

**Transcript
BFC Meeting
March 4, 2025**

[Shrivastav]

Good afternoon, everyone. I am advised we have quorum, so let's get this meeting started. Today is March 4th. Welcome to this meeting of the Bloomington Faculty Council. As we always do, I would begin with the approval of minutes from our last meeting, which was February 11th, so if somebody who's read it and is willing to get that started? Alex is the first to support a motion to approve the meeting minutes and we have John saying, seconding it. All in favor of approving the minutes as written please raise your hands. Looks pretty unanimous to me. Thank you. As we always do, we have a memorial resolution for our former colleague, Lucy Cherbas. Jessica Lester is presenting it. I know Vice Provost Docherty is here but is fighting a bad throat, so she's resting her voice a little bit, so Jessica, if you're here, please.

[Lester]

Thank you. Lucy Cherbas, a senior research scientist in the Department of Biology, Indiana University Bloomington, passed away after a long illness on October 10, 2022. Lucy retired in June 2016 after 31 years of service. She obtained her B.A. in biology from Swarthmore College in 1964. During undergraduate summers, Lucy worked at Case Western with Howard Schneiderman and Drew Schwartz; her first paper with Drew concerned a maize protein analyzed by electrophoresis. Howard recognized Lucy's talents and recommended that she apply to Harvard for graduate work and pointed her toward the laboratory of Carroll Williams, a renowned expert in insect physiology and hormones.

Lucy's graduate work was partly focused on the insect molting hormone ecdysone and partly on the injury activation of insect blood cells called hemocytes. As a graduate student, Lucy's duties included teaching in developmental biology. In that capacity, she met her future husband Peter whom she characterized as her "star student." It was at that time that Lucy introduced Peter to ecdysone and, a few years later, he introduced her to tissue culture cells.

After obtaining her Ph.D., she studied briefly as a postdoc at Harvard with Fotis Kafatos on RNA-polymerases. Subsequently, she and Peter migrated to the University of Cambridge where she worked with R. J. Jackson and Tim Hunt on hemoglobin synthesis. It was during their stint in the UK that their daughter Kathy was born. On their return to the United States, Lucy worked with Irving M. London at MIT and published two important papers on the regulation of hemoglobin synthesis.

During her time at MIT, Peter was setting up his lab at Harvard as a newly minted assistant professor and Lucy proposed that she join his lab and that they combine their scientific efforts and collaborate. She made this decision despite the strongly worded reservations of their colleague Ruth Hubbard, George Wald's wife and collaborator. Ruth warned Lucy that this kind of professional/personal relationship usually does not work out because all husbands eventually become intolerable pains in the neck. While Ruth's characterization may be generally correct, in the case of Lucy and Peter, the collaboration flourished and as a team they were enormously productive. Their collaboration focused on determining the underlying action of steroid hormones, particularly ecdysone, using *Drosophila* tissue culture cells as a model. Together, they developed tools and culture conditions for these cells, as well as developing protocols that are in common use by the scientific community. Lucy's expertise was first

recognized during her tenure at Harvard where she was sought for advice on cloning, cell culture techniques and DNA sequencing.

In 1985, Lucy and Peter moved to IU and continued their research, working with cell lines and their interest in hormonal regulation of gene expression. Lucy is author or co-author of many key articles on cell methods. She participated in the founding of the Drosophila Genomic Resource Center (DGRC) and, using her expertise, built up a unique and extremely valuable collection of 135 diverse cell lines. She was also instrumental in publicizing these materials and maintaining this widely used resource for the research community. When someone needed expert scientific advice on tissue culture, they invariably came to the DGRC and Lucy for help.

In addition to her research and the DGRC, Lucy was also intimately involved in the modENCODE project. One part of this community-wide effort was designed to completely define all transcribed (expressed) genes in the Drosophila genome. The source material for this analysis included tissue culture cells and again Lucy's expertise came to the fore. She selected 25 different cell lines from diverse tissue types, supervised the growth of the cells, the collection of RNAs, and participated in the analyses of the resultant data. The results of this monumental effort were made available to the community and informed us in fine detail of the genetic expression pattern of this model organism.

Lucy and Peter decided to move to IU because it offered excellence in genetics for them and excellence in music for their then 11-year-old cellist daughter Kathy. Kathy flourished and is now a successful freelance cellist in New York. What many don't know about Lucy is that, in addition to her scientific prowess, she was also a professional vocal accompanist. She accompanied classes and recital students at the Longy School and later recitals in England. With the pressure of both work and raising a young child, this part of her life had unfortunately gradually disappeared. However, it did resurface here at IU. Lucy attended a pre-college cello master class given by Janos Starker, intending to accompany Kathy. Unfortunately, time ran out before Kathy had a chance to play. Instead, she found herself sight-reading an accompaniment for one of Kathy's friends, whose accompanist had to leave for a class. Before the class ended, she found herself accompanying Starker in front of an audience full of professional musicians. She lived to tell the tale.

I will close this remembrance with a quote from Lucy. I do this because it really provides the reader with insight into Lucy as well as highlights that things are hopefully changing for the better.

"When I entered graduate school, women were a small minority of my class at Harvard and there were no women on the biology faculty; female graduate students were expected to perform special duties like making cookies for the lab and taking on research projects suitable for our gender and were the subject of frequent verbal slights. I am delighted that as I retire, things have changed: The emeritus faculty in IU's biology department are 95% male (not so different from that of Harvard when I was a graduate student), but the current tenure-track faculty here is almost 1/3 female, and since graduate school, I cannot recall ever being singled out to make cookies for my colleagues. I was never active as a feminist, but I very much appreciate the change in climate."

[Shrivastav]

Thank you, Jessica. If you're able, please stand for a moment to silence. Thank you. Next on our agenda, I invite faculty President Danielle DeSawal to give her remarks. Danielle?

[DeSawal]

Great, thank you. Good afternoon. It's hard to believe that it is already the beginning of March. I have a few things to cover. First, I wanted to follow up with the action of the council from our last meeting to expedite the request for the Constitution Rules Committee, CARC, to look at the proposal to add a new business section to the BFC agenda. CARC has been meeting, and we anticipate that we should see that proposal on the March 25th agenda for discussion and then on the April 8th agenda for a vote. A request did emerge from CARC to see about doing a "test run" of new business on the agenda. The BFC Executive Committee discussed the request and determined that rather than new business we would add an extended question and comment period to the agenda. As you may have noted noticed on the agenda, we have extended the question and comment period by an additional 10 minutes.

During this time, we'll be limiting participation by the members to two minutes to provide the opportunity for as many members to engage as possible. Our secretary will serve as our timekeeper. Thank you in advance, Dana, and that will be following the remarks by the provost. All of our colleagues across campus should have received an email requesting nominations and self-nominations for the 2025-2027 BFC. As you may remember, we pass the changes to the bylaws to now include nominations of colleagues to participate in this process. Please take time to nominate a colleague. The nomination form will close on Friday, March 14th at 5:00 PM. I am also thrilled to announce our BFC President-Elect candidates. This year we will have three candidates, and they include Chase McCoy from Luddy School of Informatics, Heather Akou from Eskenazi School of Art Architecture + Design, and Dana Anderson from the College of Arts and Sciences. Congratulations to our three amazing colleagues.

Next, it seems that a lot of misinformation has been circulating in the last week about the changes to UA08, which is the policy on policies now titled Policy Development Revision and Retirement that was approved by the IU Board of Trustees. While it was the intent to discuss this further at the March 25th meeting, I did want to address some of the misinformation. First, this is not an academic policy and the responsible office, and the responsible administrator is the Board of Trustees. Second, this is a university level policy and third, this policy applies to all university policies. As was shared at UFC multiple times in the fall, and as I shared with the BFC and our policy council chairs, a task force was formed to look at the overall policy framework at Indiana University. Again, this is at the university level. The policy framework that was approved includes new language for UA08, a glossary of terms and a policy approval map.

The piece that seems to be getting the most attention at this point is the membership of the Policy Executive Committee. This committee replaces the former policy advisory committee, which was only described in previous policy as "a standing committee of university administrators". In the revised UA08, you'll see a more clearly defined set of who are the university administrators, and you will also see that the three university faculty council co-chairs are also included in this membership as voting members. The UFC co-chairs were not included in the previous pack. This is a critical change as it provides faculty multiple seats at the table at both the policy proposal step and the final policy approval step. This will increase our understanding of what policies are being revised, reviewed at the university, whether that be a research policy, human resource policy, financial policy, etcetera. As faculty, we have not been given that level of transparency in the past. Academic policies are approximately 26% of all the university level policies. These are the policies that UFC has faculty legislative authority. The remainder of the policies are owned by other units at the university. The policy approval map outlines the process and specifically notes that academic policy requires a UFC vote. A couple of pieces I want to focus on with relation to understanding the changes and also articulate that faculty governance continues to exist for policies with faculty legislative authority. The process for the development of an academic policy continues to reside with the UFC, including the role of UFC standing committees to engage in the development revision work and the role of the UFC to vote to approve any policy changes. What has not changed is that we have always had a policy office and we have had to ensure that any policy that was

passed by the UFC did not conflict with current university policies or practices. Essentially, we have always had to consult with administration to be sure that what we were passing in our academic policies is feasible.

What has changed is an emphasis around transparency and more, not less, faculty engagement. If you go to the university policies website, policies.iu.edu, you will see a new layout that emphasizes these pieces. You will see the following: a policy index now organized by area of emphasis and three new sections that include: most viewed, so if you're super curious about who is looking at our policies, you can find it there, new and recently revised. You will find a list of the policies that have been reviewed, updated, and the date as well as the responsible office, and you will find a third section under review, an easily accessible space for the community to see any policy that is open for the 10-business day review and provides three mechanisms for individuals to comment. These changes provide more transparency to where we are with any policy at the university, not just academic policies.

