

Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
February 23, 2016
1:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M. (EST)
University Hall, Room 1006, IUPUI

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Applegate, Janet Badia, Tina Baich, Jonathyne Briggs, Ange Cooksey, Jan Froehlich, Charles Gallmeier, Neovi Karakatsanis, James Kauffman, Robert Kravchuk, Robert McDonald, Michael McRobbie, Diana Mishler, Daron Olson, Scott Opasik, Bill Orme, John Paolillo, Nazareth Pantaloni, Nasser Paydar, Rebecca Spang, Gregory Steel, Marianne Wokeck

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: David Fisher (Herb Terry)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Donna Dahlgren, Niki DaSilva, Alyce Fly, Linda Goodine, John Hassel, Solomon Isiorho, Wendy Morrison, Lauren Robel, Ben Robinson, Cassidy Sugimoto, Hannah Van, Jeff Watt, L. Jack Windsor

GUESTS: Fred Cate (VPR), Ting-Han Chang, Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Jan Fulton, Marcia Gonzales, Dennis Groth (VPUE), Kathy Johnson, Jenny Kincaid (CFO), Daniella Kostroun, Karen Lee (IUPUI Academic Affairs), Willie Miller, TJ Rivard, Michael Rushton, Emily Springston

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/minutes/AY16/10.27.15.pdf>

2. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Professors Chuck Gallmeier, Cassidy Sugimoto and Marianne Wokeck, Co-Chairs of the University Faculty Council)

3. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)

(Professor Michael McRobbie, President of Indiana University)

4. Question/Comment Period (10 minutes)*

(President McRobbie and Professors Gallmeier, Sugimoto and Wokeck)

5. UFC Withdrawal of Policy on Access to Laboratories with Hazardous Materials or Laboratory Animals by Visitors (10 minutes)

(Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs John Applegate) [ACTION ITEM]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/policies/LabAccess.pdf>

<http://policies.iu.edu/policies/categories/administration-operations/public-safety-institutional-assurance/PS-EHS-02.shtml>

6. UFC Approval of New Nepotism Policy (20 minutes)
(Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs John Applegate) [ACTION ITEM]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY16/U5-2016.pdf>
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY16/NepotismAcadvUHRS.2.10.14.pdf>
7. University Transfer Policy (20 minutes)
(Executive Vice President John Applegate and Assistant Vice President for University Academic Affairs TJ Rivard) [ACTION ITEM]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY16/U6-2016.pdf>
8. IU Librarian Revisions to University Academic Policies (10 minutes)
(Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs John Applegate) [ACTION ITEM]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY16/U7-2016.pdf>
9. Update on the Grand Challenges Program (10 minutes)
(Vice President for Research Fred H. Cate) [DISCUSSION]
<http://grandchallenges.iu.edu/>
10. Sexual Misconduct Report (30 minutes)
(Emily Springston, Chief Student Welfare and Title IX Officer; Jennifer Kincaid, Chief Policy Officer) [DISCUSSION]
<http://studentwelfare.iu.edu/files/docs/Office%20of%20Student%20Welfare%20and%20Title%20IX%202014-15%20Annual%20Report.pdf>
11. New Directions in Academic Advising (30 minutes)
(Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Dennis Groth; Executive Vice Chancellor Kathy Johnson; Rebecca Torstrick Assistant Vice President for University Academic and Regional Campus Affairs) [DISCUSSION]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY16/UFCAdv.pdf>
12. Faculty 10/12-month Method of Payment Option Update (10 minutes)
(Executive Vice President John Applegate)
13. Update on the Bicentennial Strategic Plan (10 Minutes)
(Executive Vice President John Applegate) [DISCUSSION]

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MCROBBIE: Alright, why don't we get started? My apologies for running a bit late, I've just finished a speech to Rotary, actually, and it just went a little over time. So let me start welcoming you all. I think this is the first meeting we've had in this building, certainly in this

room, I believe. So welcome to this wonderful new addition to the campus, too. Let's start with agenda item one, the approval of the minutes of the last meeting. They're being distributed, so everybody's had the chance to see them. Do I have a motion for the approval please?

WOCKEK: So moved.

MCROBBIE: A second?

OPASIK: Second.

MCROBBIE: Any discussion on a motion to approve the minutes? Any corrections, comments, revisions or anything anybody wants to note? Okay. There being none, I'll put the motion to approve the minutes, all those in favor signify by saying, 'aye.' [Aye] Against, same sign. [silence] Minutes are adopted. Move to Executive Committee business, and I want to note that Cassidy Sugimoto couldn't make this meeting. Rebecca Spang is, I guess, substituting for her at this meeting here, so welcome Rebecca, too.

SPANG: Thank you.

MCROBBIE: Start with Marianne, do you have any comments that you want to make?

AGENDA ITEM 2: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

WOCKEK: Yeah, I have some brief comments. I would like to welcome you to the campus and thank the colleagues from farther away to come to IUPUI. It's a pleasure and it's nice that it's sunny in February. Since we last met in the fall, four issues of concern or requiring action have surfaced, or resurfaced, and I just very briefly will report that here. The campus is expanding its traditional age undergraduate cohort of students and has responded in part to that development by adding more campus housing. The transition from mostly commuter campus to a more residential campus is a challenge. And it occurs at a time when the enrollment in undergraduate programs that are not professionals—in professional schools—requires considerable rethinking of curriculum and instruction, because transfers from Ivy Tech are decreasing and more students complete high school with AP and college credits. Second, the diversity of faculty by category and ranks has expanded considerably and the alignment of campus policies and procedures that were designed for and focus on tenure-line faculty leave non-tenure-line, NTT faculty, out or disadvantaged and do not include some categories such as academic specialists at all. Since departments and schools have made different decisions as to how to involve all faculty types, devising campus policies and procedures is complicated and remains complicated for us. Part of the differentiation among faculty with regard to category and rank has also brought to the fore critical issues of performance evaluation. In particular, the role of revenue generation and the review and ranking of research by peers. Some of those

have resulted in grievances that the IFC has to deal with, and is dealing with, and it takes quite some time. And lastly, the restructuring of the search committee for a dean of the School of Education into a committee considering the structure of this core school has led to questions about how best to manage complex units in the IU system. It is an ongoing discussion of course, albeit one with many uncertainties and anxieties. One of our colleagues from IU East has brought to our attention, and it's something that we may want to pick up as an action item later, that the date for the UFC meeting in February would be more convenient if it were later, after elections and when the weather in April is better. So this is something that has been brought to our attention and we may want to discuss that. And I want to conclude by saying this is my last meeting as co-chair and I want to thank you for participating in UFC. Thank you.

GALLMEIER: I want to—well, first of all I want to make my comments short. I've been told that I talk a little bit too long sometimes. So I promise this will be brief. We have a full agenda. I just want to add to Marianne that I've been talked to my colleagues on the regional campuses of UFC that I would really like to see if we could make that change, so the in-person meeting would be in April because many of us come from a long distance. There are weather issues. So if we can give that some serious thought. I'd appreciate it.

MCROBBIE: Well, we should definitely look at that.

WOKECK: Mmhmm.

MCROBBIE: Yeah.

GALLMEIER: So I'm going to, of course, talk very briefly and I want to talk a little bit about what some of my colleagues have called, "academic assessment gone mad." And the question posed is; is the age of accountability—has accountability to stakeholders gotten a little bit out of hand? Now anthropologists, sociologists and social linguists have argued that language shapes our perception of reality. It really shows us what culture is and how culture changes. And I can't help but notice in the past few years we seem to be living in a sea of acronyms. They're everywhere. At all the meetings I attend—I promise you I attend a great many of them—all the agendas are chock-full of acronyms. They're every place you look. That's where they are. I often don't know what many of them mean. I was relieved to discover recently that many of my colleagues on the committees I belong to don't know what they mean either. But none of us ever ask them to be defined. We're afraid because we have the assumption that everyone knows what they mean, or they should know what they mean by now. So I can't help but feel like I spend much of my day in a giant bowl of alphabet soup. So please, if there's any way we could do this, and I know we can, instead of just having the acronym can we spell them out so that our colleagues know just what the heck we're talking about. If we could do that I'd appreciate it very much. Thank you.

MCROBBIE: Thanks, Chuck. Rebecca, do you want to go on?

SPANG: Yes. I'm Rebecca Spang. I'm president-elect of the BFC. So I will be a co-chair of the UFC next year and I'm filling in right now for Cassidy who is working with her collaborators in the Netherlands. And I just wanted to highlight a few things that the BFC has been doing. I think one of the most important things we're working on is to look at our committee structure and evaluate whether we actually have the committees necessary for a faculty governance that is responsive and fast moving. So one thing we've done is to create an International Affairs Committee, because the administration has a Vice President and a Vice Provost for International Affairs. We didn't have a committee with whom those administrators could interact directly. And it's so obvious that the university, the campus, is increasingly international, that we have contacts all over the globe, the faculty needs to have a way to make its position on international matters known as well. So we created that committee. We're looking at streamlining some of the other committees or combining them in ways to prevent duplication of labor. Some other interesting and important things that are going on; I think the most important is that on a three-pronged level the BFC—and Cassidy is really playing a very major role here as you would expect from somebody whose professional area is Library Science and Informatics—is working to develop some sort of open access policy for research, for publication. IUPUI already has one, IU does not. And so perhaps once the IUB policy is in place— and this is something that's being worked on by the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Research Affairs Committee and our Library Committee, which is basically research collections—once those committees have done their work and it's come to the full BFC and we have a policy, then with IUPUI having a policy and Bloomington having a policy it might be worth thinking about how those could be brought together to create a university-wide policy. So those are the most important things I think that are happening within the BFC right now. Thank you.

MCROBBIE: Thank you Rebecca, questions? For Marianne or Chuck or Rebecca, questions anybody? Questions?

OPASIK: [comment indistinct] Which committees did you combine together, or have you combined any together yet?

SPANG: The one that we've combined is that we had a—what we've proposed, we haven't voted on it yet—but our proposal is that we have a Student Academic Appointee Advisory Committee and a Student Advisory Committee. So, once upon a time there was a special committee created just for student academic appointees, but since the Graduate School is not a campus body, it doesn't make sense for us just to have a campus committee dealing with those sorts of issues. Moreover, that other committee—Student Affairs Committee—can just as well

cover issues of student academic appointees as student non-appointees. So we're thinking—we have proposed to the full Faculty Council that we combine those two committees.

ORME: Question?

MCROBBIE: Yes, please.

ORME: Are there significant differences between the established IUPUI open access policy and the proposed Bloomington policy?

SPANG: I haven't seen what the proposed Bloomington policy is going to be, because it's still being worked on in these three committees, so I can't speak to that.

ORME: Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM 3: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: Questions? Okay. Let's move on. I just want to comment on a couple of things [coughs] excuse me. You would have—also would have seen the announcement of the search committee for the Chief Financial Officer that's going to be chaired by Idie Kesner, the Dean of the Kelley School of Business. I consulted with Cassidy and Marianne—Chuck's actually on the committee—and put together a committee that is sort of diverse in a whole range of ways. That, I think, from memory, it's next Tuesday or Wednesday that they have their first meeting and I'm giving them their charge at that meeting and the process is going to start at that point. There are a lot of—suggested names have come in all over the place and I think there'll be a lot of interest in this position. As to a timetable, I'd hope that they could come up with a recommendation—a short list—by summer, just after or towards the end of the semester, something like that. And it'd be nice to try and make the June Board meeting. That may be optimistic. If not then, the August Board meeting for a final appointment. So that one's underway. [coughs] Excuse me, I'm losing my voice. We'll make Informatics and Computing, you're well aware, that's under search at the moment. We expect to make an announcement of a final appointment there in the next week. School of Art and Design on the Bloomington campus, that's down to process of interviews of a final group of candidates but that hasn't started yet. At then IUPUC, which is the other big search underway at the moment, that's been announced and those candidates, I believe, have been around this week on the campus. Some of you may even have been involved in interviewing those people. So that's the situation with those searches. We've in the past, and probably—well, we need to find a way maybe with the Executive Committee to get a briefing from Jeff Linder—that we've always had a point of updating people on what's happening in the legislature. So far things have been relatively quiet. I think there's been some disappointments and things that didn't get attended to, but so far nothing that we're overly concerned about has got through or looks like it's going to be passed.

We're hoping some useful administrative changes might get passed. There's a good chance that'll happen. But once the sess—I think the session is going to finish on the 11th, I think they've announced that once it's over—we should get Geoff to do a briefing at some point, at least to the executive committee, I think, on his appreciation of what happened. They're the main things I wanted to comment on and with that I'm happy to take any questions.

AGENDA ITEM 4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

Any questions people might have for me on any matter? Alright, there being none, let's move on to agenda item—well I guess I've asked for questions under both two and three, I'm assuming that unless there is anything we can just jump straight to five. Which I propose doing, so let's go to five and John is going to lead this.

AGENDA ITEM 5: UFC WITHDRAWAL OF POLICY ON ACCESS TO LABORATORIES WITH HAZARDOS MATERIALS OR LABORATORY ANIMALS BY VISITORS

APPLEGATE: Okay, this is a really brief item and Marianne you may want to just check me. I believe this is a report of action already taken by the Executive Committee...?

WOKECK: That is correct.

APPLEGATE: So it's being reported back to the full UFC. So just to describe what it is, we had not heretofore had a general comprehensive university lab safety policy. And as you might imagine lab safety is not only important in itself, but laboratories are subjected to a wide range of laws and regulations having to do with safety. So the Office of Environmental Health and Safety has been working to put together a comprehensive policy for quite some time. There were some policies in effect previously, and they included this 2006 UFC policy on lab visitors. So, obviously a safety issue. It was really subsumed by the policy that you have in front of you with the number PS-EHS-02. And so the Executive Committee simply—what's the word?

