort offerings. I think there are opportunities at every point in time in our career where we need additional support. And so how can we identify those spaces and then B, build programming around them. We want to do an environmental scan of what's happening across our campus. We don't feel like our office should or can own all of the things, but what we want to do is celebrate them, amplify them, make sure we're sharing with everyone those possibilities to make sure that anyone who wants to take advantage of those opportunities can.

[\(01:35:09\)](#):

The third bullet point here is related to NCFDD. I think we have had an institutional membership to that for years and years, and it's a decent investment of our resources. So how can we leverage that investment in a way to make sure we're taking advantage of all of the opportunities that NCFDD has? Oftentimes it's just junior faculty that are utilizing those resources, but there's so much more to offer there. And then the last one here that again, Amanda has been taking a huge lead on this is thinking about how can we get more mentoring and conversations, those formative conversations between leaderships leadership at every level and our faculty at every level to say, how can we support you more? What are things that are going really well? What are things that we can help you with? How can we provide those support systems and reduce some of the barriers?

[\(01:36:15\)](#):

We're going to continue to really press on that and hopefully have it become part of the fabric of what we do and the infrastructure of what we do. I think this is something that as we've highlighted, we're doing pretty good at, but I think there are always opportunities for improvement. Again, we see that at the individual seeking tenure, they're very happy with the level of support that we have. But then what about those additional levels? What about associate to full professor or senior lecturer to teaching professor? How can we make sure the workshops that we're providing and the way in which we're creating those policies and practices to support and incentivize individuals that are looking to make those leaps?

[\(01:37:12\)](#):

So as promised, here is the data that you can go through and look at yourselves. We are also happy to meet and talk with any individuals. So hopefully you'll go back to your departments and your schools and your colleges and remind your peers about these data and that they're a resource for us. You can of course navigate the dashboard on your own, but Wen and Amanda are both amazing resources to help you look into these data as well. So if you have a particular question that you're not quite able to tease out with the dashboard, email us at just VPFAA and we will circle back around with you to talk to you about this. And please, as you begin to look through these data, if you see areas of opportunity, if you see a weakness that we didn't quite highlight here, that doesn't mean we're not focusing on it, but it is always helpful to hear from you about have you considered and have you thought about or here's something that we're doing in our space that you might want to try to support and elevate and amplify. So please let us know if you want to continue this conversation. I think we have time for questions.

Shrivastav [\(01:38:32\)](#):

Thank you. This is open for questions. Elizabeth,

Housworth [\(01:38:37\)](#):

I need to apologize before I start speaking because I'm going to be a little harsh. You showed lots of pictures and you told a story to go with those pictures and I don't see your story in those pictures. The beginning slide indicated a decrease in approval satisfaction score of about 75 to 50, and then later that was insignificant, but later there were increases of around 60 to 80, which were deemed significant. And yet those have to be about the same magnitude of change. The thing I saw with comparisons to our peers was that we were always about next to last, there was just one school, and I don't know whether it was Purdue or Rutgers who were just outliers on the low side, but we were towards the bottom. We were in the range, but the range, we were fourth out of five and one school was way below us. So there was just a lot of that narrative. So there we're at the bottom there, but here, whoever that blue school is or whatever at the bottom is just really far below. But we're kind of on the low side here. So I'm sorry, I just don't see your story in the slides that you gave us.

Docherty ([01:40:29](#)):

No, I thank you for saying that. And I think what we echoed, and again I'll add my narrative and then pass it off to Amanda, that yes, I think we see that there has been a decline and when we look at our, we see that decline that has occurred between 2019 and 2023. And you can see that there in some of the areas. And based upon our peers identified here, I hope the narrative that we are trying to say is that we recognize that and we recognize that based upon everything that has occurred. We can also see, and we have our peers here, but we also have the 60, 70 schools across the US that are doing it. And so we can also look at sort of where we fall amongst all of those universities as well. So Elizabeth, thank you for giving me the opportunity to clarify because that is not the story we are trying to portray. We acknowledge that things have decreased over the last couple of years. A lot of stuff has been happening.

Shrivastav ([01:41:41](#)):

Just in case you didn't know, Elizabeth is a professor of statistics, and I'm surprised you didn't say where is the standard error of the mean.

Diekman ([01:41:50](#)):

I had that

([01:41:50](#)):

Thought too, but

Shrivastav ([01:41:54](#)):

Okay, other questions.

Diekman ([01:41:56](#)):

Can I just point out that we also, we didn't want to waste time on only presenting the stability. And so areas that we focused in on are the weaknesses that are emerging. And so they are the bigger weaknesses for sure.

Shrivastav ([01:42:13](#)):

Other questions, comments, Israel?

Herrera ([01:42:17](#)):

Yeah, so thank you Carrie for sharing the coach. I don't know if that's the pronunciation, but thank you for sharing the survey. So my question is, when you presented the worst scenarios in both this year and the previous one, I could see that the compensation was the worst aspect repeated. So in six years, but then what the university is doing is not mentioned about this. Now that we have two service, I dunno, the previous one to the 2019, you might remember that there was also the same one. So that hasn't been mentioned to work on if it has been the feeling from the faculty. So I would like to ask about that if there is something that is going to happen. And also the thing regarding, what was the other thing that I was about? It's long day that there was another one. Oh yeah. So during the recent years, many lectures, lectures and senior lectures, they have left the university and there is something about retention. I don't know if the previous slide also my question will be is one of the slides regarding what the university is doing, not just with lectures, but I know the figures and number for other ranks. But in the case for lectures, they are leaving the university and there is something related to the retention. So what are those things that the university is doing in order to retain excellent instructional faculty?