Again, approximately 26% are academic. The remainder of the policies are other units. This will allow our community to comment on any proposed policy that may be coming from a UA unit and would impact our campus negatively. Faculty governance at the university level will now have a voice to all non-academic policies that are being proposed and finalized. Again, we will discuss this further at the March 25th meeting, including the question that was submitted about what are IUB's plans for requiring a campus policy committee. And once again, I have a delicate situation to address this time. It's about how we engage in shared governance with our students who both sit on our standing committees and as voting members of the BFC. It has come to my attention that students who have engaged in this work with us have been approached by BFC members in a way that made them feel intimidated and fearful of what engagement and shared governance through the BFC would mean for their academic journey on this campus. This is not what we want for our students to experience. We have intentionally included students on the BFC and our standing committees to model what it means to work in shared governance. Not only through these spaces are we able to meaningfully engage student voices to learn more about their experiences, they provide invaluable insight into policies and practices that impact how students experience their collegiate journey. With that, I will turn it over to our provost.

[Shrivastav]

Thank you, Danielle, and it's disturbing to hear your last part, and I hope that does not reflect our institution as a whole but thank you for bringing it to our attention. Thank you everybody for joining us today. I'm looking forward to today's agenda because we'll be talking about some of the exciting developments within our new Office of Student Life. It is a big reorganization that we took starting last summer, so I'm excited to hear about that presentation as well as an update on the budget model. That's a process that has been in discussion for almost a year and has been progressing pretty well. I'm grateful to Lamar Hilton and our student life team along with Ash Soni and Aimee Heeter for the work on the prospective budget model and for being here today.

First, I want to congratulate our new Dean for the Kelly School of Business announced since our last meeting and that's Pat Hopkins. Pat has a 30 plus year career at IU and at Kelly School of Business and for the past two years has been serving as the Vice Dean with Ash Soni. I'm incredibly excited for Pat's leadership and the amazing opportunities the Kelly School has for itself ahead. We have been remarkably successful at Kelley in attracting students and growing impact and prestige particularly over the last decade. I know Pat and team will continue to expand our quality impact and acclaim in the years to come. The demand for Kelley School of Business Degrees has never been stronger and the response to Pat's appointments has been wonderful to see. Thank you to the search committee and to all of you for your support and collaboration for Pat and the Kelley School of Business as we make this critical transition. Pat officially starts in a couple of weeks, March 17th, but I know based on emails and other

engagements, he is already starting to sit in that role and giving his hundred percent and I want to give a special thanks to Ash for nearly half a century of service to IU. He's truly an outstanding leader and a university citizen. I see his name tag there. He's not here yet, so if I forget, remind me to thank him once he shows up again as well.

I hope you have all participated in campus visits so far for the chancellor search as well. I know we have one more candidate later this week. I know that's another exciting development for the campus and I look forward to working with the chancellor who I know will have an important role with the BFC. Danielle, Bill and I continued to meet with BFC members in smaller groups. We had the first couple of meetings last week. Those were very candid conversations, and I felt were productive conversations, and I look forward to meeting with the rest of you in the coming days and weeks as well.

On the legislative side, we continue to watch legislation and action at the federal and at the state levels closely. We are, as I mentioned last week, last time, we are passed the crossover time in the Indiana legislature where approved bills move from one house to the other. There is obviously still a long way to go, but things continue to move ahead. I'm sure you're also following the budget conversations at the federal level. It will be interesting to see how these play out with some big potential impact on healthcare funding in particular, including with impacts in a pretty wide scale including on our state. As always, I'm grateful to vice president for university relations, Michael Huber and team for the continued work they're doing to advocate for IU and for higher education. I know several of you participated in their webinar. I believe there were nearly 1100 attendees, so thank you for your engagement in the process as well.

Today I would like to highlight some recent accomplishments of our faculty. We have quite a big list, so let me just give you a heads up on that. First and foremost, let's start with the awards. Please join me in congratulating, once again, I feel like we do this often because this colleague of ours has pretty much won every single prize there is to win, and that is Eduardo Brondizio from Anthropology for receiving the 2025 Tyler Prize for Environmental Achievement. This is the so-called Nobel Front for environment. It's just incredible. Of all the big contributions Eduardo makes and those of you who've met him know he's just an incredible, humble and unbelievably talented human being, so congratulations, Eduardo. I think that deserves an applause.

Thank you. I also want to celebrate some of our other colleagues who've secured all kinds of recognition and support for the research. I won't go into details but just want to highlight a few. Sasha Themis from admissions, Adam Liff from the Hamilton Lugar School for Global and International Studies, Ed Dallis-Comentale from the English department, Brenda Brenner from the Jacobs School of Music, Ruth Gasman and Keisuke Kawata from Public Health, Justin Kumar Huntley, Heather Hundley and Clay Fuqua from Biology and Jeremy Siek and Yijie Wang from Luddy School. All of these faculty have just received big awards or grants since the last time we met, so I wanted to acknowledge their contributions here. And lastly, please join me in congratulating three IU Bloomington faculty who've been named Distinguished Professors for 2025. These are Atar Arad from the Jacob School of Music, Alan Dennis from Kelly School of Business and Cynthia Graham from the College. This is a significant honor and I think this too deserves congratulations, so all three of them.

In closing on UA10, I'm pleased to report again, no additional violations have been reported in Bloomington since our last meeting. There was one submitted question this week related to immigration efforts on enforcement on campus. IU's guidance on this is unchanged from previous years, and if you haven't seen this already, please know it's available through the international services website including FAQs that goes into all kinds of details. As a reminder, faculty and staff have no responsibility to provide information to officials requesting immediate information on a phone call or during an in-person visit. Finally, I know we have a state of the campus address coming up soon and I want to just encourage you

to attend and welcome your colleagues as well. I hope we can share some good developments and updated news for everybody to share. And with that, thank you again for all you continue to do as faculty and faculty representatives. I believe, as Danielle said, we have an extended Q&A period and we will let our secretary manage that, but we welcome your questions and comments from the floor, so I'll open it up for your questions. Alex.

[Tanford]

I'm not sure if mine was the question that Danielle referred to, but I had sent you something yesterday saying that I was going to ask the question about whether there were plans in place for how the campus policy review committee, policy council, there are equivalent of UA08, whether there were plans for how that was going to be formed, who was going to form it, and particularly sort of the role of the BFC, Danielle, if that's going to be fully addressed on the 25th.

[DeSawal]

Correct.

[Tanford]

Then the question just to flag that, as you know, I'm president of the AAUP and there's a lot of concern among the campus faculty on whether this is the first step, sort of to reducing the role of faculty in shared governance or whether that's really, or whether what Danielle optimistic view it will actually come forward and I hope that that gets addressed on the 25th.

[DeSawal]

Yep, that's the plan.

[Lichtenstein]

Yeah, thank you for the clarifications, Danielle, but one thing you didn't mention, and I was looking closely at the new policy, the PEC membership includes, as you said, the three UFC co-chairs, so that's faculty. That's good. The various administrators are now designated and others designated by the president. Could you speak to who those others designated by the president might be and how many the president gets to appoint and when and by what process?

[DeSawal]

That would be a question for the president and the Board of Trustees.

[Shrivastav]

Heather.

[Akou]

Thanks. Given President Whitten's recent reappointment, I'm wondering if before the reappointment you were asked for your perspective as a representative of the faculty as to the faculty climate and how we might view that reappointment. If not, I'm wondering how you would describe the current climate.

[DeSawal]

So, the role of BFC is not part of the reappointment process for the president. That's with the Board of Trustees, so the answer is no. I was not asked or participated in that process of what that looks like. Additionally, we have information that we share on the floor of the BFC that comes from COACHE, that comes from the staff survey that was just done in regards to the current information that we have about surveying our faculty about how they feel about various entities that happen within the context of that that get shared on this floor.

[Shrivastav]

Other questions? The one voice survey data is on the web. I believe. You're welcome to look at it and COACHE is done every few years, so we'll wait for the next one as scheduled. Karen?

[Gahl-Mills]

Hopefully mine is rather lighthearted. In your appointment you note for us where we are with searches, and I didn't hear where we are with the search for the Executive Director of the Arts and Humanities Council. Is there any update there?

[Shrivastav]

Thank you for bringing that up. We wound up interviews about a week ago, two candidates. I have been in touch with the search committee. I'm hoping I can get you a formal announcement by the end of the week or early next week, but thank you and I didn't have it here. The Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education search is underway. The Eskenazi Director search is underway, and I believe the Honors Dean of the Honors, if it's not on, it'll be on within days as well. So three big searches ongoing. Yes. Julie?

[Hardesty]

Yeah, during the votes of no confidence last year there was talk from the Board of Trustees about conducting a campus climate survey and is that something, it doesn't seem to have happened. Is that still something that the board is going to do? Has anyone asked about that in the UFC realm?

[DeSawal]

That has not been a discussion, so that would be a question for the Board of Trustees.

[Shrivastav]

Lisa?

[Thomassen]

Is there any thought to adding coffee available at BFC meetings as used to be done, and that is a lighthearted question, as used to be in pre COVID times that might get more faculty support. I would certainly welcome it. Thank you.

[Shrivastav]

Coffee and popcorn? You're reaching for the stars there? Yes.

[Vaughn]

I was just curious about when you say that certain questions are for the trustees, we have, how do we send questions to the trustees just out of curiosity?

[DeSawal]

Yep, so there's an email address that's on the Board of Trustees site that you can send that goes directly to the Board of Trustees office that then gets distributed to the appropriate, either if it's a committee for the Board of Trustees, it'll get sent there or it'll get sent to all of the Board of Trustees members for them to determine response.