WOKECK: Affirmed that...

APPLEGATE: Yeah, affirmed that and discontinued the 2006 UFC policy. So that doesn't come as an action item. It comes as an information item. But it's basically trying to put in one place the wide range of rules that apply to lab safety. And you'll see as you look through the policy that there's a fair amount of reference to ongoing operational sets of practices, which are again intended to put in one place for the people who are responsible for labs. I should add that this was developed—the PS-EHS-02 was developed in consultation with the UFC co-chairs and with the respective research committees because of course they represent the faculty who are most involved with labs. The only other thing I'd mention is that it's part of the culture of compliance that we're trying to develop as a way first and foremost of protecting the safety of our students

and faculty and staff. But secondarily to make sure that we are being compliant with the welter of external regulations that apply to laboratories. So I'm happy to answer any questions if there are any.

WOKECK: There's one brief comment and that is that at this point given the way that those policies are being put together, it is still difficult to actually search for them if you don't know the numbers or the name and it's something that we do down the road need to change because this is the kind of policy that we need to have easy access to, even if you don't know exactly what it's called. And at this point this is simply not yet in place. So it's just a comment.

APPLEGATE: Right, and in fact we're looking at a new tool behind the policies website that will have a better search function. The current search function, you're right, is limited and I find myself—you know, there are those six categories—six or eight categories. You pick one and then you sort of scroll down the list. And some of them, you know—when that was created—we simply transferred what existed in, say, the Faculty Handbook without change. That was the idea. And some of the names of policies are, shall we say, obscure. So... any other?

MCRORBIE: John?

APPLEGATE: Yeah?

MCRORBIE: This is listed as an action item, and I assume that means we're voting to adopt the policy?

APPLEGATE: I'm not—is that necessary?

WOKECK: I don't think we have to unless that Craig corrects me on the procedures?

DETHLOFF: Just vote to withdraw the policy.

WOKECK: Pardon?

DETHLOFF: Vote to withdraw the policy.

APPLEGATE: Oh, that is an action item. Okay.

MCRORBIE: And just can you explain which—?

APPLEGATE: Sure, the policy that is being withdrawn is the one that's called "Policy on Visitor's Access to Laboratories."

MCRORBIE: It's dated March 28th—sorry, it was approved March 28th 2006.

APPLEGATE: Correct.

MCROBBIE: That's the one in front of us.

APPLEGATE: But the newer one does not need a vote.

MCROBBIE: Okay, alright. So we're going to need a motion to withdraw that policy. And a second? That's the motion in front of us to withdraw that policy. Any discussion? Yes?

PAOLILLO: I would just like to know how a "laboratory," is defined. I don't see it here.

APPLEGATE: That is a fair question and it's at the end. There's a set of definitions. "A workplace where chemical, biological, radiological, animal, or hazardous machinery are used for study or research on a non-productive... basis." "Non-productive," not suggesting that labs are not productive of valuable things, but—

WOKECK: Useless chemicals!

APPLEGATE: But, right. Not for the process of generating things for resale or whatever.

MCROBBIE: Herb, I thought you'd retired!

TERRY: David Fisher.

MCROBBIE: Oh, I see you're someone else! I'm sorry.

TERRY: I'm someone else. But I'm asking a question that goes—

MCROBBIE: Please, please.

TERRY: —back before I retired.

MCROBBIE: Please, go ahead.

TERRY: If I remember 2006 correctly, we spent some time determining that what we were ranking here was then consistent with federal policy. Do we know that this, on these matters, is consistent with federal policy?

APPLEGATE: Yes!

TERRY: Okay, fine. Great.

APPLEGATE: That is exactly—in two ways—one way is to reference federal policy and link to it. The other is, it's kind of their job to make sure that our plans are right.

TERRY: Right.

MCROBBIE: Okay, any more discussion on the motion? No discussion? Okay, I'm going to put the motion to withdraw that policy. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye.' [Aye] Against, same sign. [silence] The policy is withdrawn.

APPLEGATE: Great, thank you.

MCROBBIE: Anything else on this topic, John, or—?

APPLEGATE: No, just more policies coming down the road.

MCROBBIE: Okay, so we move to agenda item six, the new nepotism policy. And again, that's going to be led by John.

AGENDA ITEM 6 : UFC APPROVAL OF NEW NEPOTISM POLICY

APPLEGATE: Right, and this one is for action and approval. And what this policy does is really combines two, and makes some revisions to them. We currently have a nepotism policy for staff and a nepotism policy for faculty. And what we found—there's two things; one is that they're both a bit outdated and secondly, that they are not exactly the same. They're not radically different but they're not exactly the same. And nepotism issues often arise where you have a faculty member and a staff member who are the—nepotisers? —or whatever—who are the related individuals. And so having two different policies raises the question what rules apply to that and you go up and down different ones. Yeah, stop that. The different approvals. So given that there were not huge changes, or huge differences, it seemed to make most sense to have a single policy. The other reason is that federal research requirements require nepotism policies, and so we need to make sure that both are compliant with federal requirements for contracts and grants. And so having that in one place rather than two makes a lot of sense. Again, it mostly modernizes the definitions and situations where we find it. And it really tries to be as anticipatory as possible. That is, rather than try to have a set of rigid rules about who can be in the same lab or in the same department or whatever, instead to have every encouragement to develop appropriate plans to deal with the potential conflicts that may arise. So I think that both makes—creates more flexibility. It also creates more transparency. Both for the people who are the actual subjects—the people who are in the relationship, but as we know one of the—morale, if nothing else—issues with nepotism is people's observation of a relationship and whether it generates some kind of favoritism or not. So, being able to be anticipatory, to be flexible, and to be transparent about how those relationships—or those professional side of the relationships—work is a goal of it. The last thing I'll mention is just for pre-existing situations. The idea is not to go back and re-examine every relationship which this—or have new rules for every relationship, but rather to have an approved mitigation or management plan for those, again with the same goals. There's a working group put this together with both faculty and Research Administration and others—General Counsel was

represented. Marsha Gonzales, who's hiding back there, and Jenny Kincaid, who's not hiding, were on this. And I think they've come up with a policy that makes sense with, again, the appropriate flexibility to deal with situations that are perfectly appropriate but simply need to be managed appropriately.

MCROBBIE: Let's see, this then—the document, the UA-10, is for adoption?

APPLEGATE: Correct.

MCROBBIE: Right. So should have that in front of you, policy UA-10. Since this is listed as an action item, obviously, we need a motion to adopt this. Can I have such a motion please?

ORME: Yes.

MCROBBIE: And a seconder? Okay. So we have a motion in front of us to adopt this policy UA-10 on nepotism. Discussion? Yes, Herb?

TERRY: Off and on, AAUP, BFC met with the UFC, has discussed trying to get a faculty member on the Board of Trustees. We've considered approaching the legislature, see if they would create one. We've considered trying to find one who might run for the office of Alumni Trustee. How would the thing in the first column here apply if an IU faculty member or staff member were, for example—well, Cindy Stone was, actually, elected by the alumni, or somehow got a seat on the Board?

APPLEGATE: Marsha, do you want to talk about?

GONZALES: [comment indistinct]

TERRY: In your handout comparing these things. Yeah.

APPLEGATE: As it would apply to a trustee, you mean?

TERRY: We've never pursued that, but come up year after year in various governance councils.

GONZALES: Well, first of all, every relationship that we look at in trying to manage, we review it on a case by case basis. I wanted also to point out that this is consistent with our Principles of Ethical Conduct, the standard of conduct number eight which also applies to the Trustees. We looked at it, you know, this doesn't prohibit collaboration. We would look to see whether or not the nepotism definition is met, but we're trying to manage is supervision and influence over the employee from a hiring prospective, supervision/evaluation perspective. So those are some of the aspects we would look at in that particular arrangement. So...

KINCAID: This is also forward looking more, too. I think in the actual sentences, it should not be “familiar relationship with a member of the Board of Trustees... should not be recommended for employment.” So I think that—that’s just a technical measure, again an ethical measure in terms of having someone on the Board have undue influence in the recommendations for prospective employment.

GONZALES: They may have to recuse themselves from certain [comment indistinct].

TERRY: Okay. So what you’re suggesting is, if an IU employee or the spouse of an IU employee ended up on the Board it wouldn’t necessarily automatically result in the other person having to give up their appointment. It would be assessed.

GONZALES: Right, it would be.

TERRY: And I assume there are Board policies on this, too, but I don’t know what the rules are for the Trustee election, to be honest.

MCRROBBIE: Further comments from anybody. Other comments? Okay, with that I’m going to put the motion to adopt this policy. All those in favor, signify by saying ‘aye.’ [Aye] Against, same sign. [silence] The policy is adopted.

APPLEGATE: Alright. Thank you.

MCRROBBIE: John, this is a better day for you.

APPLEGATE: I am not counting any chickens. I’ve been watching the, you know, primary process as much as anyone else. [laughter] As I recall, Jeb Bush had some expectations that so far have not been met. But actually, if I might Mr. President, reverse or do eight before seven, my colleague has —

MCRROBBIE: I assume no one has any objections to doing that? Yep, that’s fine.

AGENDA ITEM 8: IU LIBRARIAN REVISIONS TO UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC POLICIES

APPLEGATE: Great, thank you very much. We’ve gone so fast that my colleague’s not yet here. So on agenda item eight, “Librarian Revisions to University Academic Policies,” these, again, will require action by the UFC. These are very purely technical changes, all required by the disbanding of having a single university-wide promotion and tenure system for libraries. There is collaboration among the regional libraries, actually, in the promotion and tenure process, but it’s not a single university-wide process. Instead, in 2012, it was devolved to the campus processes aligning the librarian P&T process with the campus, rather than with a single librarian P&T process. So, there are simply a number of changes that are needed to reflect that; the references to the IU Library Faculty Handbook and the Faculty Review Board and the university-

wide system. And I think you have the memo from Erika Dowell. She was—and I say this as a compliment—lawyer-like in her fastidious indication of where the changes are, and what’s added and what’s subtracted, though I don’t think anything’s actually added.

MCROBBIE: So this is document number U7-2016.

APPLEGATE: Right.

WOKECK: Yes.

MCROBBIE: So, anything else, John?

APPLEGATE: No.

MCROBBIE: Okay, so this is, again, this is for action to adopt those changes which are obviously pretty much drafting changes. Could I have a motion to do so please?

OPASIK: So moved.

MCROBBIE: A second?

BAICH: I second.

MCROBBIE: Any discussion on that? Discussion? Okay, there being no discussion I’ll put that motion. All those in favor? [Aye] Against? [silence] That is carried. That is, those changes are adopted.

APPLEGATE: Great, thank you. Well, my delaying tactic having failed, I will—

MCROBBIE: Fred, are you ready to perform? Are you—?

APPLEGATE: Yeah, that might be a good idea, actually. So, thank you with your indulgence.

MCROBBIE: Sorry. What was that?

APPLEGATE: If we could move to

WOKECK: Fred’s here.

APPLEGATE: Oh, Fred’s here! We could move to his agenda item.

MCROBBIE: Yeah, that’s what I was saying. Yeah.

APPLEGATE: Oh.

MCROBBIE: Fred would you like to give your update and report on the Grand Challenges program?

AGENDA ITEM 9: UPDATE ON THE GRAND CHALLENGES PROGRAM

CATE: Thank you very much. I feel like I'm talking about "non-productive" research here after hearing that phrase earlier in the meeting. It's a tremendous pleasure to be here and I really appreciate the opportunity to talk about Grand Challenges. As you know, we've launched this program, which was part of the bicentennial strategic plan, committing \$300 million dollars in new and incoming funds—existing and new funds—into funding potentially five major research projects involving hiring as many as 175 new faculty across the university. And the goal here is really twofold, although we list lots of goals, they can be summed down to these two. One is to make sure that we are having the maximum impact we can through our research in the external community so that we are making an impact on society, we're making an impact on the state, we have a different type of conversation with state funders and with foundations and with others outside of the university. And the second goal is to have this transformative impact within IU, to be hiring faculty, to be focusing our research efforts in a way to be as strategic as possible and to create the maximum impact internally as possible. Let me just quickly tell you where we are in that process now. Although you may well know, it's all public. It's all on the website, grandchallenge.iu.edu. Preliminary proposals were due in November, we received 21 proposals. They came from more than 400 faculty on 6 campuses, representing 29 schools and 37 centers. So we were very happy with this first round of Grand Challenges that the reach extended as far as it did. Out of those 21, 5 were selected for development into full proposals. I might just say a word about how that was done. There's a Faculty Review Committee which reviewed every proposal. There is a what we're calling a "Steering Committee," which is basically made up of the administrators who are funding Grand Challenges and are going to be responsible for—at the high level—for overseeing its implementation. And those recommendations all then went to the president who makes the decisions about the final commitment of funds. The five proposals that are going forward—and again, these are all on the website, in detail—the full proposals are: health equity in Indiana and beyond, one on precision medicine, one on preparing for change dealing with nature's assets, public health and human wellbeing, a fourth on knowledge science and governance for sustainable water resources and the final one on transforming environmental protection for Indiana and beyond. Now those teams are now hard at work developing full proposals, a very time consuming, and I have to say cumbersome process, in which they have received an enormous amount of support from across the university. And particularly from the various offices including the chancellor's here, who has been really instrumental in helping facilitate these research partnerships. Those will be due in late April and we hope to have decisions announced by mid-June with a goal of implementing the likely one—successful one, potentially two—by early next fall so that this

would be in many ways, by university standards, lightning speed. We would have rolled out the entire thing in one year. There will be future rounds as well. We anticipate this funding for probably five rounds, maybe four rounds of competitions. We'll, of course, learn a little something each time, hopefully get more efficient at doing it, and less burdensome to the faculty. And at the same time I think that faculty will get a better sense of what it means to think at a Grand Challenge level, to think not in terms of a single research project or a center or an initiative, but at some really remarkably transformative broad research. So let me stop there. I'm happy to answer any questions or I can talk indefinitely. I should say, the president and I were yesterday in Washington for meetings at the White House with officials at the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and the president did that briefing and did it so efficiently I'm not even clear why I was needed here today. So what is it that I could tell you that we haven't already covered? Yeah, first!