Docherty ([01:44:17](#)):

Great points. I'll start with the second one and maybe leave the compensation piece to my colleague here. I think you're exactly right. We are thinking about the faculty development and mentoring as one avenue for faculty retention. We're also thinking a lot about that cohort building that we're trying to create and cultivate to support those individuals at all the various stages. I think the fact that we see a department weakness around collegiality is another piece of the puzzle that I think we're really trying to focus in on and think about how can we elevate everyone and improve the feelings of coming to work and the collegiality that you have there. And I think that will require a partnership both at every level. So at the campus level, at the school and college level, at the department level to really work on what are those sticking points. And I know you highlighted the lecture to senior lecture, but I also think there are other ranks within our campus that are not feeling as supported as they want. So really teasing that out and creating opportunities to make those improvements. Any compensation thought?

Shrivastav ([01:45:46](#)):

Well, I try to build a pay raise in our budget model annually. We've been able to do it last two years in a row. I know that has not always been the case. We are working on it right now. Hopefully in the next few weeks we will have that sorted out. We do have a compression issues in some areas more than others when we can, we address that pretty directly. At least one unit. We did a pretty big change about a year ago. At the end of the day, it is what I said in my state of the campus address, we have to look at every single practice that we have, decide what it is we want to keep, what it is we want to let go and then repurpose the finances from it to do things just like compensation issues. So it is on our radar. It is a multi-year problem. It's not something we can fix overnight. I wish we could. It is a result of things that have decisions that have been made over decades really. And it'll hopefully not take decades, but it'll take a few years to fix.

Johnson ([01:46:56](#)):

So at the risk of stating the obvious, I just wanted to sort of make an observation, which is when you look at the things that people value most and the things that people value, compensation, whatever. But one of the things I'm always struck by is, and this I guess this is no great surprise, is we like each other a lot better than we like our leaders. And I think that's not a surprise. I think that's true in lots of, but here's the interesting thing, which is I think in higher education in general, and this seems to be true across institutions, I think that dynamic has become more amplified on this campus relative to what it

used to be in the past. And that should be cause for concern because that's corrosive if it becomes very pronounced. But there's a weird opportunity in higher education, which is our leaders actually are us or have the potential to be right, which is you're all faculty as well.

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

And I think there is a kind of misnomer that is actually a kind of mistake that is the product often of kind of process, generalized leadership strategy that comes out of corporate America that says you gain the most by distinguishing yourself as a leader and creating space between yourself and other people. And I think if our leaders acted more like faculty, which doesn't necessarily mean not concerning themselves with budgets, but does mean talking to us as other intellectuals and scholars, I think there's a huge space of opportunity for people in leadership in higher education. And I think it's why people love the scholarly writing program so much. It's not about only hanging out with people in your department who are experts in your field. People love that because they get to spend time with their colleagues outside the frame of their field and they get to interact with other people as intellectuals and scholars and citizens of this institution in a way that feels supportive and collegial and is kind of agnostic to scholarly expertise.

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

And that's the foundation for a vibrant intellectual culture. It's the nature of interdisciplinary curiosity. It's about productivity and it's about collegiality. And that's what we need. That's what more of, but it is very clear that we like each other a lot better than we like our leaders. So present company sort of excluded, but I'm just saying I think that matters and it's one of the things that's poisoning higher education is this sense that there is a difference between people in leadership positions and rank and file faculty. And it is going to kill us if it continues, it is going to destroy us.

Shrivastav [\(01:49:30\)](#):

Yes. Question in the back,

O'Brien [\(01:49:32\)](#):

Just a comment building on what Colin just said in the slide where you're talking about the responses to issues of the divisional school department and then the questions that were being asked in the university level. The question that was being asked is how can we better support our senior leaders? And I think that is a good question to ask. I think another really helpful, very, very helpful question to ask to Colin's point would be how can the faculty as a whole feel more heard and listened to? I think that's been a common thread in conversations that I've had with grumblings about how things are run is whether or not it's true that we're being heard. I think the feeling of being heard is not necessarily there and I think that could definitely be enhanced. And I do want to maybe take this point to highlight one place where I think that feeling of being heard did come through really well and it was a really productive thing was the increase in the grad salaries that was as a whole, the grad students, the faculty shouted really loudly about that and there was a really positive, it was a very abrupt and major change, but I think it was the right thing to do in response to, and I think a lot of us felt heard for that and I do appreciate that.

[\(01:50:47\)](#):

Docherty: Thank you.

Shrivastav [\(01:50:49\)](#):

This transcript was autogenerated by AI REV.com

Other questions? Seeing none. Thank you Carrie and Amanda and Wen, appreciate your time. That is the last item on our agenda. We have 11 minutes left, so I will leave you to enjoy the last official day of winter. Spring equinox is 11:00 PM tonight I think. So thank you again and look forward to seeing you in a couple of weeks. Meeting stands adjourned.