[Shrivastav]

Julie?

[Hardesty]

This question is actually about SEA 202 policy implementation. So, the schools and department policy committees and the deans are able to see the policies and processes that are being put in place by the different units, so they're basically talking to each other and seeing happened. There's a shared Microsoft Teams area and I think that's really great that actually they're able to do that and talk with each other and see those policies and discuss how each place is doing that implementation, especially for five-year tenure review. My question is if BFC members can also be allowed to see that Team space and see the same policy information that's the implementations being put in place, particularly for the five-year tenure review process, because I think it would be really good for us as a faculty council to be able to see how that is generally happening and how that's going to be impacting tenure for faculty on campus.

[DeSawal]

So, I can discuss that with the policy council chairs and the executive committee and see what's feasible in those regards.

[Shrivastav]

I would also recommend Julie, every faculty has a policy chair who represents your unit. Why don't you reach out to them and get a sense for what's happening?

[Hardesty]

I have, yeah, I've been discussing with the library policy committee folks that are participating, and they do have access and can see, but I'm just wondering as a whole if BFC as a whole can be more informed about what those processes are they're being put in place and how it's impacting all faculty.

[Shrivastav]

Other questions? We put 20 minutes. We still have 20 minutes. Is there another question? Heather? Oh, Heather? Yes. Sorry.

[Akou]

Yeah. As you're describing your role with the board of trustees, I'm really concerned that you don't seem to have much opportunity to represent the faculty. Could you describe what opportunities you do have, if any?

[DeSawal]

Thank you, Heather. So I think that one of the things to recognize is that the co-chairs of the university faculty council do not have a formal role with the Board of Trustees. We sit in on the public meeting and we provide a comment update space that we share within the minutes that go with that. In addition to that, we have advocated for and have been able to meet with the Board of Trustees members who serve in the Academic Affairs Committee component piece, the chair and the vice chair in order to have conversation with them about things that are upcoming or what that looks like in that space for things that would be of their concern that relate to the Board of Trustees agendas.

[Shrivastav]

Alex?

[Lichtenstein]

Well, as long as we have all the time. So to follow up on that again, I mean this is why I share the same concern. So was there no effort during the process of rewriting UA 08 to flag that question of what the hell is these others designated by the president, which is a huge loophole that to me belies your rather optimistic account of what this looks like, the way you described it. Great, more transparency, more faculty participation, all good, but that particular thing, when we ask about it, we get asked the trustees, so was there any effort during the process to raise a question about that, which at the very least for a president who has such a negative confidence rating on this campus should probably have raised a red flag that the PEC will essentially be governed by whoever the president designates and that that's hardly transparent. You said we had to ask the trustees.

[DeSawal]

I can provide that as feedback back. The task force's role was to provide recommendations to the president and that is what that task force did in accordance with what we were asked to do for the charge. Again, it is not an academic policy, it is a Board of Trustees policy, so the UFC does not vote on it, nor are we in the space for the conversation of the Board of Trustees when they make the final decision about that. I think it's important that folks understand where some of the differences lie, and when we talk about our roles in faculty governance, we have to also remember that we have our space which we advocated to retain, which is retained in that space that the role of UFC and the role of the development of policies that are academic within the legislative authority of the faculty remain strongly in place.

The beginning part and the end part now have seats for the university faculty council to sit on, which I shared didn't exist prior. It also provides us space to not only recognize that we have academic policies that impact us, but we also have university policies that impact us and now we have space in which to have conversations to share that in a true collaborative nature of what shared governance looks like. In order for us to move forward, all of us have to take steps from both sides to figure out what that journey looks like at this point. And so I think that it's premature to think that there is all negative intent with one specific line because that one specific line could be the importance of us needing to have somebody on or to review a policy for a specific process or procedure that requires their expertise.

[Shrivastav]

If I may add there, I think the UFC co-chairs did a great job. The charge was to benchmark our structure to the structure at our peer institutions and that's exactly what they did, and I encourage you to separate the organizational structure from your perceptions of individual people. What they're recommending is a structure that allows the institution to run effectively and efficiently, and I think

what they have recommended is benchmarked pretty closely to our peer institutions. Other questions? Yes.

[Gottipaty]

Hi, I'm Anjali from the graduate and professional Student Government. I'm the president. With the last BFC meeting, not having time to address questions on the SAA presentation and I think ironically having Pam Whitten get an increase to 900 K, seeing that there was a vote of no confidence at a high level as well. I'm curious if there are conversations happening of financial equity on a hierarchy for campus. We're making 24K right now. I hear that that's within the 50% of the Big 10, but still not a living wage for us graduate students and people above us are making much, much more. So where are those conversations happening?

[Shrivastav]

Again, a question for the trustees.

[DeSawal]

The one thing that I will add to that though is that every academic unit does do equity reviews in order to look at salaries. So there is a regular equity review that happens throughout the campus with regards to salaries to pay attention to things like salary compression as well as the market rate for different disciplines and positions throughout the campus.

[Shrivastav]

And the SAA number as Dean Daleke presented is the minimum, but I think if I remember it right from your presentation, the average student is making 1400 more in addition to the minimum. Is that the right number from your presentation?

[Deleke]

Yeah, I think that it's about 2000 total actually from above the minimum and that's the average across all disciplines. But there, as Danielle mentioned, there's quite a bit of variation amongst disciplines in that regard.

[Gottipaty]

Not to be rude, but are we arguing that 2K more on top of 24K is enough to live?

[McDonald]

Yes. David, David McDonald, Arts and Humanities. Perhaps I misunderstood that last exchange, but by directing the previous question to the Board of Trustees, are you saying that the Board of Trustees determines our graduate student salaries?

[Shrivastav]

I believe she was talking about the presidential reappointment as a benchmark.

[McDonald]

Oh, okay. Well then perhaps we could talk about how that 24,000 is determined here on this campus? I believe that is a campus.

[Shrivastav]

It is a campus one and we had a whole presentation on it. Was it last meeting or two meetings ago? Two meetings ago. So you can check the minutes on that

[McDonald]

And I believe we ran out of time to discuss it, is that correct? So maybe we could discuss it, is that correct? So, maybe we could discuss it?

[Shrivastav]

David?

[Daleke]

Yeah, I can talk about the minimum stipend. The provost a few years ago set a goal for us to have our minimum stipends in the upper half of the big 10 public institutions and so, annually, I collect that data from the websites of all of those institutions because all that information is public information and then I present that to the provost to make a recommendation of what we need to do to remain in the upper half of the Big 10. Those numbers shift annually, so we constantly need to be looking at that and usually at about in the fall and then also during the summer we double check those numbers to make sure that they haven't changed very much, but that's how that is determined. The average stipends that we discussed at the last meeting are actually a reflection of individual hiring units and what they pay graduate students because that, SAAs, because that doesn't reflect the minimum as much as, what they feel would be competitive in terms of being able to recruit students for example, or to hire students into particular positions on campus.

[Buggenhagen]

Thanks. I'm Beth Buggenhagen and I represent the social sciences and history. So I appreciate Dean Daleke that you added your contribution just now because I think it really for me raises the question of campus climate and I think it's something that a lot of faculty in the social sciences and in history faces this question of how can we continue to do our one research given what's happening with our graduate programs? And I think a lot of people in this room would probably agree that we are able to recruit top graduate students to our amazing programs, but we can't fund them so we have to turn them away. And that contributes to the larger campus climate where that, coupled with cuts in federal research and many other things happening at the same time, I just think it's really difficult for graduate students and faculty alike. And I wonder if you could speak to the feelings also surrounding the salary, which I think are also important.

[Daleke]

I think that to your first point, remaining competitive for bringing in top graduate students has always been a challenge. We have always had to pay attention to what our competitors are being able to provide their graduate students and to try to match that. But that is done, and this is important to keep in mind at the unit level and it's done within whatever the budgetary decision-making process each individual responsibility center has and some units have responded by being able to direct more funds towards that effort and some of them have not been able to depending on how well resourced they are. So, the other is that there are some clear disciplinary differences if you just look at the numbers. The

natural physical sciences of course are able to provide higher stipends than the social sciences, than the arts and humanities, and that's reflected in the SAA stipends as well.

I think that it's important to keep in mind that the policies for SAAs are held by, as they are for other academic appointees, by the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs office. And that's where all, because that to me, that aligns our SAAs with the academic appointees that are faculty, and I think that's a good thing. The budgetary side of thing is all held by the responsibility centered units and that includes both the academic units as well as the non-academic units that hire graduate students typically as GA's. And that's a substantial number of our SAAs are funded in that way. And so those units have different incentives. They actually try to hire graduate students at probably the lowest cost they can just to fit their budget. And so I think I find when I look at the data that those GA's are probably the ones that are being paid a little bit on the lower end, but when you talk about students who are being hired within their academic unit, that really is driven by the competitive calculations I just mentioned.

[McDonald]

If I could just follow up on that. Thank you, Dean Daleke, I appreciate your information here. As a matter of principle, it seems like these conversations begin from a benchmark of aspiring to the 51st percentile and I'm curious if that is a satisfactory resting place for our values for our graduate students and as a follow-up, would we also aspire to the 51st percentile in administrators pay?

[Daleke]

I can't answer that second question, but the first one I can say that we could look at it as aspiring for the 51st percentile, but we don't always have to land there and in fact, I don't think that that's what we attempt to do. It is a moving target is very much a moving target because everybody is changing their stipend level, so we do the best we can to try to maintain that position.