TERRY: This is, again, looking at the larger impacts of initiatives like this. Cluster hires or interdisciplinary hires or schools that hire across schools, and this sort of thing, can sometimes be problematic when it comes to promotion and tenure and those sorts of things. I guess I would say, you know, I hope as you go along, if you identify things in the policies that we have that govern those activities that may not work very well as people get engaged in Grand Challenge's initiatives and want to be rewarded for them, but to bring that to this group and to the campus involved. We have promotion and tenure policies and other policies that were not predicated on work of that nature. And I just think it would be useful if, as you encounter those, alert folks.

CATE: I very much appreciate that comment. Let me say, we are acutely aware of the difficulty of this type of very strategic hiring. And also this type of process where there's funding committed for a hire but then we base all hires currently in departments, and therefore you've got to make sure the department's in line with what's going on. One way we deal with that now is often through written agreements. And in this case we will certainly be clear when making these hires what the agreements are regarding how tenure and promotion will be handled, consistent of course with policy. But I think this process is already illuminating some ways in which we might re-visit some university policies, to be more efficient, more strategic. I've raised some of these already with the UFC co-chairs who have been incredibly receptive to that conversation and so our goal is not really to remedy those issues in this one context, but to try to identify them and resolve them for future contexts as well. Please.

WOKECK: Fred, on the other side of that, I think it's also important to remember that the system is large enough and may have people who may not have been identified at the beginning to be part of that, but to really to pull them in rather than always looking outside for

new people. So I think this gives us an opportunity to really pull people with interests that come together through the Grand Challenges in ways that we have not done before.

CATE: Yeah, I...

WOKECK: So that's the other side of Herb's comment.

CATE: It's an excellent point and in fact I would say it is the—probably the most heartwarming comment that I hear about Grand Challenges. I hear lots of not-so-heartwarming comments about budget questions and things like this, but the notion that already we are seeing new research partnerships where colleagues may have existed, sometimes in the same department, but often in the same school or just across campuses, but they never have worked together before. Now there's an incentive and a process to get them talking together. And so we regard even the ones that may not get funded through the Grand Challenge process each as their own success if they get new teams collaborating and will continue to be open as these move forward.

MCROBBIE: Yes, Jane.

FROEHLICH: Back to a not-so-heartwarming question about budget.

CATE: Alright, budget is fine.

FROEHLICH: With that many hires at one time the perpetuation of that salary for those individuals becomes a burden on that department, particularly if they have more than one individual. So have you built into this whole thing investment so that the department continues to receive the funding they need to make those hires ten years from now?

CATE: Yes.

FROELICH: Okay.

CATE: Yes, and let me just be explicit. No one's going to be asked to make a hire and given funding for some short period of time and then asked to assume the cost later. The funding for Grand Challenges in the case of faculty lines—now this isn't true for equipment or other things—will be funding that will continue for the life of that appointment.

FROELICH: Okay.

MCROBBIE: Other questions? Other questions for Fred? Alright, thanks Fred. Thank you very much, appreciate it. Alright, John your colleagues have arrived, I believe.

APPLEGATE: Yes, thank you very much.

MCROBBIE: So we move to agenda item seven, backwards.

AGENDA ITEM 7: UNIVERSITY TRANSFER POLICY

APPLEGATE: Perfect, great. Thank you. This is a set of policies that have to do with the transfer and acceptance of credit from inside and from outside. So let me start by introducing TJ Rivard, I think he's spoken here before on transfer issues, he is assistant vice president in my office and professor at IU East and the head of the University Transfer Office which is an increasingly necessary role as more and more students transfer among our campuses and particularly transfer from other institutions, community colleges and the other four-year institutions which will become relevant in a moment. And the goal of the office is to not only respond to a very heavy dose of external requirements—mostly from the state—about transferability of credit among public institutions in Indiana, but also to have a more transparent and accessible and authoritative source for the transfer requirements of the various campuses and departments. In some cases, we've been required to harmonize those, the so-called single transfer and articulation pathways. But in most cases it's simply a matter of making sure that those are available authoritatively to students and advisors in making their decisions. The policy basis of transfer really comes down to three separate policies, and they're listed at the top of this fairly thick document that you have. And they have been adopted over time for various purposes and cover, in the first case, the transfer of credit from two-year institutions which of course is very important to us. We get a lot of transfers from Ivy Tech on all of our campuses—primarily Ivy Tech—on all of our campuses. Then intercampus transfers, which again, happens increasingly. And then finally the Master Course Inventory policy which is the basic policy that assures that a course that has the same number and title in one place in the university has the same basic content across the university. The first two policies, and I will ask TJ to go into more detail about this, the first two are primarily like the other policies today, updating them, making some choices or ratifying choices, but are basically updating policies that exist in basically a reasonable form. ACA-81, the Master Course Inventory policy, is very much outdated. And it is a policy that is really—was adopted in—I have it here—in 2002, and is extremely arcane and has never been implemented because the amount of work that was required to create this inventory at other than a pretty basic level was—I mean—no one was either available or interested in doing it and so it really needs to be rethought. But it is a fundamental part of and a fundamental aspect of the university in that we offer the same degree. We're one university. And therefore having coordination among the courses that have the same number that lead to these various degrees is really important. So the idea is to create a policy that is workable so that differences and changes and disputes can be handled in an open and thoughtful way. I'll just add that there is an IU Articulation and Transfer Committee that TJ convenes that meets on a regular basis. Its beginnings really are that there is a state-wide Transfer and Articulation Committee. Some people here have had the misfortune of serving on said committee. Nasser,

I'm looking at you. And what we did a few years ago was to get the IU members of that committee together to work together to make sure that IU was speaking with a common voice and was therefore able to get the kinds of results in that committee that we felt we needed. Often those results have to do with recognizing the diversity of higher education in Indiana and recognizing the diversity of our campuses. Too often the discussion of transfer and articulation is about cookie cutter answers and, you know, one course or one model that fits everyone. That's not the strength of Indiana University and it shouldn't be. And so I think that group has had a great deal of success representing the university in that way. But that's the group that is also on a day-to-day basis literally involved with transfer and articulation issues, and so was really the appropriate place to do all of this work and it really was a lot. So TJ, with that I'll turn it over to you, if you maybe talk through each of the policies, and at least give people a sense of what the changes are.

RIVARD: Sure. Thanks. And good afternoon ,everyone. As John said my name is TJ Rivard and I'm the director of the University Transfer Office. And with that introduction I don't know that I can add anything else other than to begin to go through the policies and point out what our committee... The Articulation and Transfer Committee is made up of representation from all of the campuses and then there was a subgroup of us that came together and put together and made some recommendations on these policies. These went back to the Articulation and Transfer Committee and then with the agreement that they would come forward to UFC. So the first one—and I figure I'll just go through these in the order that you have them—in the first one, the transfer of credit from two year institutions. The basic issue there was that the title of the policy which is, "Transfer of Credit from Two Year Institutions" didn't match the actual policy. The actual policy as you can see there says, "Credits earned at undergraduate institutions other than Indiana University in courses at first or second-year levels..." So the policy implies it's any institution and the title says it's two-year institutions. So there was a discussion about which way it should really go. And so there was a group that, like, felt very strongly that it was community colleges and junior colleges that it should be aimed at them, and there were others that got into a more philosophical discussion and said if numbers on courses mean anything, then lower level courses and upper level courses should be differentiated no matter where they come from. So option one, you'll notice there specifies that particular option, to say that credit earned at an undergraduate institution other than Indiana University, it's the same policy and we just simply change the title to "Transfer of Credit Completed at the 100 & 200 Level." Now there would be an unintended consequence to that because we would have to—one of the things that my office, the University Transfer Office, did is we went through and we pulled all of the course work that is presently articulated from the 100 and 200 level to the 300 and 400 level for community colleges and there are quite a few. Which of course, it violates the policy in any sense, in which case we're going to have to go through that and figure that out with each of the campuses. However, if we were to do this for

all colleges, for all universities that transfer credit, it would be an extensive number so logistically it could become problematic in that regard. It would mean there would be a lot more course evaluations across the board, so I think that's something that this body would have to consider as you consider looking at this policy. So in a nutshell, that's what this policy—the change either needs to happen in the title or the change needs to happen in the wording of it. The second option you'll notice here—

APPLEGATE: [comment indistinct] the committee's recommending the first option, that is, to keep the current rule and just to clarify it with the different title.

RIVARD: Exactly. Yes. The second option includes the underlined wording, which says “Application to degree requirements normally fulfilled only by advanced level course credits is precluded, unless the degree-granting unit authorizes the equivalency.” And so on. There was a minority voice that said that it should be the degree-granting unit that determines whether or not a 100 or 200 level course could be counted at the 300 level. The overriding voice said that, well, they had that option anyway, because if the course comes in as undistributed the degree granting unit can apply it however they see fit. So there seemed to be a sense from the majority that that was not necessary and so would not be an option that they would recommend. Any questions about this?

TERRY: Actually it's a question about paragraph in the middle of page 11, the one that begins, “The current...” —page 2, I'm sorry—the one that begins, “The current policy works reasonably well...” Those further—it allows exceptions as needed. Where does it allow for those exceptions? Certainly the paragraph you've got here is mandatory.

RIVARD: I should say that it happens in practice more than anything else. So that if a student—so if a student—for example, criminal justice is probably a prime example of this—there's a number of 100 and 200 level courses in policing and in courts that on our campuses are at the 300 level. When a student comes in with those, and often times—especially in the regional campuses—the course is taught by the very same person and they will use the same book and the same syllabus and so on. And so what happens is that the course will come in and the receiving university—the receiving department—will say, well you won't have to retake that course, you have to take another 300 level class, but you won't have to retake that class. So they bring in that undistributed credit and waive the requirement to take that particular course. So it's really—that's probably misworded—it really should be about in terms of practice rather than...

TERRY: Exceptions.

RIVARD: Exceptions.

APPLEGATE: Or the use of undistributed credit.

RIVARD: Right.

TERRY: Okay.

WOKECK: I think I would do that. That is much clearer to make it clear that it's undistributed—comes in as undistributed credit—because otherwise it is indeed ambiguous and that makes it very clear.

MCRORBIE: Can we foreshadow that as a friendly amendment to this policy?

TERRY: Yeah.

APPLEGATE: Is it even needed, though? In other words, it's always open to bring

WOKECK: Well this is really the framing of—

APPLEGATE: Yeah, I really think it's more—

WOKECK:—the policy, so it's not part of the policy.

RIVARD: Right, it's not part of the policy.

WOKECK: It's a clarification, I think that Herb brought up, and I think it's an important one but I don't think it's part of the policy.

RIVARD: No.

MCRORBIE: Well, that's just a drafting change that you can make.

RIVARD: Yeah. Change that paragraph in the report.

MCRORBIE: Further questions for TJ?

RIVARD: Alright, moving onto the next policy, which is the Undergraduate Inter-Campus Transfers. This one does not change the intent of the policy. It's mostly changes in wording to clarify it and also to eliminate things like, "INSITE" and "IUCARE" which have not been used on any of our campuses for I don't know how long. So, it really was to kind of eliminate those things and then if you'll notice under, this is on page 8 at the top, C., this approval decisions concerning ICT applications. It's just to focus on the student applying for intercampus transfer as opposed to the transfer of the actual credit and that was a confusion that was in that particular note. The only other—if you'll notice on page, actually 8 going into 9, there is a reference to the UFC EPC committee. There was, to put this into a context, there've been a couple of courses that campuses have challenged, in other words, against another campus. So

business law was one that I most recently dealt with. There was IU Bloomington and IUPUI Kelly Schools teach business law in a particular way. The regional campuses also teach that very same course and they teach it in a particular way and so there was this discrepancy. It also ties into the MCI as well, so these two policies actually overlap with one another. So what occurred is that the A&T Committee came up with a process called the course discrepancy process and we implemented that when it came to business law. We brought faculty together from the campuses, talked about business law, ironed out the differences and now it works in terms of transfer in the way in which they dealt with it. And they had agreed finally that this is what the course should look like and everybody now uses the same course. Had they not agreed we would have gone through the remonstrance process and changed the name and number on one of those courses. So essentially what we did is we put the course discrepancy process, which is actually in the MCI policy, not in this one, in terms of defining it, and replaced the UFC EPC with that so that it was more institutionalized and could be facilitated through the UTO. The UTO does not make any decisions on that. It simply serves as a facilitating body for those kinds of discussions. Ultimately, and we'll get to this later, but ultimately that decision rests with this body here.

APPLEGATE: So again, these are basically bringing this policy up to date.

RIVARD: Right, bringing the policy up to present practices.

GALLMEIER: TJ, I hate to be a pain but, could we do something about the acronyms? Could we spell them out?

RIVARD: Sure. I live by acronyms and probably will die by them. Any other questions on that policy?

MCROBBIE: Questions for TJ on the second policy? Questions? Alright, there being none, can you move onto the third one?

RIVARD: And last but not least and perhaps the most important one is the MCI policy.

MCROBBIE: Master Course Inventory.

WOKECK: Yes, Master Course Inventory. You missed the introduction and hence you're being held to a standard that you didn't know about.