[Shrivastav]

Would you say, I want to remind us, a year ago we were in the top third I think, or two years ago when we first changed this, we were in the top third. Well, we started at the bottom third, we moved up to the top third. Now we are just above the middle and we will reevaluate it every other year. That's our plan and see what we want to do.

[McDonald]

So, we're falling is what you're saying. We've got to kind of redress this. If we made it to the top third and we're now falling down to the 51st percentile, that might be a cause for concern for we're moving in the wrong direction.

[Shrivastav]

It is and we'll re-benchmark it and redo it again when it comes. It's just every school does it on a different cycle. Sure. So we find ourselves where we are. It's not an uncompetitive position to be in and that's the important thing.

[McDonald]

Absolutely, and I'm actually quite thankful to hear that we are very much keeping tabs on this, but we have graduate students in our presence who are pointing out that we're missing the mark and we have graduate students in our presence who are pointing out that while administrative salaries seem to be

going up, striving for far higher than the 51st percentile, our most vulnerable contributors to this university as what we've already described are having a hard time just securing a living wage. Now we know that fungibility extends across all of the budgets of all of the campuses and all of the units. So while we can try and drill things down and blame the smaller departments for not being able to pay so much, that money comes from somewhere and as we can see, it's moving upwards and I would just as a BFC member representing the Arts and Humanities and mostly departments who are at that lower range that you described, I would just like to register my concerns for our most vulnerable contributors to this campus and in particular securing them a living wage that aspires to be higher than the 51st percentile.

[Shrivastav]

Advise we are at time. David, if you have anything to respond, that would be the last one.

[Daleke]

No, I do agree that it's a challenge and it is a budgetary challenge. We'll hear about our new budgetary model that's coming and that might help us address some of those things as well. But I do appreciate your comments and I share the concerns.

[Gottipaty]

I would really like to make a final comment just because it was also something I would have liked to discuss last week or the last BFC meeting. I'm a counselor. How many of you would want your healthcare provider to be burnt out because they can't make a living wage and have to work two to three jobs? I'm sure none of you would because you want competent healthcare. We are part of the people who provide that healthcare. We are the graduate students who do that. We should have living wages so that we can focus on our schoolwork and on our practice and we need more of a relationship with the university to be able to do that and our administrators shouldn't be making 900K and making an argument that they can't pay us more.

[Shrivastav]]

Thank you, Anjali. That's let's move on to the next item on the agenda. This is changes to BL-ACA-H28 faculty instructional responsibilities. This is a second hearing, so this is an action item. It does need a vote. So we have Bryant Paul, Catherine Sherwood-Laughlin, and Veronica Salama.

[Paul]

I want to thank everyone so much for letting us come back in and further explain what we're trying to accomplish with this policy change, which as I've mentioned, I'm going to talk about just to introduce what we're trying to do again and try and better do it this time. To be perfectly honest, I couldn't see the screen last presentation and so I was sort of putting stuff up and kind of winging it and a few things did get, I think missed in interpretation or in presentation, so hopefully I can do a little bit better on that. To that end, I want to remind everyone that STU 00 does provide the right to students graduate and undergraduate to receive a class syllabus in a timely manner and to be informed of course, goals, testing and grading procedures and course content, in sufficient time to facilitate efficient course selection. Interestingly, if you look at across the Big 10, we are actually the only university across the entire Big 10 that does not provide a specific date that syllabi need to be posted. So many of them say day of the first class, many of them say a week before, a few of them say before the registration period in the semester prior to the upcoming semester. We actually don't have a date certain that syllabi need to be made available to students, yet we do say that they need to receive a syllabus in a timely manner.

Again, just to remind everyone why we're even talking about this. In 2020, the IU-GPSG passed a syllabus posting resolution that is a copy of the resolution there and in that they asked for the first two weeks of class specifically spelled out so that graduate students could make good decisions about which classes to take, how to take them and how to put their schedules together. The IU student government generally took up the matter for undergraduate courses. That matter was then handed to the BFC Executive Committee, which handed it to the Student Affairs Committee, which took it on. This was in 2020. We had some issues obviously with being able to meet and get anything accomplished for a few years there. And then when we got back to it, it became something that was talked about apparently, because I only came onto this committee this last academic year, but has been talked about has been they approached it. There've been attempts to create syllabus repositories and change the approach to how information is released at the beginning of the semester, but it's always fallen back to the committee and never even made it to the floor. So I was excited last time to really be able to get this to the floor. I'll also say that I'm not particularly skilled at doing this because I haven't done it before, and so thank you for the learning experience. I also want to thank my colleagues for all of the feedback that I received, and I sincerely mean that. I received close to three dozen emails in response to the presentation and the proposal. Some of them were supportive, some of them were not. Some of them seemed very well-informed, some of them less well-informed, but that's fine. But I want you to know that the SAC and the BFC Executive Committee spent substantial time, and I've spent a lot of time on this trying to make it as palatable as possible and as beneficial as possible to all students, faculty and staff.

So, the current policy, by the way, would apply to undergraduates and graduate students. So it would basically put into the policy this resolution that was presented in 2020. So, the solutions to this issue of what students have been describing as, consistently, and I hear this a lot from students, we've heard it in the sac, we've heard it outside of there. I've heard it from my students many times. They are looking for course information to make good decisions about which classes they want to take, and they are worried about hanging on a little too long in that first week and then getting a W on their transcript, which I talked about last time. So, the solutions, basically the only two solutions that we really have to this are, one, to create, expand, utilize existing syllabus, repositories. There are some that are in place, but having gone through every one of them that anyone has suggested might be available, none of them are functioning optimally for what students I believe need. And then the second one simply to post basic course information earlier, and I'll get to that in a bit. Is there a syllabus repository here at IU? There are several resources available, none of which are particularly well utilized at this point. The gen ed learning outcomes repository. I will admit, I went on to check this one out and realized I hadn't put my information up and so now it's up. So enjoy that if you want to take a look, but many folks have not put that information up there. We get emails asking us to, but it is not something that we are punished for not doing apparently. And so that's something that we can look into. We can look into expanding. We can look into potentially making more than just gen ed classes available through that. Some schools and departments and units have their own approaches to this and that's great and we can, as I proposed in the last SAC meeting, potentially have a group that would look into combining all of those somehow formally in a non-onerous manner to make sure that students have access to use syllabus. Potentially the new stoic system, IGPS does offer some basic, basic course information. The bulletin also, and there may be others that I have yet to hear about, but we'll continue looking into it. Just to give you a sense where we stand in relation to other Big 10 universities, I talked about this last time, you can see Purdue and University of Minnesota offer three different syllabus posting systems, Rutgers has two. We have again, the learning outcomes repository, but that is just for gen ed classes as of now. And so right now, if you were to ask students where there is an overall syllabus repository where they could get this information from, I wouldn't know what to tell them. I've looked into it pretty significantly at this point.

And there are six universities that as of now from the information I was able to obtain, do not have a specific general repository. They do have some units that list having them, but otherwise, no.

Here's the proposal in a nutshell now that we've changed it is a charge by the BFC to the VPFAA to strongly encourage faculty to make basic course information available to enrolled students at least a week before the semester starts. Provides several suggestions for the types of information extract, excuse instructors might consider but does not mandate those and also does not limit anything to those, and it provides any such information to students via some means of electronic transfer hopefully, but not necessarily via Canvas or similar course management system by email or other preferred means. So, it is not mandating how this takes place, but it is strongly suggesting that this be done on the behalf of students because they have expressed, many of them have expressed a deep interest in having access to this information.

I want to point out that it recognizes certain factors such as last-minute course assignments, life events and other factors could make the above impossible. We get it. People get assigned classes the day before they have to teach them, the day have to teach them, after the semester starts. Those people cannot be expected to have this information available a week in advance obviously. So, it is addressed in the language where we say to the extent that it's feasible, it does not mandate that instructors provide, and this was a misperception I got in a lot of messages, it does not mandate that instructors provide complete syllabi or access to a fully populated and operational course management system prior to the start of class. It is not that. Anyone claiming otherwise is misinterpreting what we are doing, and it does not state or imply that changes cannot be made to course information provided prior to the start of the semester.

As the semester unfolds, as you'll see when I put the actual language up in its context, there's actually language directly after this that says you can change what you're doing in the syllabus as issues arise. Why the proposed change? Again, the W on the transcripts is the big issue. I've come to find out it's not as much of a financial issue because the W when it comes out is you can still get some of your money back or most of your money back a little later. I thought that we were students were losing their money when they got that W after the first week. As I understand that's not quite the case, but you do if you go later in the semester, lose some of the money that you spent on a course initially. That said, obviously a number of Ws on your transcript does serve as a potential red flag by admissions officers and graduate schools and other professional schools and potential employers that maybe you don't have the follow through that you're supposed to have, and that's not necessarily what it suggests.

IU provides, as I mentioned last time, only seven days from the semester start to drop without receiving a W. That is tied for the shortest period of time from the start of the semester in the Big 10 with the University of Iowa, only the University of Oregon offers less time six days. We offer six days, 23 hours and 59 minutes and 59 seconds as you can see. Now, again, this is a different, it's a little bit different across schools. I've come to find out, I've really had to learn a lot about this as I've been working on this project because you do, as you look into this stuff, and try to satisfy people's concerns. The other thing that we didn't talk about last time is that it helps avoid, and this is something that Veronica brought up to me, and then I had a number of students, I've talked to folks in my class about this, my class is about this, so probably a couple of hundred students at least. Many students report that they register for classes just to access or check out the syllabus, and that means that that allows them to determine whether they really want to take a class or not and allows them to efficiently set their course of study, but that also blocks other students as they're signed up from signing up. They could put on the waitlist, but they don't have access to the syllabi, so that is also problematic. What we're proposing here hopefully would allow them to have the information where they don't have to do that. They would be able to see that earlier and make their decision earlier. Also, I've also heard from a number of faculty having talked about this with them, they've had large enrollment drop off once the semester starts and

people get their syllabi and they drop the class before the semester starts. And I'm not making it up. I mean, I was talking to a theater professor that had 12 people in his class prior to the beginning of the semester, the semester started and eight of them dropped, so he was teaching a class of four students. So just to point this out, where it sits, it is now, it would be in BL-ACA-H28. You can see it's under faculty instructional responsibilities, and what we propose to do is put it above the language that is in there now about the fact that you're allowed to change your class as the semester moves along. So that just because this seemed to make sense to put in there first as far as making it available. The specific language, and we actually, we just add the word further to the next paragraph, the specific language, the Bloomington Faculty Council charges the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs to communicate to the faculty each semester that, in order to facilitate efficient student course selection and structures, which comes directly by the way from STU00, instructors are strongly encouraged to the extent that it is feasible to make basic class information available to enroll students via Canvas or a similar course management system by email or by some other preferred means, at least one week prior to the semester start date, as determined by the IUB official academic calendar or at least one week prior to the date of the first class meeting for any class or course taught outside the standard semester start dates. Suggested class information could include the general and or specific topics that the course is expected to cover, the ways in which student performance will be assessed, particular expectations regarding attendance, and anything else that might aid students in selecting the right courses for their academic pursuits. Thank you, Professor Anderson for your terse summary of what was formally, I think three paragraphs and you can see the other term further is now added to the second paragraph because it's and doesn't change any of the language.

Real quick, how is faculty feedback incorporated in that previous statement? Number one charges the VPFAA. We want it to be clear, this is not a mandate directly to faculty. It is a recommendation strongly encouraging faculty to do this because it is in the interest of the students, and it charges the VPFAA to do so. It includes the qualifier to the extent that it is feasible to address concerns for those that are assigned a course less than a week prior to a start date, or for those that have other burdens that they could run into that have reasonable reasons not to be able to do this. It suggests, does not mandate the types of content to include, nothing is included, and it is in no way intended to convey the expectation that a fully completed syllabus or instructional management system be made available to students prior to the start of the semester. We're not mandating syllabi be listed a week in advance. It is just a strong suggestion to aid students in their course selection process from the VPFAA. That is all that we're trying to accomplish with this. I will open it up for discussion based on that information.

[Shrivastav]

Thank you, Brian. It's open for discussion. Alex.

[Tanford]

It's a little bit off what you were talking about. You mentioned there that students have six days to drop. What happens if the course doesn't meet in that first six days, which can happen if the faculty member is stranded an airport, if we have the campus closed on that day because of bad weather, is there anything, I mean now they're being asked to drop the course before it's even met. Is there, as part of your process, are you looking at that to add some asterisk to that requirement?

[Paul]

I hadn't looked at it. I don't know what happens in that situation, but we definitely can look at it. I have absolutely no aversion to that at all.

[Shrivastav]

Alex, I can, two things I want to, just for context. One, Oregon is on quarter system, so six days is much more portion of the semester. The issue you're raising. I have not worked at a single institution where this issue has not come up sooner or later in faculty governance, there's always a tradeoff. The longer you wait, the more time students have in your class to make a decision, but the longer you wait, when students drop something and enroll in something else, they've missed a bigger window and sometimes it's hard for students to catch up. I don't think there's a right answer. It's just what we have to do for ourselves. Alex.

[Lichtenstein]

Yeah, I mean, I thank you for all the hard work on this. I think this is an excellent reform, actually. I was skeptical at first, but I see the advantages still. You point to one real problem, which I'm not sure this solves, which is that students have to be registered for the course in order to get the information. And I feel a bit foolish about this, but I hadn't realized until this year that through OnIU, we can all go in and update our course class descriptions each semester. I just did that just this second for my class next year. So why not encourage/mandate people to use that? Maybe extend the size, change that template, now it's just a blank box, but just create a template, course description, readings, assignments? Everyone can do it themselves. Students can access every single course in the books without having to register, and that's that.

[Shrivastav]

I would recommend just my recommendation that the motion here is on what we want our faculty to do. What you're saying is the how. I'm sure that's one good way. I've not personally investigated it. If this is the step we decide to take, I would encourage our VPFAA to investigate the best way to do it so it's easily accessible to students. Diane?

[Henshel]

First of all, thank you very much for the change. It really makes a huge difference. So instead of being vehemently opposed, I would say uniformly people are okay with it at this point, though, I will say that, once again, it's the non-tenure track faculty that have the greatest concern about it and want to remind you that they have kids and can be teaching up to four courses in a semester and, therefore, especially for what's happening right before in the fall, they're dealing with kids getting to school at first and in January they're dealing with, sometimes that means having to work over winter break and they're burned out already. So as it is framed right now, it's appreciated. Thank you.

A couple of comments. If you think that O'Neill's repository by the way is not functional, let us know, because we would change it, because we've tried to make a big deal. We actually do a pretty decent job of it, we thought. A request was made that if there is anything that the students really feel that they need, it should be included explicitly in the language, that the vagueness may not necessarily always be helpful. So, if there's anything really explicit, to include it. But there's also on the other side of it, multiple faculty question why students need more than a week after the start of classes to attend and concern was raised, especially by an administrator recognizing that students overbook and then they don't drop out soon enough and then other students can't get in and where's the play in there, and some faculty just let them in on waitlist, but not all students know to ask for that. And so if somewhere that could be addressed, that would be helpful, and then I have a more extensive language about that to send to you guys. Okay, thank you.

[Shrivastav]

I saw a question there. Yes.

[Pickett]

Yeah, I just wanted to follow up on Alex's question and your comment about the modality. The language here does speak to the modality. It gives three separate options, which given that we have three or four separate systems in which this could be housed, we now have three modalities. I worry about this spreading to become harder to find rather than solving the problem by creating too many ways that this might happen. And that's really the challenge of writing something like this that's a recommendation but also and meets a lot of requirements but also is actually accessible to students. I mean, we want it to be easy to find as well.

[Shrivastav]

So, since we have a motion on the floor that needs to be voted, is that a friendly amendment you would like to articulate?

[Pickett]

I am not sure I know how to address it, but it is a challenge that I see with offering three separate ways just in the text of communicating that information.

[Shrivastav]

Okay. Brian, do you want to respond to that?

[Paul]

Sure. The separate ways that we offered again where it says just to go back. Yeah. Well, and also, we can just look at the language where we get to, or at least suggested information could include similar Course Management System via Canvas or similar Course Management System by email or by some other preferred means. So that's really what we're, we were really trying to just give alternatives as many alternatives as possible and I completely agree with you. I mean, one of the biggest problems that I've found with all of this even for myself was and I believe was mentioned earlier, we don't even know that we had the options of posting this stuff and then students don't know that they have the option or the ability to access these things. So, we were just trying to offer, especially with that last part in that parenthetical statement, suggestions and open it up so that as long as there's some way that this stuff is out there and then it becomes a question of getting students to be aware of the fact that they have access to it. So completely agree with you. One of the big problems here is that the information might be available but they don't know that they have access to it. Putting it up on the through one and the course update system, that would be perfectly in line with the way that I believe this is written. It's just another possibility. So potentially making students more aware of how they would access this information is another part of this process to make it more streamlined and effective.

[Shrivastav]

We are running behind on time, so if it's something critical, certainly VPFAA, we do need to hear that because this will fall on your office, but we need to wind this up soon.

[Docherty]

I'll be brief. I think what might be best here is instead of trying to create a one size fits all, since we are all so different that maybe we look to our local policy committees to take the lead on what's going to fit for their local unit and then we could provide that encouragement through the start of semester memo or other options. But I also think it might be helpful that we then become the keeper of what each different school or department is doing. So a student could have a commonplace to go, if I'm looking for a class in O'Neill, they can go to a commonplace and say this is where that might work. So I'm happy to work with the policy committee chairs or the academic associate deans to work on the implementation of this and then could report back to this body.

[Shrivastav]

Okay, thank you. Yes.

[Salama]

Hi everyone. I am Veronica and I am the student representative on the SAC and I just wanted to say that I understand that there are concerns that there are different modalities for the information we provided, but honestly I think students would just be really appreciative if you posted it in the best way that's possible for you and then just maybe kindly send them an email like, hey, here's the syllabus in the email or I posted it to wherever you have posted. I think students would really appreciate it and they would actually go look. The reason why it's very lenient is just to make it easier on the faculty, whatever's most convenient for them. I mean us, students, we understand how much you guys do and we very much do appreciate it, but we also really much value this information and think it would be extremely beneficial.

[Shrivastav]

Okay, thank you. I think it's time to vote on this proposal, so I would, doesn't need a motion, it comes from the committee. So, all in favor of approving the motion as on your screens in front of you, please raise your hands. Do we need to count, parliamentarian? That looks like a majority. The motion passes. Thank you very much. Congratulations. Next item is a report on student life. We have Lamar Hylton, Vice Provost for Student Life who's just joining us, although he's been here in the back, I could see, in the room. So, welcome Lamar, and your presentation.

[Lamar]

Good afternoon, everybody and thank you for the opportunity to share with you about the Office of Student Life. I'm grateful for the continued support that we've received from our faculty partners and leadership as we strive toward our mission and advance the goals set forth in the IUB 2030 strategic plan. Before we jump into the presentation, I would like to take this moment to thank Danielle and the entire BFC leadership and contingency represented here for the invitation to speak with you today. The work of enabling student success is not done in a vacuum, nor is it any one entity's responsibility solely. Student life enjoys the opportunities for collaborative and meaningful faculty partnerships designed to have a positive impact on the lives of students and these collaborations lay the foundation for the achievement of our vision of a premier and thriving student experience here at IU Bloomington. This vision is our North star as student life continues to develop our strategic plan and leans into our mission of championing student success at IU Bloomington by creating and supporting transformative experiences through the amplification of care, belonging and wellbeing. Our values of community, integrity, learning, partnerships and people first provide strong framing for the achievement of that mission. This is just a visual representation of how the units are organized in the Office of student Life.