RIVARD: Well, the Master Course inventory policy which was developed in 2001 and it was primarily a process for all of the courses to go through, which some I think went through but most did not. We now have a Carmen process, which at least when a course is called forward from the Master Course Inventory that it goes out to the campuses and creates a model framework even though it's not called that in the Carmen system. It actually is a model

framework which is called for out of the Master Course Inventory policy. So what we have done is actually taken that and attempted to reword the policy so that it reflects that idea of a model framework around coursework that will allow both the calling forth from courses from the Master Course Inventory as well as hopefully a repository for things like—and there’s a list—on page 20. “A brief but informative description... nature of prerequisite qualifications... learning outcomes... standards of competency,” and so on, that in the middle of that page. That those things would be recorded in Mandy Bartley’s office and she would then—or that office—would be then the repository for all of these. So that when there was a discrepancy we would have something to access and we would be able to pull it forward and be able to then say, okay, here’s what the course—not only the course description—but actually what the model framework for that course is, and so now we have something to base our conversation on between campuses or among faculty and so on. I also want to draw your attention to the principles, which is on page 21, the “Master Course Inventory (MCI) Principles,” these are additions to the Master Course Inventory policy as it was presented. And it essentially identifies the basis behind which the Master Course Inventory was developed. So, “Identically numbered courses must be sufficiently comparable... Identically numbered courses should be treated equivalently on all campuses,” and so on. Number 3 is important, “Differences in mode of delivery are no indicative of incomparability...” Now, the interesting thing to me on that is, if you look at page 22—and this is not a change from the original Master Course Inventory—there’s a “Revisions of MCI (or Master Course Inventory) information,” says, “Substantial changes in course content, method, or requirements that may affect comparability should not be initiated on any campus, except in an experimental way, without communication with relevant units on other campuses.” So there’s a—what was meant by “method,” I don’t know, when that was developed in 2001. So, one could argue that that is something that needs to be discussed within this body in terms of differences in mode of delivery versus what a method is.

APPLEGATE: But the idea throughout this is, again, trying to balance the need for interoperability among campuses with understanding that the content of courses will differ among campuses, and indeed among instructors, and should. And so the choice of the term “framework” as what we’re working from is to try to balance those two things. And I guess I also really want to highlight what TJ said about a place to begin the conversation because these questions do come up and should, that’s natural, but do come up and there needs to be some place you can start to have that discussion and I guess I’d say the method question is another example of trying to build flexibility into it so that the Master Course Inventory doesn’t become a way that we kind of pickle thus curriculum or our teaching methods into exactly what we’re doing and really to encourage experimentation. But then with the idea that as a course method, or whatever, develops that that then needs to be propagated in a timely fashion so that we’re again maintaining those principles of interoperability.

RIVARD: Right, and I think that—and just to re-iterate—I mean the model framework is really the, I think, the key to this process. And of course courses that are already taught on the campuses which perhaps never have through this process will never go through this process unless there's a discrepancy of some sort. So that kind of eliminates that idea that we have to go through the entire catalogue of courses to make sure that there's some kind of equivalency unless there's an issue, unless an issue arises or unless a campus brings forward a course that they have not taught before so there'd be the matching course thing. And then the last thing on this particular policy is the actual course conflict resolution which the Articulation Transfer Committee uses and which I have used on occasion, Business law being an example, creative writing actually being an example which I kind of hold near and dear to my heart since that was, you know, it's my area. So we use it in that particular—and actually changed courses from both campuses because of what we're doing. So, that's that. And we wanted to get that particular piece into this policy so that it becomes—so that is it not something that's ad hoc, that it is something that is officially part of our process. Any questions?

WOKECK: Yep.

MCROBBIE: Marianne?

WOKECK: I've at least three. So one is, would you comment on the composition of the committees that are in here? For example, the UTO and the—that's the University Transfer Office—and the IU and AT&T and the, as it relates to number seven on page 13, in part I think what I want to try to get the better sense of— in some of the instances where you said that it will be in the end the UFC that needs to make decisions, my recommendation is that at least, there's at least one liaison, possibly more, from UFC on those committees because otherwise the communication might really not flow in the way that it should. So this is a suggestion as to how to compose those committees rather the structure itself.

RIVARD: Mmhmm. Mmhmm.

WOKECK: I think it is fairly unwieldy as it currently is, and of course you look at efficiency, but I think the need for knowing what is going on if then UFC somewhere at the end of a process is asked to adjudicate, it would be helpful to be part of that process.

RIVARD: And to kind of respond to that last part first, I certainly don't see any problem with having someone from UFC being a part of that. As far as the committee make up themselves it would depend. Those are not built until there's an actual issue and they're built out of the faculty who are involved.

WOKECK: Okay, I think that somewhere might be reflected as to what the composition is likely to be in that there is faculty representation, because under the acronyms you couldn't tell whether it is administrative or whether it is faculty and this needs to be clear in my view.

RIVARD: Mmhmm.

WOKECK: So that was one. And the other that I'm curious about is that we are going through review process that was necessary, and how do we build in a review process that we may need in five years or ten years? In other words, how do we know that the process as we—the three policies as we hav—ethat they indeed work the way we want them to rather than have the same process from 2002 where we never did what we said we were going to. So that is there a way we can build in some kind of general review after, I don't know, a couple of years, that indeed we're doing and that it's effective what we're doing. Any thought on that?

RIVARD: Yes. There has been—we have talked about a review proc—and it's very similar to what happens in the Core Transfer Library right now is that there's this currency review that happens with course work. I think where we had come down on this was that would—and I guess I would throw the question back out—would there be a review process necessary unless there is an issue or a problem that has been identified? And in terms of a review process, because we were also talking about this from the perspective of AP credit as well as CLEP credit and PLA credit generally in that kind of—

WOKECK: Translate those acronyms—

RIVARD: I'm sorry, I'm sorry.

WOKECK: —because there are a lot of people who do not know what you are talking about.

RIVARD: I'm not even sure I can. CLEP credit is a CLEP test, what does the acronym stand for? College Level—

BRIGGS: Equivalency something.

APPLEGATE: AP, Advanced Placement.

WOKECK: Program. Advanced placement, yes. Sorry.

RIVARD: And it essentially offers credit to students who take the CLEP exam for particular coursework. Like, for example, a lot of people CLEP out of foreign language courses. They'll take these exams for foreign language and get certain amounts of credits for French or Italian or whatever. The AP is Advanced Placement and we have talked about the possibility of doing a kind of a review on the credit that is offered for those particular exams. Now one of the reasons we haven't moved forward on that is just the time and energy and hours it would take for

faculty to do it. So we have been discussing it from the perspective of, are there ways in which we can use Box or use some other method where we can place these things up there and say if there are faculty who have an issue? We can invite faculty just to peruse it and then if they have an issue then we would have that kind of review, but just to do a blanket kind of review would be time consuming.

WOKECK: I was really looking at—not the review of the courses— but the review of what we put in place, is it working the way we want it to work?

RIVARD: Oh, oh. Personally, I think I see that as assessment of the Articulation and Transfer Committee and the University Transfer Office.

WOKECK: Okay, so there should be some reporting out mechanism that we consider. That's what I'm trying to get at in terms of efficiency and communication. And lastly what I would like to just call attention to, the Master Course Inventory is really very helpful in many of the things that you laid out. The one thing that it doesn't do as comprehensively I think as it could, or where sometimes there are some questions that remain, is that, if individual units create their programs with different kinds of requirements that the courses are the same but the requirements that they may have in different programs are different. And that is something that the Master Course List is because it is focusing on courses rather than programs just doesn't do. And that's something that I think collectively we need to think about because as we operate more as a system, especially with regard to IU Online, this has become a question and will continue to be questions and we need to be able to address them with the help of the Master Course List but in the context of curricula that are program specific. So this is just a heads-up we need to do more work.

APPLEGATE: I wonder if the thing to do is add a UFC representative to the Articulation Transfer Committee because the core of the committee, of course, are representatives, one from each campus which seems the right thing to do. But then there are a number of university—I'm looking at the first page of this—university representatives of individuals who need to be part of the conversation for more and less technical issues, but maybe that's the way to—

WOKECK: That would be one way that one could do that.

APPLEGATE: —to address it and so ask the UFC each year to designate someone to serve on that.

WOKECK: Yeah, okay.

MCROBBIE: Questions? Other questions? Yes, Herb.

TERRY: I'd actually follow up on Marianne and I hope Dennis can... If I remember right when we were trying to implement the degree map process we discovered that we had a major problem because different campuses had differing prerequisites for some courses. That some campuses didn't even offer the prerequisite that the campus that were being transferred—you're nodding—okay. Did that get resolved and is that at all relevant to this document?

GROTH: Well, the—

TORSTRICK: We're in the process of starting a process of cleaning up the prerequisites—

TERRY: Will this document work with that resolution as far as you can tell?

GROTH: It won't hurt it.

TERRY: It won't hurt it.

APPLEGATE: And remember prerequisites I think are in that list for the master—the framework, right? The framework includes prerequisites. So—

TERRY: Then I have a question as to the meaning of a word, on line 20. The first sentence in the last bulletin paragraph, what do you mean by the adjective “disciplinary” faculty? I raise that because I think, for example, you may have an introductory course in the Media School that might be actually taught by a sociologist sometimes. It might be taught by a political scientist at another time. What do you mean by that adjective? What is the practical effect of that limitation?

RIVARD: Yeah, we had a number of conversations—interesting you should bring that up—because we had a number of conversations on, you know, program faculty, disciplinary faculty, we had faculty just generally there, and it was intended to suggest that the owners of the courses are the disciplinary experts and so it was the disciplinary experts that would be able to come to a meeting and suggest that the courses are equivalent or not equivalent based on their expertise. So that's essentially what we intended there, now I see what you're saying and I'm not certain exactly how to get around that.

TERRY: That presumes all courses are every single discipline—represent a single discipline.

RIVARD: Right.

TERRY: And increasingly with Grand Challenges and Media Schools and Schools of Global International Studies and that sort of thing we're trying to break that mold. And I'd hate to see us locked into this, if that's contrary to the way much of our instruction is likely to go in the future.

RIVARD: We could say, “appropriate faculty.”

TERRY: That might be better. It’s more relevant, but the discipline no longer plays quite the role it once did.

PAOLILLO: So I wonder if the issue here is, I mean “appropriate” or “relevant,” they’re kind of ways to try to dodge what it is that we’re really getting at. And one could ask, ‘Okay, so what happens if you just remove that word?’ Now you say, ‘all faculty who teach the course,’ and that is probably not what you want if you have people who teach it irregularly. Right? So, maybe you mean “regular” faculty, you know, people who regularly teach the course or something of that nature and that maybe helps you whittle it down to a manageable set of faculty rather than maybe a, you know, any number of contingent faculty that might have been hired to teach it one some occasion.

APPLEGATE: “Regularly teach,” would seem to cover it rather nicely, I have to say.

TERRY: Rather than “disciplinary.”

WOKECK: Yeah.

MCRORBIE: So what’s the change? Is it just the change?

RIVARD: The suggested change would be when there is a—this is the way I understood it—“When there is a challenge to the equivalency of a course, all faculty that regularly teach the course will be invited to discuss the issues...”

MCRORBIE: So if we take that as a kind of foreshadowed friendly memo when we put the motion...?

RIVARD: Yes.

MCRORBIE: Okay. People are okay with that? More questions on the third policy?

WOKECK: Herb has a [comment indistinct]

TERRY: This is just a suggestion—

MCRORBIE: You’re in fine form today! [laughter]

TERRY: Yeah, I just got these! This is just a suggestion for clarity. I know that on page 23 you say you’re going to attach the April 23rd 2002 policy, but I think by and large your intent is that U6-2016 replace that policy. I can’t find anything in the policy that you intend to keep in effect, is that correct?

KINCAID: No, that's just a history section, so what we've been doing there is for archiving purposes.

TERRY: But is the intent of U6-2016 to replace the 2002 policy?

APPLEGATE: Yes.

TERRY: Okay. Then I would recommend that the second sentence in the first paragraph of the policy statement be struck. It's true that that's where that language comes from but I don't know why you want to reference a policy you have, in effect, repealed.

RIVARD: You're on page 19, yes?

TERRY: It's page 19, yeah. I'd strike the second sentence "Campuses wishing to adopt an MCI course will follow, blah, blah, blah," because you're telling them to follow something that in effect you want to repeal. So I would just strike that second sentence from that paragraph and then go ahead and attach the 2002 document for historical purposes, but you've eliminated possible confusion that you still rely on the March 2002 statement.

MCROBBIE: Any objections to that, again as a shadow friendly amendment? Anybody? Okay. Further questions? Any further questions on policy three or one or two? Anybody? Alright. TJ, how would you—this is an action item, so these have to be voted on—do you want to do them all together or do you want to do them individually? What do we—what would we be expected to do on this, Craig?

TERRY: We have to make a choice between action one and two—option one and two.

WOKECK: It has to be separate.

MCROBBIE: That's right, it has to be separate, alright.

RIVARD: I have one other question, right?

MCROBBIE: Yes, go ahead.

RIVARD: These policies when they were first brought forward went through campuses and whatnot, so I'm assuming that they would not have to go then back through the campuses again.

APPLEGATE: No, the UFC would decide—

RIVARD: —whether—

APPLEGATE: —for everybody, right.

MCROBBIE: Okay, so then let's see, you're recommending—

APPLEGATE: Option 1.

MCROBBIE: —option 1 and so the motion would be—

APPLEGATE: I move adoption of the proposed ACA-56, option 1.

MCROBBIE: Option 1, okay. Alright, sorry – second?

KRAVCHUK: Second.

MCROBBIE: Second. Thanks Bob. Alright we have a motion in front of us. Any discussion on that motion? Any discussion? Alright, there being none I'm going to put that motion first, all those in favor? [Aye] Against? [silence] That is adopted. So now we move to the policy ACA-55, anything you want to say? Can I have a motion—sorry—first to adopt that?

APPLEGATE: I move adoption of ACA-55.