We strive to align our units to best meet the needs of our students and allow for greater ease in partnering and connecting with the work happening in each of these areas. As we drive toward this vision with the IUB 2030 plan as a guide, there are six core areas that our work is situated in. Our care and advocacy efforts ensure that students, parents, and family members are supported in their experience, helping students to connect, engage, grow, and thrive is at the heart of our work. At student life and we seek to create and leverage programs, experiences and facilities to create a meaningful sense of belonging for all students.

Our goal is for all Hoosiers at IU Bloomington to be well and to attend to all aspects of their health. The residential experience including on and off campus living is at the core of our undergraduate student success efforts and then the blending of the curricular and co-curricular environments is paramount to helping students thrive, all students to thrive in their premier student experience. And finally, the cornerstone of our work in student life is organizational excellence, operational efficiency, sound fiscal and financial practices and the ability to tell a strong data-informed, compelling story about the student experience.

For those that have been at IU Bloomington prior to 2023, you'll remember our predecessor organization known as the Division of Student Affairs. In 2023, the campus shifted the name to the Office of Student Life, a new structure for student-focused units across the campus. This shift allows us to more fully bridge academic and campus life, better serve diverse student populations and groups, improve student health and wellbeing, engage students more proactively and foster stronger connections for students with each other and across the IU community. With this transition came also a separation from the former Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students role into two distinct positions. I get this question a lot as we've transitioned of what's the difference between my role and the role of the Dean of Students. The Vice Provost for Student Life is the strategic leader for the office providing vision and direction for program, services, facilities and resources that assist with enabling student success and the Associate Vice Provost for Student Life and dean of students who is in the back of the room. Dr. Kathy Adams Riester serves as the deputy to the Vice Provost for Student Life and is responsible for leading efforts focused on student care and advocacy. This role also provides critical leadership to student care crisis and conduct matters.

We have a wonderful student life executive team focused on the many parts of the student life operation. I have the great fortune and honor, and it is truly an honor to work with each of these leaders and their teams in support of our mission to provide transformational experiences for our students. As we continue to make progress toward our vision in student life, I'm pleased to share that we've launched a strategic planning process for the office. This process began in June of 2024 and will yield a five-year plan that provides the blueprint for our most ambitious work. From 2025 to 2030, our new plan will have significant alignment with the IUB 2030 plan and serve as a bridge between our campus strategic goals and the work emanating from the many departments and units within student life.

The process has been quite inclusive and has engaged students, faculty, staff, alumni and parents. There is a core team of student life leaders, students and campus partners that is responsible for guiding our strategic planning process along and as you can see, we have made significant strides over the last several months with an intended completion of the plan development later this semester. We hope that you will stay connected to our planning process by visiting our website studentlife.indiana.edu or scanning this QR code for more details. The QR code will lead you to that site where more information about our planning process can be understood.

Student life continues to build our capacity of taking a data informed approach to implementing programs, activities and experiences for students. I'd like to just share a little bit about what some of the data is telling us about our students. To help guide our work, we utilize both national data sources like

the National Survey of Student Engagement, the National College Health Assessment and the Beginning Student Survey of student engagement, as well as the unit and department specific data that focuses on programmatic faculty and service outcomes. The lion's share of our student engagement data is collected through our Be Involved Platform and focuses on engagement and success for students.

At the end of the fall semester, we conducted a survey of first year students to more fully understand how welcome week and programming happening during the first six weeks of classes impacted different outcomes for students. You can see here just a few of the key results from that survey of students in terms of their engagement with the suite of offerings both academically and in the co-curricular spaces during the welcome week experience through the first six weeks of the fall semester. We will use these data to dive in further through focus groups with students to better understand how we can support student success through engagement and campus life experiences.

The ACHA National College Health Assessment is a national research survey organized by the American College Health Association to assist colleges and universities in collecting data about their students' habits and behaviors on the most prevalent health topics. IU Bloomington participated in the assessment this past fall and we are working through the analysis of our data in areas like general health and campus climate, nutrition, physical activity and food security and impediments to academic performance to name a few. We also have data sets that are broken down by different demographic categories, so, for example, data focused on graduate students, students who participate in sorority and fraternity life, students from varying racial or ethnic backgrounds, students who identify as LGBT and students who are first generation or first in their families to attend college. And we really are using those demographic breakdowns to examine how these specific groups of students compare to our overall student population in terms of health-related outcomes and wellbeing-related outcomes more broadly. We look forward to utilizing this data to deepen our strategic efforts around student health and wellbeing and belonging on campus.

As we continue our work, it is very important to us to continue cultivating meaningful opportunities for academic engagement and partnership. We continue to explore opportunities for coordination between the Office of Student Life and student life functions within each of the schools in the college. Our Council on Student Affairs, which is convened by Kathy Adams Riester again in the back, brings these colleagues together routinely to identify ways to connect and collaborate with a goal and an eye toward a seamless experience whether that student is in their academic or school setting or living life outside of the classroom. We are also looking, always looking, always looking for new faculty friends to join us in our work to support students. We are so fortunate to have many faculty already engaged in committee work and in programmatic efforts and more, and we're always excited to welcome even more faculty colleagues to partner with us to serve our students. We cannot do what we do without you all as faculty. And so, I want to just underscore, we are always looking for ways to partner with our phenomenal faculty here at IU Bloomington.

Recently, IU Bloomington was named a most promising place to work in student affairs by the ACPA College Student Educators International and *Diverse Issues* magazine. This recognition comes as a result of an analysis of our workplace culture in student life. This is the first year that IU Bloomington has been recognized with this award, and we are very proud that our campus is celebrated for the work it does engaging staff who in turn engage students in the student life context. Also, this year our counseling and psychological services area received full accreditation from the International Accreditation of Counseling Services. After a rigorous process of document and operational review including a two day site visit from the accrediting body, we were pleased that CAPS joins the ranks of a select few counseling centers to receive full accreditation. This signals that our practice in this critical area is strong and that the service we provide students is meaningful. I do want to again end where I started. I know that was quite a bit of information in a short amount of time. I knew I was time bound, but I do want to thank you for your

time and attention this afternoon and I look forward to any questions that you may have about today's presentation.

[Shrivastav]

Thank you, Lamar. We have a few minutes, so Bill, you want to kick it off?

[Ramos]

It off? Yeah, thanks for the presentation and you kind of made an appeal for faculty involvement. Can you talk a little bit about how faculty are engaging? Has it dropped down maybe since the pandemic? You weren't here at that time, but are we seeing trends? Sometimes I worry if, and you're doing a beautiful job, but I wonder if sometimes we miss the message where faculty say, oh, student life has it.

[Hylton]

Yeah.

[Ramos]

Right?

[Hylton]

Yes.

[Ramos]

So how are we making sure faculty are engaged and then on our end, I guess to my colleagues having served on student organizations and one in particular for 25 years with little to no acknowledgement in my promotion and tenure process, that we have the ability and the control over those documents to emphasize and incent those types of things so that if we really believe in that engagement with our students, we can make them matter.

[Hylton]

Yeah, thank you for the question, Bill. It's such an important one. I would say that there are some very natural ways that faculty are aligning with the work happening in student life. For example, our Living Learning Centers is a very smooth entry point because our living learning programs are tied back to academic units. Each of them have a faculty director and that the happenings there really are dictated and driven by the faculty leadership in that way. We have a host of faculty who advise student organizations to the point that you made some of even our sororities and fraternities. There's a connection there and then we try as best as we are possibly able to, to incorporate faculty into broad scale committee work that's happening or emanating from student life. So as we were designing our mission, vision and values as an example, we held Crimson conversations that brought faculty and other leaders to the table to kind of talk about their perceptions or their engagement with our work and where they would like to see that go.

So, there are natural ways or more easily facilitated ways for faculty to get involved, but certainly if faculty have ideas or perspectives or ways that they want to be involved, we are all ears to that. Again, I want to go back to what I said in my comments. We cannot do what we do without the support of our faculty and we would welcome exploring opportunities to deepen that bench. In terms of the numbers

pre COVID post COVID, I'm not really sure. What I do know is that the faculty that we do tap tend to be very, very engaged once they're in the work that they're participating in. I appreciate the question.

[Shrivastav]

Jim.

[Sherman]

Yeah, thank you for all you do. You talked a little bit about the health aspect of students. Could you say a few words about how we're helping them with regard to legal and financial kinds of questions and issues that they face?

[Hylton]

Sure. So we do have, as a part of the suite of units in student life, a student legal services area that really provides legal advisement for students. I would consider to be very well-trafficked in terms of students being able to readily access those services. And then financial, I'm assuming your question is about whether they need financial support and there are a few ways that that can materialize. We do have a student care and resource center that students can tap into if they are in need of some level of financial support in terms of connecting them with other resources that might be available to them. We also have a growing and ever expanding basic needs support area that's focused on multiple aspects of a student's basic needs. So, think food insecurity, housing security, to name a couple. And so we do have staff who are situated in those areas that again are the conduit between the students and connections to resources that might be able to support them as they're navigating their collegiate journey.

[Sherman]

Yeah, thanks. What about financial advice regarding things like student loan and how to take care of their finances?

[Hylton]

Absolutely. So that would actually come through our financial aid office and so we are really critical partners with financial aid. So if a student was to present the need to learn more about their financial aid, student loans, grants and other scholarships that they receive or are in need of, we would be working very closely to get them to financial aid to get those questions answered.

[Shrivastav]

Alex.

[Tanford]

We've had for years a number of cultural centers that have been very, very important to some students, particularly students who feel alienated, disadvantaged, things like that. Obviously those students are going to feel even more at risk in the current political climate. Do those fall within your office? And if not, and I suspect not, what do you do about coordinating with them so as to be a resource for helping students?

[Hylton]

Yeah, absolutely. So as of last Monday, they actually do fall into the purview of Student Life and so we are quickly learning about their operations more intently with the goal and the eye toward providing that level of service and resource and support that students that access those services are in need of. We have historically though, even before last Monday, been very closely connected partners to the culture centers programmatically when issues arise and more. And so, we see those as deep contributors to the student experience, certainly to our mission around deepening a sense of belonging for students. As a personal aside, I'm a former cultural center director myself before I got into the world of being a VP for Student Life and so I know firsthand the value add that those spaces bring to marginalized identities and students that hold those various identities. This is a politically uncertain time. I think everybody is keenly aware of that and so we are doing our best to continue to strive to provide the necessary resources and tools of support for those students even with our political climate as the backdrop and we continue to make day-to-day decisions based upon what we're seeing and hearing and learning about ways to continue to make sure that students have what they need to be successful.

[Shrivastav]

Last question, Diane.

[Henshel]

This is to both you and the provost. So it's to both of you. We know now that the students are about to face a time of food insecurity between the 25% increased tariffs and the fact that California lost 2 billion gallons of the water needed for the end of the summer for our food area, food growing area. And there's a few other things that are happening nationally that are affecting food availability and therefore food prices are about and if they haven't already started to spike. Is there a fund available to help increase the available food resources in the Crimson kitchen so that the students have food to go to and a place to get food because it's going to hit them, it's already hit them and this is just going to be terrible.

[Hylton]

Yes, we do have. Thank you for the question. Yes, we do have actually a couple of funds that students can tap into. There's the Beverly Warren Emergency Fund, which goes to students that are in emergency need. We also have a fund though that supplies our Crimson Cupboard, which is our food pantry main food pantry here on campus and we actually just got a pretty significant donation from a set of parents to continue the work in stocking that Crimson Cupboard. That is actually one of the priorities that we have identified on our fundraising and development plan for student life in addition to the campus resources that come to bear to support that effort.

[Henshel]

So, provost, I would request that you have available and make available some funds to as backup because we don't know what's going to happen, but in the next six months it's not going to be good.

[Shrivastav]

Yeah, we work on multiple fronts to support not just that but other programs like that. We also partner with a local food bank and United Way, so there's, there's no silver bullet to solving these problems. We try to support them through a variety of means, but thank you for bringing that up. Thank you Lamar. Let's move on to the next item, which is a current update on the budget redesign led by Aimee Heeter,

Vice Provost for Finance and Administration and Ash Soni, Dean for Kelley School of Business for another 10 days or so. And Ash, you missed my thank you at the beginning of the meeting, but I wanted to say that when you're here, thank you very much for, not just the wonderful work you did the last two years as Dean, but nearly half a century of service, and love and support for the university. We are all very grateful for everything you do and continue to do so thank you.

[Soni]

Well thank you. Thank you Provost. It's been an honor, it's been a privilege to serve the Kelley School and IU for this long. So just getting to the budget redesign, first, I just wanted to thank our committee members. Our charge was given to us in late fall of 23. We spent most of spring of 24 as well as fall of 24 working on this budget redesign. The committee consists of administrators, faculty, staff, and it's been a privilege working with this committee as well. And what we have here is a concept model that we'll present to you. This is a model that is still in flux. We'd like your feedback and even though I'm stepping down in about 10 days, I'll hang around for another four or five weeks after that to make sure that we take this process through and get all the feedback for this budget. So let me turn it over to Aimee and she'll start off with just some of the fundamentals here.

[Heeter]

Yeah, thanks Ash. One thing I will note, I do know that we are kind of time limited today and there's a lot of details. So we've created a condensed overview today, so will not hit on a number of your questions, but the last slide we will have opportunities to hit for questions, but we will be doing a longer presentation with the BAC. Happy to come back to the BFC anytime and we will have all types of faculty sessions throughout the spring and into the summer, because, as Ash mentioned, the big piece is continuing getting the feedback through each stage of the model. So just real quickly, we'll go through this slide relatively quickly because of time, but what is a budget model and really the budget model, as most of you know, it's just a means of allocating the income and expenses. The budget model is not going to create new money, though we do hope that there can be strategic incentives to go in new directions but allows us to adjust our spending and our priorities around new financial model.

What we're hoping is that they can align with a lot of the campus-based initiatives as well as the individual school needs and initiatives as well. So, during this time that Ash noted just recently was what we've been focusing on the conceptual model, and that is the first circle that you see, and that's where we are right now. The committee, the steering committee, recently we provided an overview of the conceptual knowledge of the provost, we've had a chance to talk with the staff council just last week and with the deans as well. And so, our first priority was to come to the BFC to have this discussion. That's where we are right now. And then we will move this summer into a prototype model development and then into a functional model because the model itself will not become fully functioning until fiscal year 2027. Now you'll see these arrows between each one of the circles and that's indicating this continuous feedback loop. Even though we don't have one on the functional model, there will be a continued review process. So we're going to be looking at feedback now, feedback when we look at the prototype and see some of the pluses and minuses also taking into account different changes that are happening in our external environment.

So some of the key model impacts, since we have limited time, we wanted to really focus on this, is one piece that the committee felt strongly about is a centrally-funded salary pool. I think people have discussed in the past how one unit might be able to do a salary pool increase while another unit might not be able to because sometimes there was this thought that an RCM-based budget created disadvantages for that, and that entail impacts the employee, impacts the faculty and the staff within

that unit. So, what we're looking at is a centrally-funded annual salary pool, and that's for the salary increase. It does not determine the salary increase for the employee; it is just a mechanism to provide the same amount of funding availability to each unit for the salary pool increase. Second one is to distribute undergraduate tuition to schools based on instruction, but also based on major, support health insurance costs for SAAs through central campus funding, centrally fund all instructional and learning spaces-we'll get to this one a little bit later, but one of the barriers that we have found as well when reviewing the current model was the ability to renovate different labs and studios and performance spaces. Classrooms aren't just classrooms where there are desks and technology equipment, a lot of that happens in these multidisciplinary spaces and in arts as well. So we want to make sure that there's funding set aside. Same thing for instructional technology upgrades and lifecycle replacement, and that includes in the classroom, but then also ongoing software updates for faculty and staff, our annual computer updates. And then lastly is safety and security enhancements across campus. There are a few things that we will continue to review during the prototype but could be part of phase two because of the complexity and/or involvement in other areas. So, one is the general education. The BFC is going to be working, as you all know are working on a review and developing a framework. And so the estimated completion is around June of 2026 to have that feedback. Another one is the PhD education and research. Again, looking at our external impacts that we might be facing, but then also how should we fund PhD education and research. David Daleke had reported back to this group when looking at our peers in our Big 10, it matches very closely to what we are doing now. And we even reached out to other institutions that went in one path and then came back to our current distribution, which is the unit where the PhD student sits. However, we are going to continue to look at this and model different impacts. And the last one would be R and R, which is our repair and rehabilitation of buildings and setting up mechanisms so that there's understanding of what renovations are going to be done on the campus when those could be done and giving the provost a little bit more eye into that involvement in that process.

[Soni]

Okay. As Amy pointed out, this is a dynamic process. This is a dynamic model and one of the things that we are proposing is a new committee called the IUB Financial Advisory Committee. This is a committee that will consist of the Vice Provost for finance and Administration, academic leadership from around the campus, and also representation from staff and student leadership groups. The committee will serve as an advisory role to the provost and the chancellor. They'll analyze the budget model from time to time, including the impacts and the priorities and make recommendations on any adjustments. A couple of things to note. First, the academic deans of each unit will maintain the final authority on their unit strategic priorities as well as fiscal planning. And the role of the BFC Budgetary Affairs Committee will remain the same, including integral contributions to the annual provost budget conferences, which are going on right now or are they just finished today?

Okay. Several things. There are several sources of income and the biggest source obviously is the undergraduate education. We also get straight state appropriations and let me address those two first there on the left-hand side of this particular slide. Those two will help form the campus revenue allocation. We are proposing to use some of the monies for undergraduate financial aid like we do today. The undergraduate tuition as well as the state appropriations will help with a fund called the strategic fund. We'll talk about that and a second fund called the general fund supplement and we'll talk about that as well. The last fund, the general fund supplement is a new fund that we are proposing as part of this budget redesign. And then the rest of the undergraduate tuition will be allocated to the units as Aimee pointed out, based on two things, credit hours as well as the number of majors. The number of majors is a new concept. Units spend a lot of resources supporting their majors and so that's the

rationale for bringing in the majors. Graduate tuition will flow back to the units a hundred percent, the way it is done right now. IU Foundation funding back to the units depending on the donor intent and the various other things that come with funding from the foundation. ICRs will continue to operate the same way. 70% will go to the school of the PI and 30% will go to the office of the Vice President for Research. And then any of the fundings through services or fees, we'll go back to the service provider. Okay, I'm going to skip over that and let's talk a little bit about the expense side of things and Aimee will talk about that.