MCROBBIE: And a second?

KRAVCHUK: Second.

MCROBBIE: Okay. TJ, anything you want to say on that? Anything additional?

RIVARD: Uh, no.

MCROBBIE: Any discussion on that motion? Ok, I'll put that down. All those in favor? [Aye] Against? [silence] That motion has been adopted, sorry, that policy is adopted. Move to policy ACA-81.

APPLEGATE: I move adoption of policy ACA-81, Master Course Inventory, with two changes I believe. The first is on page 19, to strike the second sentence of the policy statement.

TERRY: To be clear, the one beginning, "Campuses wishing..."

APPLEGATE: Right, "Campuses wishing..." and ending with "...which reads:" And then the second change would be, where's it hiding, on page 20 in the second solid bullet at the end of the line add the words "regularly teach" between, actually it should be "who regularly teach" the course.

RIVARD: My apology.

FROEHLICH: Yes, and omit the word "disciplinary."

APPLEGATE: Yes, and omit the word “disciplinary.”

MCROBBIE: Okay, you’re moving that, John?

APPLEGATE: Yes, I’m moving that.

MCROBBIE: —that policy—or that couple of revisions.

KRAVCHUK: Second.

MCROBBIE: Thanks Bob. Any discussion? Any final discussion on that? Okay, there being none I’ll put that motion. All those in favor? [Aye] Against? [silence] Alright, that is carried. Thank you, TJ.

RIVARD: Thank you .

MCROBBIE: Thanks everybody.

APPLEGATE: Thanks to everyone on the committee.

MCROBBIE: Yes thank you to everybody on the committee, too, for a lot of very detailed work. Alright, we, let’s see, move to agenda item 10, sexual misconduct. That’s going to be Emily Springston.

AGENDA ITEM 10: SEXUAL MISCONDUCT REPORT

SPRINGSTON: Thank you for having me. I think what you all have is in an annual report and I had some slides but I think they track pretty closely to the annual report so we can just go through those, unless you have [comment indistinct]. So I’m here to talk with you about a year ago that I was before you talking about the sexual misconduct policy that was adopted and you all asked for an update so I’d like to share with you what’s been accomplished over the past year, what are our challenges, what are we doing, and answer any questions you might have. The annual report is really the tool that we used this past year to talk about the work in the prior academic year. This report we published in the fall which puts—we really saw this as an educational tool for students who ask lots of questions, faculty and staff who ask lots of questions, parents, prospective students, so we saw this as one vehicle by which to get more transparency information out there to our campuses and others interested. We talk about the structure and purpose of the student welfare initiative. We talk about the overview of what the student process looks like, what happens when a report comes in and how that tracks. There’s a lot of information for people to understand about what that looks like when the university receives—and I’m using quotes, “a report”—and what in fact even a report entails. We also used the annual report for the first time to publish data on the number of reports coming in and then what that data looks like if they go through to an investigation and an outcome

process and I'll walk you through some of that. And then also we wanted to highlight some of the work that's been going on. There is a lot of work to be done. But there's also a lot that's been accomplished and we wanted to give a nod to what's going on on the different campuses and let people know that there is a lot of work going on. And one of the things that's not in the annual report but that I like to talk to everyone about is the work on our initiative, the work in our office—in the Student Welfare Office—which is really working with everyone on the ground on each of the campuses under this structure that we've developed, is both response to specific reports and incidents but also prevention. And both are as important as one another. We won't see this issue really improve unless we can get out in front and do education training and prevention. One of the first things that we did and you'll see it on page 5 of your report is create flow charts. We heard from our students that they wanted to understand this process better. We've put these on our websites. We use these in trainings and we pass them out on occasion. We also use them when we meet one on one with students to walk them through about processes. There's actually two flow charts in order to make it clearer. One is what happens when the university learns of an incident or potential incident of sexual misconduct. And I used quotes to say "report" because, as you know, as we broaden the scope of who a responsible employee is and who needs to report something to the university—and we rolled out significant training on that his year—all of us who are responsible employees have an obligation to report over to Title IX any knowledge of sexual misconduct or any reason to believe sexual misconduct. And again our bucket of sexual misconduct is very broad; any gender-, sex-based discrimination which includes sexual harassment, sexual assault, stalking, dating, domestic violence, sexual exploitation. So it's a big bucket of what we're talking about. What we see is—a good thing—is we see lots of reports coming in because Title IX has instructed us—this is really broad—and so if faculty member hears a student having a conversation, they reference they've experienced something over the weekend, that creates a report even though that student may not have intended or have formalized a report, that becomes a report into one of our offices. What we then do is we funnel that, whether it comes through faculty, whether it comes through IUPD, comes through Dean of Students' Office, however it comes in it gets funneled to people on each campus designated to receive those reports which are deputy Title IX coordinators as well as student conduct offices primarily on our larger campuses. We work hand in hand with those individuals as a report comes in to assess it, see what it means, what it looks like, do we have any information, and then to outreach. The outreach is back to the individual who the report came in, who may have been harmed, whether they made the initial report or not. And we try and take care in making that outreach, particularly if they didn't seek us out in the first place, to work with whoever kind of has brought it to our attention to try and smooth that communication and say we understand something may have happened to you, we're inviting you to come meet with us and engage, learn about our processes, but first and foremost it's to make sure they're okay. Because when I

say how we respond to reports, investigation and discipline is one piece of that but there's a larger response effort is making sure that student is connected to the people who can help them continue and succeed and work through some of the challenges. So that's what we try and spell out in terms of what does response look like. Who knows this? What are you doing when this information that comes in university? And we try and take real care in being transparent, helping students understand what that looks like as well as faculty and staff. If the report relates to a member of our community, so another student is accused or staff or faculty, then we look at what an investigation might need to entail. Many students do not want us to do anything with that information and then we balance that. We figure out what is it do we know, what little bit more can we figure out if the student is not engaging us and are we okay with not doing anything or can we defer to the wishes of that student and just help them—kind of help them—but not do a more formalized investigation and outcome. So with our report on page 6 what's important to know and what's hard about sharing this data is that the data includes any and all types of reports that come into us. We give account to that but we don't know when a report comes in whether that's something that the university even has jurisdiction over or whether it relates to something that happened to the student irrelevant to the university, it's just we're here to help them and deal with it. So we wanted to, and I don't know whether anyone is actually going to read all of the text, but we really wanted people to understand the different types of reports and where those go and why the numbers break down into different categories, so those that are dismissed either because it was a third party report and we looked into it and it was not something there that rose to the level of sexual misconduct or it was even mislabeled to begin with. There's also situations where we receive a report but it's anonymized so we can't do anything more and there's not enough for us to even figure out more. There are reports that come in that, as I mentioned, the person who is identified to have harmed or engaged in harassment or misconduct is not affiliated with the university. So again it's the care for on the student's side but we can't put that through a disciplinary or look at that side of it. If we can connect up, and sometimes we'd get reports of students from other schools or things like that, we certainly work through channels that are available to us to let other institutions be aware of that. There's also under the category of unknown respondents either the complainant, is what we identify as a person who may have experienced it, is unwilling to share that information with us. On occasion they don't know and again we're talking about all sorts of sexual misconduct, so whether it's harassing behavior and they're not aware of that individual's name, or assault and we do have assault situations where the students are not able to identify who has done this to them. I want to be clear in that because I occasionally hear people still reference to notion of a stranger sexual assault, and it is extremely rare that we see assault of someone dark at night jumping out of the bushes, that stereotype. When a student says that they don't know, what that traditionally looks like is in a social setting they may have met them that evening. They don't know enough to tell us about who that individual was. Sometimes we

can piece it together and get back. It's figured out. But that's an interesting term that we're discovering with our students, is what does "stranger" really mean to them? And what does it mean to us when we analyze this information? On all of these categories, the student's not limited in the time frame to come forward and seek our help and make a complaint. So if a student is not willing at the particular point, we leave the door open for them at a later point but also we explain that our ability to take certain actions may be limited or evidence may not be as available to us for those sorts of things. Other reasons for not moving forward; again, the complainant may not want to engage and we may have analyzed it and decided that's okay. We won't move forward in this situation. And then we have the cases that do move forward. So the data that I wanted to share with you is—starts on page 7. So using, for example, to start—Bloomington—we do have the highest number of reports incoming [sneeze in background] are on the Bloomington campus—bless you—followed by IUPUI. Bloomington last year had a total of 252 reports of any sort of sexual misconduct that came in through these channels. And then you can see the breakdown on that page between the different types of sexual misconduct alleged, and then those different categories that I just walked through. So you can see for sexual harassment it's a significant number, sexual assaults, which includes unwanted sexual touching to the range of completed penetration/rape. 26 of those cases moved forward through a disciplinary process. If you turn to the next page, we call this our tree chart. This is the one that the media when they ask for questions are typically looking for. It is how many cases did we have that went through a process, how many students accused, per se, what did those findings look like? To remind you, we have investigators that meet with the students, notify the accused student who is referred to as a respondent of the allegations. All parties are given the opportunity to tell their story, to identify witnesses. That gets compiled and gets handed off to a hearing panel, a three-person panel, who makes a decision as to whether there's evidence by the preponderance of standard evidence to find that the respondent is responsible for the charges or not responsible. You can see the breakdown there by the different categories. Of note, for Bloomington, the five "not responsible" —those are five cases of sexual assault. So we had 21 findings of responsibility in that category and five "not responsible." And you can see the type of sanctions that have been applied. The sanction for deferred suspension to be clear, those are not completed penetration allegations. Those are allegations of unwanted sexual touching. So there's some variation in the type of the sanctions you'll see. IUPUI follows on the next couple of pages with a total of 84 reports, similar breakdown. But I also want to bring attention—we see it on all our campuses—in fact increasingly—is the incidences of dating and domestic violence between our students and the stalking-type behavior, which is significant and particularly concerning this dating violence because we may be seeing physical violence and it is harder to judge. That is different—from my perspective—a different type of potential threat than the sexual assaults. These are individuals that are still interacting with one another and so we put some heightened triage

efforts on those cases to assess safety and also work very carefully with those individuals on their comfort levels and their safety plans to make sure that any actions the university's taking make sense for the safety concerns of those students. And sometimes we walk very carefully in terms of when we move forward versus not. And then you can see the breakdown for IUPUI cases on page 12. Similar, you can see the ranges of sanctions, similar outcomes in terms of the numbers of findings versus no findings and the no finding—I will say that one of the things over the past year that we in assessing how all this work was done and then trying to get some more co-ordination consistency across our campuses, we were not doing a good job at tracking. Luckily, IUPUI and Bloomington had a little bit more reports and experience to go on, so utilizing the simplicity tracking system has been really beneficial at IUPUI and we've got some sessions for others to learn what they're doing. We put some additional data points to be tracked on all our deputies and campuses so this is kind of the barebones tracking that we did over the past year. In years going forward we hope to have even better data—whether we'll share all of it publically will be another thing—but we're adding additional data points that we've asked everyone to track—for example, the on and off campus, the gender of all the individuals involved, their affiliation with different student organizations, things like that that we need to track better that was a little too difficult to get over this past year. So hopefully that will be better going forward. And then the pages that follow, our regionals have fewer reports and similar to our other larger campuses, many of those reports—the other individual is not also at the university—so a lot of work to help the student find and connect with community resources off campus, a lot of work with IUPD as well. But you can see the breakdowns there. This report did not break down and reflect on data on reports incoming as to staff and faculty. It wasn't the focus of this report. I know some campuses report that out separately. Following the data, unless there's questions on that I'll jump ahead, and then I—go ahead.

TERRY: The tree charts—are those categories mutually exclusive? And in other words, was there no case where both responsibility for sexual harassment and whatever were adjudicated?

SPRINGSTON: That's a great question and I hope I'm getting this correct. I knew it in the moment when we did them. I'm fairly certain because you do have charges where there will be several categories. My understanding is it's the most severe charge is the one that's reflected here. So where it's not reflected, you won't see a double counting—

TERRY: Okay.

SPRINGSTON: —you'll see it reflected in the most severe charge.

ORME: Question. How widely distributed is the report, do parents and students see it?

SPRINGSTON: It's a great question. It's up on our website, when we released it we put it out there—we put it out on the website. We talked about it. We refer people to it all the time. One

of the things we struggle with is; what is it that people are reading? What will they listen to? And we've heard feedback that is sometimes frustrating in terms of people still discovering what's online or what we've talked about. So it's out there and available, but certainly we're always taking suggestions of where we can get that out there.

ORME: Well just as a follow-up, and then the reason I ask about [clears throat] —excuse me—parents and students is that not all parents and students may understand the meaning of your categories.

SPRINGSTON: Right.

ORME: So I suggest that you might want to put definitions of those categories in the report at some point.

SPRINGSTON: We did, and—are you referring to the behavioral categories?

ORME: The pie chart categories.

SPRINGSTON: Right, the types of conducts?

ORME: Mmhmm.

SPRINGSTON: That's a great suggestion. So on our website all those things are defined. We also have something that we developed which is a top ten—this sits on our website too, but we've gotten good feedback on this so we're doing lots of printing of this for campuses, but... It includes the flow charts, it includes the key categories of conduct defined. And then this top ten policy, we made this in response to students too who asked to post the policy around, and we thought you really don't want us to post that big policy out and about, but we thought if we could condense it to the key pieces so that's another piece in the way we try to get this information out there.

ORME: It just strikes me that if I'm reading this as a parent, you know, it would be useful to me to know what the pie chart represents in terms of definitions.

SPRINGSTON: Yeah. Okay.

ORME: Thank you.

SPRINGSTON: Thank you for that. So some of the trends in responding to these cases that I wanted to share with you, we've seen over this year an increased reporting, mostly across the board. We've seen a steady increase in numbers even prior to this. This is the first year that we felt comfortable tracking and reflecting the data for all our campuses, and we're seeing an increase. We—I believe—we believe that that increase is not because of an increase in actual

incidents, but an increase in reporting. One of the ways, primarily, through responsible employee is that any time people are aware—and I thank everyone for this—is they're picking up the phone and calling us. And we talk through whether that even is a reporting obligation, too, we're often doing. So increase awareness, also of our students, we're hearing anecdotally more awareness among them of where to go, where to get help and helping one another and our online and visual messaging, but I think there's a lot of room to improve on that. In the processes we're seeing increased legal representation, primarily on the respondent's side, and that's primarily in Bloomington. And that—it slows down our process a little bit. They are—every student's entitled to an advisor and we try and create a process that's helpful for the attorneys to understand, but they often want to see that that looks like a civil or criminal process that they've been involved in. So—and every case is a little bit different—so fielding the new questions and the new challenges that come across our plate and working closely with the office of general counsel it creates some inefficiencies and every case poses something new that we didn't have come across out plate before. But as I mentioned the response is not just that investigation process and the hearing, there is so much going on in addition to that; the outreach, the resources, the coordination among the different people on campus to help that student and/or to look at safety issues and larger things and additional training. And our office is in regular consultation with each campus on that. I want to turn and talk briefly about assessment and feedback. You may know that Bloomington conducted a campus climate survey on sexual misconduct, specifically last fall—fall of 2014. The public report on that, which also sits on our website, was released this past fall in 2015. In the weeks coming starting in March each campus will be rolling out their own climate survey and we've been working very closely with the assessment individuals on each campus. It's a little team of the assessment individual, the deputy and often the key student affairs individual who have looked at the survey instrument with us. We've made tweaks. We've made it personalized so that the student receiving it is going to read it as a student at the specific campus using the language of your specific campus. We've tried hard to make that feel more personalized. And we'll start rolling that out—each campus is on a slightly different calendar—starting in March. What we did was we took the Bloomington survey that had been created by a research team and made some improvements to it. For example, that category of “stranger” that we asked students about, we tried to get a little bit more clarity in the way we asked that question to see if the data could be more helpful to us on the back end. And then in the coming year we'll be looking at the data that's come in. I share a concern, I know our campuses share the concern, about how many students are really going to engage in this survey. And so we're hopeful. We worked with social media last week to ramp up social media attention to the issue. And students will receive three email invitations over the course of the survey, hoping that they'll engage in it. Other ways that we try and get feedback from our students; we've conducted focus groups over the past year, both student and employee, through the Rape Prevention Education Grant from the Indiana

State Department of Health. One of our individuals is conducting needs assessments and basic campus action plans on each of our campuses for prevention efforts. And we're always receiving in any which way feedback from students, good and bad, that helps us inform our process. On prevention efforts, and a lot of the work over the past year was highlighted in here in terms of what each campus is doing, and primarily through funding from the grant I mentioned we've been able to hold a number of conferences—statewide conferences—and we've invited peer institutions and other community individuals as well as law enforcement. It's on a student leaders conference in the fall, students from each campus came along with some key student affairs individuals and helped on engaging students, develop them as leaders on this particular topic. We also held a conference—a statewide conference—for employees. We have three conferences coming up for the coming year for social norm prevention. One focused on non-traditional students, commuter type students, that will happen in August. We are working to continue to look at the items that we use to reach all students with the online, vended modules that we use, while also recognizing that those have their limitations and so we're looking in the coming year to assess the online module. We have a year left on the vended products. We want to look at those and see what else is out there. Some of these vendors are getting more sophisticated in understanding that you can't speak to an eighteen year old in the same way you can speak to a graduate student or an international student. So those are some of concerns that we're looking at. We are increasing our offerings of bystander intervention trainings. We recently held a "train the trainer" for all campuses to go back out and try and increase the number of individuals who can hold and conduct bystander intervention training programs. Again, those are one of the promising prevention—primary prevention—efforts is bystander education programming. We've also ramped up employee training and you may have seen or you will still see an email reminder coming to you if you haven't taken already, but we have an online module for all employees. Luckily—or thankfully—we've received good feedback on that, that it did answer questions that employees needed to know. They felt they were better informed about how to do this process. We've tried to supplement that. Some campuses, the deputies and others, are able to get to every staff and employee for additional in-person training on our larger campuses. We can do more targeted departmental training. And we also use that to address issues that come to our attention more broadly where we can do some targeted training for maybe climate and atmosphere issues. And I'll turn to prevention challenges—just briefly mention that a little bit of what I already said is we have the obligation and the need to reach and inform all our students. To engage all our students is a significant challenge let alone to reach them. So we're looking at those online modules and the orientation in those ways, but the challenge and a constant feedback of a one-size-fits-all approach does not work within our campuses and among our campus—show varied and different our students are and their frustration if they hear a certain message and it just does not feel like we're speaking to them or it's resonating with them. So that's a balance

in trying to figure out how to spend our resources, what do we still need to do in a uniform way, but what can be do more uniquely. Obviously we're competing with other educational needs and time constraints in getting in front of students and we're at the very early stages of understanding the effectiveness of prevention efforts. There's a lot of discussion out there and every day there's just lots of vended products, lots of different prevention strategies. It's almost too much, because it's just sort through it and figure out what is it that the university wants to invent some time and energy on. One thing I've seen in this co-ordination is—that is helpful—is even though we're still figuring it out, we've been able to utilize the experiences that someone on one campus has done to share that and explain how it's doable on another campus. And so there's a lot of sharing of ideas and resources and I think we're building on that momentum and we're building on the core individuals who feel and are engaged and responsible for the efforts. That's helpful. The only other thing I was going to mention is in terms of Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights, they're still undergoing the compliance review for Bloomington. Every so often we'll see a resolution agreement come out with another institution and we keep our eyes on that to see what that entails. We think we're fairly well positioned because the key items that they identify in those resolution agreements are things that we have. We have our non-discrimination policy. We have a uniform comprehensive policy. We disseminate all the policies and procedures, our student and employee training. We have kind of the baseline pieces there, conducting the climate surveys and our system for documenting and tracking complaints and reports. So we think we're in a good position to meet all of those, despite the fact that we believe OCR will find things to critique us on and find our holes, so... And with that I'll take any questions.

SPANG: Given that such a significant number of cases don't move forward—and I assume that often that's because the complainant says, "don't do anything,"—do you have a sense of whether students are more likely to move forward with a complaint against a peer or against a faculty member or an undergraduate versus a graduate student? How do those power differentials play into it?

SPRINGSTON: And these all relate to peers...

SPANG: Okay, so only peers.

SPRINGSTON: So this is what this is reflecting.

SPANG: Okay.

SPRINGSTON: Right.

SPANG: So if a student had a complaint about a faculty member—

SPRINGSTON: Yes?

SPANG: —that wouldn't go to your office at all?

SPRINGSTON: It would. It would. If it is sexual misconduct, it would be funneled the same way. The individual to investigate and respond may be a different office depending on the campus. For example, at IUPUI and Bloomington, we've got separate student conduct and affirmative action. The deputies handle it differently on the smaller. The deputy [comment indistinct] may be one and the same person, although we did add an additional investigative person in my office, too. It varies. There are—and I think that's what's important is the ability to still meet students where they're at and also address the problems where they are coming into us. We appreciate it when students or individuals come forward to express a concern which they don't like to hear that we might say that actually is not sexual harassment. It is not meeting the floor threshold, but we're glad you came because let's help you figure out how to express to the individual this is unwanted. Let's start that dialogue. Let's get this before it rises to that level. There are certainly the few cases of the student who wants the university to know something but they are extremely nervous when we're talking about faculty. Particularly, our graduate and professional schools is where we're going to see that and so that's a delicate process. And each one presents a little different and we work closely with the deputy of a particular campus. Sometimes the vice chancellor of academic affairs is involved. But that depends on what they're telling us and how adamantly they're saying, "do not use my name," and that's a Catch-22 sometimes that we're in. With the student's side of their peers, it's a whole range. In this climate survey what was fascinating was the number—it was more than 80% of students who choose not to report. When asked why, one of the most significant reasons was, "I didn't think it was serious enough." Again, that's one of those responses that—we're not even sure what that means. What do they mean by, "it wasn't serious enough?" But it is often—occasionally we hear the anecdote of "I'm just seeking help, I'm not intending to get the other person in trouble. I don't want to ruin their lives." That's a common anecdote. Sometimes we're concerned of some retaliation, things like that, and if we're aware of that we address that, too. And some students just didn't intend it to come to our attention. Some students come back a couple of months later and say, "Okay, this is important to me. I realize." And you often can hear that anecdote, individuals realizing that I didn't want to address it at the time, but in hindsight I wish I had done something more about that. So it's so personal and individualized, I think, and also what they've experienced is so varied.

ORME: Question?

MCROBBIE: Yeah, go ahead.

ORME: If I may piggyback, sort of, on that one. I did note in the report that it says, “This report does not include information reports against university employees.” Is there a parallel reporting mechanism?

SPRINGSTON: What I’ve seen is there’s not—

ORME: I don’t mean—I’m sorry—reporting mechanism within the university. I mean a public reporting—

SPRINGSTON: Public report, right.

ORME: —a parallel public reporting mechanism.

SPRINGSTON: Not consistently. Not all campuses do it. I believe IUPUI Office of Equal Opportunity does a report ,and I’m not aware of other campuses doing a report.

ORME: Okay.

MCROBBIE: Yes. Herb?

TERRY: Well, I kind of wanted to go the same direction. I was on the UFC when we required this report and I think one of the things we were looking for was not only the impact of the report —did it work or not when it came to student issues—but also the impact on faculty and, to some extent, staff. How did it intersect with protections of academic freedom and that sort of thing? So can you give us some feedback on how it worked with regard to faculty and staff?

SPRINGSTON: Yeah, we’re seeing—well, I’m seeing and again I’ve only been in the role for less than two years so it’s hard—I don’t have the—and I don’t know how well it’s been tracked by different offices. My sense is just compared to last year we’re seeing an increased number of reporting with respect to staff and faculty situations. Again some of those are those, you know, things coming in at a good level that we can address them in that way. That’s the other challenge with data and what’s considered a report versus not, what’s a formal complaint, so those are challenges. So I think we’re seeing more, and more students speaking up. We’re also seeing more externally from granting agencies and such, giving heightened attention to this and saying—I’m trying to remember the most recent one—and saying we’re going to independently look at your structures to make sure that you have procedures to address sexual harassment in these different academic areas. Is that...?

TERRY: It may be all you can do this year. You know I think the UFC’s resolution was that it would be an annual report.

WOKECK: Yeah.

TERRY: And so I'd kind of hope that down the line as you gather more feedback on how it works—

WOKECK: And I think just piggyback on that—

TERRY: —you can tell us.

WOKECK: —that one of the questions was, what's the level of preponderance and we—

TERRY: Oh yeah.

WOKECK: —in order to be sure that it is working. So we need to find a way of tracking and reporting that is mindful of that.

SPRINGSTON: And what is it on the standard of evidence other than that it is applied [comment indistinct]

TERRY: I would say the concern on this part of some of the UFC faculty was that the university's response to the non-lawful, but pressured—because they keep saying it's not the law—recommendation that it be a preponderance of evidence seemed to some to be unfair.

SPRINGSTON: Mmhmm.

TERRY: And so I think we were looking for something that said, “well, here's how that worked.” And so far all you can tell us is, “we applied it.”

SPRINGSTON: Mmhmm.

TERRY: Telling us how it worked is very difficult. You can't very well ask these panels what would your outcome have been if you'd applied the clear and convincing evidence standard. Frankly, I think this is—in the end—going to be settled by the election. It's going to be settled by the Senate or it's going to be settled by the President or it's going to be settled in another way which I want to ask you about later. It's going to be settled by court action. But if you can come up with anything that says, “here's why we think sticking with preponderance of evidence is a good thing,” —despite criticism of it—or, “here's why we don't think that's a good thing and if [comment indistinct] will change its mind we'd go someplace else.” That would be useful down the line. But I think it's probably largely out of our hands in terms of what the national standard eventually turns out to be.

SPRINGSTON: OCR just had to answer this question to the Senate hearing committee.

TERRY: They finessed an answer.

SPRINGSTON: Did you see that?

TERRY: Yes.

SPRINGSTON: Yeah, okay. I didn't know if you were aware of that. So that was an interesting read and they referred—and which I've seen them refer to before—is that in civil cases this is the standard that's applied to sexual harassment in related civil rights types complaints.

MCROBBIE: Other—yes?

KRAVCHUK: I wanted to make an observation if I might, as you might recall regarding the campus climate survey when you presented the material to the faculty council in Bloomington, the question was raised about the response rate and a couple of faculty present challenged the veracity of the results on the basis that the response rate was as I recall something like 23% or something like that.

SPRINGSTON: Whittled to 17% once—

KRAVCHUK: 17%, that's correct. In order to judge the efficacy of our efforts at prevention we're going to get back up, that's true. Because comparable data of course is going to be required over some period of time. But I would still contend that despite the low response rate, that the report was informative. There were as I recall a couple of hundred people that had reported that they had previously unreported instances of sexual harassment, and as far as I'm concerned what that particular survey did was to reveal that the problem is indeed still quite prevalent, that a couple of hundred people in this 17% reported having suffered at the hands of somebody else unwanted attention. And so it doesn't have to pass scientific muster to be informative or—for that that matter—a policy or administratively actionable standard. We're not talking about publishing it in some academic journal somewhere. We are after all talking about something that is going on in our campuses. And so I would still contend that we should try to get the response rate up so we can judge the efficacy of our efforts over time, but just because we don't doesn't mean we don't have a problem. That was quite—I'm shocked at the high level of reported numbers. I really am. It's something that struck me and I'm just beginning to wonder whether or not I should reevaluate my opinion of American manhood. Sorry, but—I'm a boy scout.

MCROBBIE: Any other questions for Emily? Questions? Yes?

PANTALONI: Is there a threshold of behavior beyond which we become less deferential to the complainant, and can you articulate what that norm or standard is?

SPRINGSTON: What we say is there are certain factors that we look for, whether we believe there is a heightened threat of safety to them or others. So, examples of those factors are

weapons, physical violence, multiple perpetrators or a repeat perpetrator—a name that has been reported before, also some tangential things, but the age of the individuals involved, minors obviously, those are the things that we’re looking for. Again when we’re talking about dating, domestic violence, that’s frankly a very hard analysis because those are often the ones that a threat of safety exists, but then we also know that—and we—none of us really are experts on handling those cases the way—so you enlist the help of people who understand what that means to move forward when physical violence is threatened.

PANTALONI: Can I ask one more question? So if you have—if in situations where the threshold exceeds, you know—

SPRINGSTON: Mmmhm.

PANTALONI: —enters into those spaces, if you don’t have the co-operation of the complainant, what—

SPRINGSTON: How? Yeah, that’s a great question.

PANTALONI: What, I mean—can witness accounts count in this or—?

SPRINGSTON: Right. So that—and frankly that’s part of our analysis is, do we have anything to go on?

PANTALONI: Okay.

SPRINGSTON: So the less we know, the less we’re able to make an informed analysis of those factors in the first place. If, however, something—and it’s rare that we have moved ahead—because another area of research that I feel is not well understood is who’s a perpetrator, who’s a potential perpetrator and what’s their likelihood of repeating that behavior. There seems to be two bodies of thought on that and we don’t have—so we’re not able to look at something and say, predict, whether that individual is going to again assault someone else. So if they’re not willing to co-operate—and we had a student pose this back to us the other day—and we thought, “we finally have a student who picked up on this.” This challenge is, if they’re not willing to engage, we don’t have much of evidence. So if there is other evidence, say they may have already given a statement to the police, and they’re just saying, “I’m done. I don’t want to keep engaging.” Sometimes they’ll allow us to move forward, and we just utilize them and they don’t have to participate, but that’s someone who’s okay with us notifying the other individual. It’s back at the stage of the individual saying, “I don’t want you to say a word about this.” And we often know very little to even know those factors which we err on the side of deferring to the individual.

MCROBBIE: I'm mindful that—while this a very important topic obviously—but I'm mindful of the time that if we stay on time we should probably wind this up soon. Any concluding questions from anyone? Herb?

TERRY: One broad question. This was a complex policy. Do you have suggestions for the UFC of things about this policy that we adopted that are not working well or should be changed?

SPRINGSTON: I would like to take a review of the policy this summer because of even little statements that may have been a little bit too concrete, or we need a little bit more room. It's not necessarily the policy, but the procedures on the student side, I think as we gain some ground and we can get some stable staffing for some of our investigators I'd like to look at the process and watching what other institutions are doing. Is our approach the most efficient and most useful and appropriate? So the ability to adjust in that area. So I'd like to look at it. I can't think of specific things to say for UFC, but I'd like to be able to engage in that process over summer.

MCROBBIE: Any other questions? Other questions for Emily? Thanks very much, Emily. Appreciate all your hard work in this very complex and difficult area and for this very important report that you put together. Okay, let's move onto agenda item 11, and I think Dennis is going to kick this off? Or Dennis and Cathy are going to kick this off together? And Becky, sorry, yes.

AGENDA ITEM 11: NEW DIRECTIONS IN ACADEMIC ADVISING

TORSTRICK: Thank you for having us here today. What we want to do is to bring you up to date about some transformations that are going to be happening on our campuses around the issue of academic advising building up to the bicentennial. So this is a sort of a long term cultural change process that we're going to be undertaking. And the first few slides in the presentation are coming from the National Survey of Student Engagement, so I want to sort of situate that for you, and you'll notice no acronyms. The survey which was, as you know, developed here at Indiana University, is a really solid national instrument now that many campuses give that looks at the student's engagement with our campuses and looks at engagement in a lot of different areas. But in terms of advising it only had a few questions on it, and so in 2013 the people at the survey decided that it was time to add a module on academic advising, assessing academic advising, and we were able to administer it on all of our campuses for the first time in 2015. So what it provides us is the opportunity to look across our campuses to see where we're at in terms of what's happening with academic advising. Now in terms of the broader Survey of Student Engagement all of our campuses have peer institutions that they benchmark against. We're not at a place yet where we can benchmark these results, because they academic advising module is an add-on module. Campuses have to choose to offer it and so it's still getting sort of picked up by campuses. So, we hope that in the future as more of our peers pick

this up and start to use it we'll actually be able to benchmark ourselves, not simply internally but also externally. And in terms of what you're looking at here is an all IU picture of what's happening with our first-year students and in many ways this is really good. We're at the quite a bit level, right, for our advisors in terms of helping students, students feel like they're being listened to, they're getting useful information, they know about deadlines, advisors have been available. And we see that when we look our seniors, they're reporting much of the same information, quite a bit of contact, being listened to, being available. Not as much about support options and some other things that as a senior they've already taken advantage of these things so it's not quite as important that advisors are going on about these things with them. And then if you look at how many times have you and an advisor discussed your interests, course selections or academic performance you'll notice that across the board pretty much students are reporting that they're seeing advisors at least two times every year, which is actually really wonderful when you think about the number of students and the number of advisors on our campuses. So that students are clearly getting in for advising at least once each semester to speak with someone face to face. Now, here is the slide that gave us some pause. And this is, how often have students been reached out to about academic progress or performance? And this slide gave us some pause because this is actually really key and essential for retention issues on all of our campuses. When students are struggling they need to be—they need that help at the point in which they need it. So being able to be proactive in terms of getting to them at the point they need it, becomes very important. And you'll see that here students are not only reporting that this happens sometimes, and so this is the metric that we want to move. And so we're taking this as a baseline and our goal is that over the next four years is we build to the—to the—

GROTH: Could I add one thing, too?

TORSTRICK: Yes.

GROTH: One thing, also, in all of our efforts that collectively as a team we often spend a lot of time talking about “at risk” students. But talking to a student about academic performance can also be about talking to students about good performance and also recognizing when students are actually—if they've had an uptick in their performance—how you can recognize that and encourage them to keep going. For many of us, our students are going to be successful and so the glass is way more than half full. So this is not only, I think, in the literature there's so much research that focuses on, in some sense, the negative cases, and we're not going to ignore those. But we're also going to focus on the positive cases as well with our interventions.

TORSTRICK: One of the things that our involvement with the Student Success Collaborative through the Education Advisory Board—one of the data pieces that I think surprised a lot of departments is that when they look at the students that are in their department that are, say,

at a 3.5 to a 4.0 grade point average, the students you don't think you have to worry about, departments were actually learning that they actually were losing some of those people, right? They were not graduating in that major at the level that they were at the university as a whole. And so Dennis is right, this is an opportunity not just simply to reach out to the students who are struggling but to reach out to all of our students and help push them higher. So the goal here is to—for the bicentennial—to get this number moved forward and so the way we're going to do that is through what we're calling an enquiry based advising model. Now all of our campuses have adopted the NACADA. NACADA's the National Academic Advising Association. And they've all adopted the—the sort of the model that advising is a form of teaching so that we have that deeply embedded on all of our campuses already. What we want them to start doing is to be inquiry minded. So we want them to pay attention to the information we know about students and about what makes students successful and to start actually using that to be proactive and targeted to what students need. So we want to begin to support student success by giving our advisors up to the moment knowledge about learning science. Things like mindset, grit. We want to develop coaching skills on our campuses and are taking steps to do that right now. And other relevant success research as it becomes available. So there's a lot of work going on nationally right now on what helps students succeed. And we want to make sure that we're bringing that into our advising experience. And I'd like to note here that in bringing this in, we're not simply bringing it in for professional advisors, but we have campuses and we have units within campuses where there's significant faculty involvement in advising, as well. And so this is actually an effort to also be sure that faculty advisors are also empowered with the information that will allow them to do a better job working with students. And then the other goal of course is to use our technology to support our advisors so that they have that space freed up, right?—to be able to be there for the student with what they need when they need it. Our advisors are all very well educated people, so in a sense what we're asking them to do is to help us research what's happening with the student experience on our campuses, to look for the patterns, to make us aware of them and then help us use them to good effect to help students. And we have really rich data at IU to utilize in doing this so we've got University Institutional Research & Reporting has been building a number of custom tableau reports, one that's highlighted here is the—what happens with students who take 15 credits a semester under the 15 to Finish initiative. The CBI, the Consolidated Business Intelligence portal has a number of Business Intelligence reports that people can look at the find out what's happening with students on their campus. The Student Success Collaborative is building in new analytics into their platform that will be available we hope within the next three to four months, so that departments will be able to see—to look at course patterning and see how that effects what's happening with students in there. And then we have things like the National Survey of Student Engagement, so a lot of really rich data. And we're beginning to try to figure out how to pull this together in ways that advisors and that others—and we see also a role here for faculty, for

department chairs, deans—I mean this is data that we believe can really be put to a lot of really good uses. So I'm going to now turn it over. So that's sort of the background and the intent and I'm going to turn it over to Dennis to talk about the tools.

GROTH: Okay, so we have been quite busy for actually more than two years now in developing a range of tools, and what we really refer to as an eco-system of intervention strategies energized by the technology so that students, faculty, advisors are aware of what's going on. And at the heart of all of our tools is a philosophy—and a change in philosophy—and a behavior change we want to have for our students and that is for them to become more planful—for them to be forward looking and not rearward looking. We already know what they did. What we want students to articulate is a plan moving forward and the longer they can articulate the plan the more that we have the opportunity to utilize their plan and help them make sure that they have a good plan. And we can get in advance for students that might be missing something and see what they're missing. For students that are not missing something, we can see opportunities to connect with their planning with other opportunities and experiences on campus. Right now the history has been—and this is really nationally—often the discussion is with advisors is what do you want to do in your career, but okay, then it quickly narrows down to what classes am I taking next semester? To us that's the least interesting conversation to have. We have tools in place to help students know what classes they need to take—but create a plan. Even, I would say—claim a bad plan is something we can work with. The empty piece of paper is really unacceptable moving forward. And this is one tool that we have, the Interactive Graduation Planning System or the IGPS. And the metaphor here is just like the GPS in your car. You want to set a destination, in this case our destination is graduation, and we want then to create a path from where you are today to where you are moving forward here. We can see different classes that the student has taken or has planned in these particular semesters, and this plan is completely extensible. There's no limit to the number of years, of course. Once you get too far, once you get beyond four years, students get, you know, they've crossed the line and we know now, hey, do you realize your past expected graduation time? Or, even, do we realize that your plan puts you past expected graduation time? And why is that and how can we help accommodate your interests in our undergraduate program? We also are working on ways to— again driving on this planfulness—this is what we call our “aspirational resume.” The idea is for incoming students, not to put them in a class to learn how to construct a resume, because there are thousands of example resumes that somebody can pull down, but really to create an aspirational résumé. What do you want your résumé to look like at the time you graduate? This isn't, what do you want to be after you graduate? That's a different tool that we'll work on to help visioning there, but here this creates a roadmap in advance and students will fill this out before they come for orientation. On this aspiration résumé includes information about the high impact experience that the students expect to do; when will they do an overseas study? And what country? What kind of leadership opportunities are they interested in? What kind of

internship? All of that information will flow back from a data standpoint. We'll be able to reach out to students then and notice that, Herb, you thought you would be interested in going to China next summer, and there's an information session coming up. And so it's this contribution of information that students can give us that we can then start leveraging back to help give them a more positive and impactful experience. This is fully integrated with our advising systems so when a student does this and actually you yourselves can do an aspirational résumé. If you're a student, and if you have a student record out there and you submit it, it will go to advising records but you can go save drafts. And this is the idea, this is a reflective piece. We can go back, this is pedagogical, we can go back and see to the student, we notice that you didn't mark any high impact experiences, did you not see that we said this is an expectation? Not a hope, an expectation, that you will look at these in terms of your undergraduate experience. We also have the Fostering Learning and Graduation Success system, and this is at the point where students—faculty and the students in their class are able to identify are students attending, are they not attending, are they performing well, are there performance concerns? And this provides input to a range of activations. Advisors can be informed about what's going on and we have a lot of work going on in this area.

TORSTRICK: And it has positives.

GROTH: Yep, and it has positives as well. And then...

TORSTRICK: Want me to take this one?

GROTH: Well, I can say this and then I'll it turn over to Kathy when we get the Simplicity. In addition to this, we have our—so we've been looking at some of the academic tools. Across the IU system there are also tools in place to capture and organize the co-curricular activities for our students and CollegiateLink is one of these. So through this, their engagement in leadership, their engagement in different student organizations, and key co-curricular experiences is chronicled here. And it's available for all students on all campuses. Now I'm going to turn over to Kathy to talk about some of our career—

TORSTRICK: And one additional piece about CollegiateLink is, it would be a mistake to think that this is simply something to use for student organizations. Academic departments can actually create a space within CollegiateLink for their department and then begin to identify an experience that they want their majors to have outside of academic programming as they go through the university, and the student can then track it and create a co-curricular transcript. So there's actually the ability to create sort of a learning curriculum within CollegiateLink.

JOHNSON: Okay, so shifting gears just a little bit, I wanted to talk a little bit about career advising and the intentional integration that I think is really the hallmark of our new approach to academic advising. We really think that there's an integration that needs to happen really

from day one through to graduation, and that entails close partnerships between academic and career advisors and integration of the systems that they use. So we remain completely devoted to helping students to take full advantage of their time on their campuses to prepare for graduate schools or for professions. And here are little snapshots of some of the tools that we're using to help advisors accommodate students in meeting these goals. The Student Success Dashboard that Dennis showed a little bit earlier has actually been integrated by the Educational Advisory Board with something called Burning Glass Technologies. And it basically gives academic advisors access to career information that's aligned with majors that the student is interested in pursuing and it gives them regionally specific information about job opportunities, starting salaries as well as foundational skills and competencies that are important for that career. This ordinarily would be information that academic advisors would not be able to access very quickly or readily and it's really, I think, an advantageous tool for students to have access to as well. On the left hand side is a snapshot from our Simplicity platform which has a very ironic name. It's not that simple to set up, but once it is set up it does do a wonderful job of helping to connect students with internships as well as part time jobs on campus and as they approach graduation of course, they can use this to also search for opportunities for employment. On the IUPUI campus we've also been piloting this year a partnership with Indiana Internet which is a statewide database of internship opportunities and we've been able to accomplish a data feed into Simplicity that gives 47,000 students that are in our multi-school environment access to these positions. And we're hoping to learn from this and make this available to other campuses that might be interested in using it as well. We also continue on with our EDGE initiative, which is another acronym. EDGE stands for Exploration Development Graduation and Employment, which really provides a nice holistic approach to helping students to think about career preparation, again from when they attend orientation as freshman, hopefully through to graduation and employment. This is a snapshot from some marketing materials that we've been using to get the word out about an annual conference that will be in its third year this year. That's involved both academic and career professionals from around the IU system. I think this conference has been very beneficial, both for helping us to continuously apprise these professionals of upcoming opportunities and new technologies, but even perhaps more importantly, it's been great for them to be able to network with each other and share information and best practices about their work. And this has been also part of an initiative aimed at developing online modules to help to augment student's preparation for careers. These are modules that have been developed by faculty as well as career professionals. In fact, Becky and I have taken a spin at developing some content for these. It's been a very fun project. The goal is to end up at the end of five years with twelve modules. These are being funded through a grant from the Lilly Endowment. And the purpose of them is to be able to use them flexibly across a number of different contexts. We can use them in first year seminars. We can use them in career courses as well as capstones. We can also assign them in advance of

students coming to meet with a career advisor, for example. I know that some of my colleagues have said that if they have to teach another student the mechanics of developing a résumé, they'll lose their mind. So you can actually direct students instead to this module. They can take a first crack at developing a résumé and then they can provide feedback and hopefully use their time more effectively. We now have five of these up and running. We had a pilot in the fall semester with just over thirty faculty and staff using these in various courses. We're in the process of harvesting the data and the feedback that they've provided so that we can continuously improve these. And I know Becky has been involved in the next generation of module development. I've been told that by the fall we'll have eight that are up and running. These are wonderful opportunities. If you know of faculty, we're still looking for folks to pilot these, even in the spring semester. I know as a person who teaches a capstone and knows nothing about writing a résumé I would have loved to have access to these. So please do spread the word, we would love to continue to have people piloting these and giving us feedback on them. And I think we're ready for questions.

MCROBBIE: Questions? Questions, anybody? Yes?

KAUFFMAN: [comment indistinct] you talked about trying to increase the number of touches [comment indistinct]. Is that based on data? Is there a correlation between—I assume there would be—how many times the advisors are seeing those students—juniors and seniors—and the rate of graduation? Is that what we're finding?

TORSTRICK: We know that if students—we know from some national research that's been done that the more that we can touch students and connect them to the campus—so there's been research done about developing students' sense of belonging, the fact that nudges can make difference. Sometimes that's all a student needs in order to stay focused and be able to be successful. So our sense is that the more that we can get advisors connecting with students, that we will in fact see benefit from that. Now I'm not going to say that it will be, sort of, a huge rosy picture because Indiana University is a very diverse university, and we have students at Bloomington who with very little pushing will graduate. And then I've seen the data from the regional campuses about the kinds of hurdles that our students are up against. I do believe that, and with advisors being able to connect with students better, what will happen is we will gain a much richer, deeper understanding of the obstacles that are there in front of our students which then allows us to act to help them overcome them. So I think that sometimes at the regional campuses we're sometimes working in a mode where we're not really quite sure what's the obstacle or what's the critical response. And so I do believe that by having advisors interacting with students on a more frequent basis we are going to collect better data.

MCROBBIE: Yes, Herb?

TERRY: I want to make a report in a sense. I was your representative, the UFC representative, for a year or more of the group that had to respond to the legislative mandate that we create degree maps which obviously had to be integrated with all of this. And what I want to tell you folks is that the faculty were concerned that the wishes of some in the General Assembly and some in ICHE that these requirements would lead to a simplification of our degree requirements and just sort of a one-size-fits-all path to a quick four-year degree were resisted by the members of this group, not just the faculty, but by the administration and others. Between the work of Kathy and Dennis and especially Becky, really was the coordinator of all of our efforts, we met the legislative mandate. Not exactly completely, but we sure came awful close, and were faithful to the things that set, not only Indiana University apart from other institutions in the state, but set the various components of the university which have different functions and different missions, different traditions, preserved much of that. If you haven't figured this out, where we're going is where we will have a great deal of big data on students and their choices and their behaviors and their backgrounds and in an era of big data where I hope ultimately where all of this will lead is that both through in-person advising and through automated systems, we'll end up with pretty well tailored advice to individuals that in a nice way will be preemptive. We'll figure out what we should tell them before they get in trouble rather than once they are and are off-track to graduation. And I just wanted you all to know that from my perspective as your representative on that one small part of this whole process, you have a very good team pulling this together, people who have worked very hard and been very easy to consult with in terms of the interests of faculty.

GROTH: Thank you.

TORSTRICK: Thanks, Herb.

GROTH: Thanks Herb, very much. I would say you're exactly spot-on in terms of what we—first, in terms of the greatness of our team but then secondly, in terms of the ability to provide information and in the era of big data. So we're not really adding that many more advisors around the campus, so we have to work smarter. And that smartness comes from information at the right time in the right context so that we're not sending out blanket messages to everybody but focused messaged to just those students that will make the biggest difference.

MCROBBIE: Questions? Yes, Jan?

FROEHLICH: [comment indistinct] professional students have to take national entrance exams, the DAT for the dental school and MCAT for medical school, what I've found often times is that they don't understand when those exams are given early enough in—sometimes they don't know where they're going to go—but often times they do, but even if you do, they don't understand when the exams is given and how much information they're going to have to have

taken to be able to do well on those exams. So they find themselves with a dead year, a year between their graduation and when they're going to start a professional school simply because they had to push back when they took MCATS, because they didn't have the courses under their belt to be able to take it at the time that they should have. So I had one of my students put together a flow chart for students that are coming in with a science background and for those non-science. It's surprising how many art people end up in medical school, for instance. So we have two flow charts now of what should be taken in what years to be able to take the last chance at your MCAT before you go to medical school and not have a dead year. So if that would be helpful to you, I'll send it over.

TORSTRICK: It would absolutely be helpful because one of the modules we're going to be working on for EDGE—Career EDGE—for the summer is how to get into graduate school and professional schools.

FROELICH: [comment indistinct]

TORSTRICK: Well, no, but professional school.

FROELICH: Only because the timelines are pushed back.

TORSTRICK: Yeah.

GROTH: But we also the degree map capability and milestone so we can create the degree map exactly for this case precisely.

MCROBBIE: Other questions? Other questions? Alright. Thanks very much.

TORSTRICK: Thank you.

GROTH: Thank you very much

MCROBBIE: Thanks, all. Alright, John, agenda item 12.

AGENDA ITEM 12: FACULTY 10/12-MONTH METHOD OF PAYMENT OPTION

APPLEGATE: Okay, very quickly. This is just an update on the ten over twelve method of payment. I have this from the office of the CFO. The self-service tool that will be available through OneStart is... no, not OneStart, One.IU, sorry, called Paycheck Modeler should be going live at the end of March. And what it does is allows faculty members—or I guess anyone on a ten-month salary—to model using their own actual payroll information, what it would look like to have that paid over twelve months as opposed to ten—what would be the tax consequences and so on. And then to use what's called the savings tool, which is part of that, to link directly to your direct deposit information. So if what you want to do is to take the modeled information

that says this is what you would need to save out of each paycheck, and put it in a savings account so that then in July and August you could draw on that instead of having two months where there was simply not a paycheck coming in, you can do that. So it is not the same as having the university in effect do that by paying ten months over twelve months. It allows you to do it yourself in a couple of steps, first modeling it and then directing it to direct deposit. And that should be available at the end of March. It's been pilot tested with about forty faculty and staff members to try to make sure it works and is user friendly. They're probably going to do a soft launch, as they say, to make sure that in drawing this information it does not somehow interfere with the payroll system itself, because we definitely don't want to interfere with the payroll system itself. But once that's stabilized there will be a much broader launch. So that's where that stands.

OPASIK: The way you described it, it sounds like taxes and let's say any other health insurance payments would be taken care of before the money's then directed to the savings?

APPLEGATE: No, it's just a model. In other words it allows you to hypothesize what it would look like in your particular situation given how many deductions and all of that stuff that you take. And you can use that information either for information to put money away or not, or you can then go to the savings tool which allows you to deposit a certain amount—the amount indicated by the modeling tool—into your own savings account which you could then draw from in the lean months of the ten-month salary structure. One of the complications here is that we've moved from PeopleSoft 9.1 to 9.2. That creates both some of the complication in getting this tool to work—it does provide some further opportunity to pay ten over twelve, but as we've discussed before, there are a lot of compliance, tax, contracts and grants issues with simply paying ten over twelve, that would still need to be resolved.

MCRORBIE: Bob?

KRAVCHUK: John, I have two questions.

APPLEGATE: Sure.

KRAVCHUK: And one is, would this be an annual election that somebody could decide they wanted to do this maybe once a year in advance of the start of the academic year?

APPLEGATE: Since it's simply a modeling and savings tool you could do it any time you want.

KRAVCHUK: In terms of actually making the election to go to twelve months, is this—?

APPLEGATE: No, there's no election. This avoids any election. You're still paid over ten months. It allows you to do your own savings in advance.

KRAVCHUK: Oh, I see what you're saying. Rather than switch it over to a true twelve month program—

FROEHLICH: It's budgeting.

APPLEGATE: Correct. Correct.

KRAVCHUK: [comment indistinct] put some money away. Oh, that [comment indistinct] Thank you.

MCROBBIE: Yes, Marianne?

WOKECK: If I may, I do want to go on record though that the goal remains to make it available as a tool for everybody—not as a self-service tool—but as one that you have the option to either have ten month paid out over twelve as other universities do. So that remains the goal. This is an interim. So I just want to—

KRAVCHUK: [comment indistinct] the ultimate goal then, sorry, the ultimate—this gets to my second question—which is the ultimate goal is if you move your—there has been some development work which has come at some expense. With interest rates expected to rise sometime [comment indistinct] gets around to [comment indistinct] quantitative easing, I wonder if the university might be able to sort of pay for this ex post facto through some interest earnings on the cash flow.

APPLEGATE: The interest earnings on the cash fund is an interesting question because it creates, I gather, some of the tax issues you have and some of the fair labor standards issues you have. That is, even though it's elective there is some, at least possibility, that it would be the university taking somebody's money because you're paying people over a longer period of time and then taking the interest on it. This is the reason some faculty members choose not to get paid over twelve months. They would rather have the money themselves.

KRAVCHUK: I mean it's going to happen anyway. And if you had a twelve month program, it comes out of a general fund, no CFO worth their salt is going to let a single dollar sit around without investing it even overnight, so you are going to have some return on it.

APPLEGATE: Oh, there absolutely will be. And that's why I say that it cuts both ways. In other words, clearly the university if it accumulated this over a work force, would be paying out over a longer period of time so accumulating money and getting interest on it.

KRAVCHUK: The money that would be invested overnight would be pretty substantial.

APPLEGATE: Oh it absolutely would be, and so the concern would be, is it fair for the university to accumulate that interest on money that is—

KRAVCHUK: Well, faculty could always elect to increase their—

WOKECK: But that's an opt-in—that's why they opt in.

APPLEGATE: Right. And people have different views on that subject. Yes, I agree.

KRAVCHUK: Thank you.

MCROBBIE: Other questions on this topic for John? Other questions? Alright, let's jump to the final agenda item 13.

AGENDA ITEM 13: UPDATE ON THE BICENTENNIAL STRATEGIC PLAN

APPLEGATE: And I'll just make this really quick. In the spirit of saving trees we have the report that was given to the Trustees earlier in the month of the various actions taken under the strategic plan. It is a fairly lengthy report. It's on the UFC website. Right, Craig?

DETHLOFF: It will be this afternoon.

APPLEGATE: It will be this afternoon as a .pdf document. Rather than having a reading, and going on 'til about nine o'clock, of all of these things, I'll just say that there are substantial actions under every single one of the action items. They are from across the university. It's really amazing how much has happened just in calendar year 2015 in pursuit of the bicentennial strategic plan and so I certainly encourage you to peruse it at your leisure.

MCROBBIE: Alright, thank you John and with that we are adjourned. Thank you.

GALLMEIER: Could I just add one more thing?

MCROBBIE: Yes, yes.

GALLMEIER: Like Marianne, this is my last time serving as the University Faculty Council co-Chair from the Regional Faculty Caucus. I want to thank all of you for making me feel welcome. I especially want to thank my colleagues from the Regional Faculty Caucus for giving me the honor to serve in this new role for the first time. This is also my last University Faculty Council meeting since I'm also stepping down as president of the faculty organization at IU Northwest after eight years. It's been a long run. It's been an honor to serve. Thank you all very much for making me feel welcome.

APPLEGATE: Thank you, Chuck.

MCROBBIE: Thank you, Chuck.