[Heeter]

Alright, so one of the things the committee reviewed was how we would allocate the expenses, and we talk about the expenses is to be looking at the expenses for the administrative units, other units such as the library, student life, undergraduate education. And we started by a combination. We looked at how university administration was going to allocate some of their costs in trying to build upon some of the metrics so we could create some stability or some level of sickness between our multiple different campuses. And we looked at, do we have fewer drivers or several drivers? And that's something that many schools look at when they update their budget models. And for those of you that have been around for multiple years or decades such as myself, you know that we've gone through phases where we have had a number of drivers, the biggest complaint, it does create some transparency, a potential transparency into the exact cost. How many times your particular student went to the library. However, the biggest drawback that we always found with that in the past and currently is it doesn't give units the ability to plan at the dean level or even at the department level. When they're planning new programs, new degrees, they're really trying to figure out how many faculty do we need? How much space do we maybe need for the research? How many students do we want to bring in? And being able to understand what the potential other costs are has been really helpful. So, looking at drivers that would be somewhere in the middle to allow us to have that simplicity to plan, but also provide the flexibility to the essential administration for unknowns that happen from time to time and reduce uncontrollable costs. And so what we wanted to really do with that one was to really look at what would work best. So what we looked at was to allocate this to the support units using something that would be metric based, which aligns with the university administration and the accountability, the predictability and some level of transparency.

All of these throughout the process, as Ash mentioned, there will be committee developed as well, and they will, one, be updated and involved throughout the planning process, but also during the implementation. What are these drivers? All of these things are always changeable. It needs to fit the culture of the campus as well as the culture of society in general and what those needs might develop for the students, the faculty and the staff. And the database methodology will help provide some incentives to control some of our costs, especially on our administrative side, creating a lot more transparency and then reallocating resources to common good as well as priorities when possible.

So, the expense metrics that we're looking at right now, again, we're at the conceptual model and what we're moving into is the prototype. So there's several listed here and some of these might continue, some of them might be combined, but it will be done so in a consultative fashion where we'll have input throughout. So, one is looking at academic FTE - those would be appointed positions, would not be looking at part-time - appointed staff positions, and we tend to use FTEA a little bit more than just head count - Bloomington is one that has a stronger full-time population, but the part-time population also comes and goes in flux - student headcount or credit hours - we'll be building prototypes based on both - assignable square footage as well as direct expenses. I'm not sure if it's on this next slide and I don't think it is, but one note to say on the assignable square footage, a big change that we'll be looking at for this upcoming budget model is to move away from where we looked at space specifically by the unit. If

it was your classroom, you're paying for that assignable square footage. Instead, we're going to be looking at it a little bit more globally when it comes to space in terms of lab space, classroom space, those are all common good spaces. So, kind of will help some of those units that felt hampered by having large spaces, but maybe low enrollment or size capacity limits based on the type of instruction that they provide. And a few other... And then the direct expenses. So we went through, I just hit point number two. We just sit through the annual salary pool, how we're going to change the instructional learning spaces, looking at funding for instructional technology as well as upgrades, and then the safety and enhancements across the campus. That part right now, just so you know, is we're looking to our campus partners to provide us out with some more details.

What we wanted to do for cost effectiveness as well is, this is a need in many different departments. So we really shouldn't have each unit having to try to find money in their budget to make sure their students and faculty felt secure. We should be doing this as a campus. And then the last one too is that the allocation of the R and R funding is looking at how we make a little bit more of a visible imprint change within some of our classrooms. I think you might've mentioned Project Inspire, if you've seen as far as the 2030 strategic plan, we've been focusing on some major lab renovations in the sciences and this is kind of continuing that with some other enhancements from faculty committee on space.

Alright, so campus involvement and feedback. Just I'll go through this one quickly. This is where we are right now. March 4th we are at the Bloomington Faculty Council. And then in the spring into the summer we'll continue to have town halls, meetings with units throughout. And this is also where you will be able to get more information or to give us direct feedback. We do not have a code; we have to get with Lamar on how to create a code and put that on here. But you can submit us questions and comments, invite us if you have a department meeting and you want people to come and discuss this, we are happy to throughout the process. Again, a number of participants from the Bloomington Faculty Council have been part of this and happy to partner with them as we have these discussions. So with that,

[Shrivastav]

Thank you very much. We have a few minutes for Q&A. Yes, Jackson?

[Jackson]

Hi, I'm Matthew. I'm the GPSGSA representative. And so I heard that you have developed this in conversation with staff and faculty and other administrators, but I just wanted to put this in the context of our previous discussion, this meeting that it seems like graduate stipends are something of a point of contention in the budget. And so I was wondering if there's any intention from your committee to incorporate the voices of graduate students in any way to these budgetary discussions that determine if some people get to eat or not?

[Soni]

Yeah. Two things here. One is as we sort of take this budget redesign on the road and have town halls, we fully expect feedback from graduate students and other student bodies. And second, that committee that I just talked about will have a student representative there. So we will have student representation on that committee going forward.

[Heeter]

And also, we'll continue to look for ways if you or others have other models from other institutions as well, please, please get those to us. That allows us to incorporate it, whether it's right away, whether it's in a phase-in approach, we will definitely want to take that feedback. Appreciate it.

[Stoffman]

Thank you. Noah Stoffman, Kelley School. I'm wondering, I assume that most of this process was done before there was an awareness of the changes that appear to be coming from federal funds. And I'm wondering if this budget model will allow a response to that sort of new reality or if there will be a need to come up with an entirely new budget model in the coming months. I'm just trying to sort of think that through.

[Soni]

Noah. That's a really good question. You're absolutely right. Most of this work was done before a lot of these new policies were enacted in Washington DC. Even on some of the new policy changes, we don't know where they're going to go. So I suspect what will happen is that as we work our way through these next few weeks and more information becomes available, we'll try and incorporate that into the model. As I said, this is a dynamic model and that's something that we'll have to look at.

[Heeter]

And when we have more time, when we have more time to kind of express, there were three pots of funding, and the two pots are the strategic funding and then there's also another pot for campus allocation or general campus funding. That creates a little bit more flexibility for the provost to kind of, as these things start to happen, what's most central that we might need to be able to pivot and provide different resources for people. But, a hundred percent, these are things that we're going to continue, whether it's the ones that we know of today or five new ones that come out on Friday, we'll continue to work through this.

[Shrivastav]

Somebody there had their hand up, Diane?

[Henshel]

Sorry guys, just to request. IT is like a piece of two of these, I think. And since IT has been fully centralized theoretically at IU, could you, in your next round, start clarifying where all the IT pieces are going? And from especially, I think what I'm most concerned about right now, honestly, is cybersecurity, especially given the fact that the federal government is dropping its cybersecurity against our major threats. And I know how much that's been a focus before and just kind of wondering if you guys could cover that and make sure that that's being addressed. Thank you.

[Heeter]

Yeah, sure. Thanks Diane. Definitely we will do that. But that is exactly where some of the discussion and that mention of that came in. For those of you that have been around five years ago, we used to have a partnership where there was campus funding and university-level funding that would pay for ongoing upgrades. And so that was a concern that, would computers continue to be upgraded on the three-to-five-year cycle, or would we start running that cybersecurity risk? So that's where we started to do this so that we could ensure that they, and I say I think of you, it would tell us whether it's three years or five years, how often do we upgrade? And those upgrades would be along what we would consider to be

builder grade, here's your standard, and if there's some enhancements, then that would come from the units.

[Duncan]

So, thank you for the presentation. I think the way I'm interpreting the model, and just correct me if I'm wrong, is so we can think of revenue comes in at least the first chunk, the undergrad tuition, and I don't remember the second piece, but the state appropriations, so that comes in to the units and then the university, or let's say the campus in this case basically applies a tax rate, collects some revenue and uses that to fund some stuff. And the rest of it goes to the unit. And it seems like what you're proposing is to increase that tax rate and then take some of the expenses from the units. So some of the expenses get centralized and you're increasing the tax rate to fund those additional expenses. So I wonder if you could talk a little bit about what's driving those two. So these are the things we want to centralize and then this is what the tax rate needs to be to fund these things or this is the tax rate we want and with this revenue we can fund a bunch of things and then maybe just a little bit of how that tax rate differs from the tax rate that currently applies.

[Soni]

Okay. You want me to take that? Sure. Okay. A couple of things. I talked about the general fund supplement that we're going to create at the central pool level. This will consist of two sources of funding. One will be the state appropriation. They will not flow back to the units, they'll flow back into the general fund, and the second will be some portion of the undergrad tuition. And the general fund supplement will be used for several things. One would be the annual salary pool that'll come from that particular fund. It'll be a central fund and then it'll be also used as a smoothing mechanism. Aimee alluded to that for what's going on right now. But as we move to the new model, it's quite possible that some smoothing will be needed to keep units whole. So we are going to a new model and that could sort of create some inequities some way and that's what it's going to be used for. And so the central pool is the one that will drive that. And then you want to talk a little bit about the taxes?

[Heeter]

Yeah, so I think the goal there was being very decentralized. What were the issues being decentralized compared to being centralized and what was it that needed to be fixed? And so that was the premise. And so that's how we morphed more into this hybrid model so that we could do those things a little bit more frequently that might need to be done in terms of needs for the students and needs for the faculty and staff. Compensation was one of the biggest ones, so that was the biggest driver to move to this. It is, and for those of us that work in the world of numbers, it's really hard to stay in that conceptual model because we're ready to move into the prototype and see what those net effects are. We're going to work on those, and the goal is that there will not be any set winners or losers as a result that people will be starting at a current place as to where they are right now, if there are no structural deficits in place. And that we would then would continue to be able to move more into this hybrid model where people aren't worried that everything that we do is tied to finance. We're here as the academic mission and the academic mission should lead the finances. And that was just kind of a way for us to move in that direction as well.

[Shrivastav]

Okay, thank you Aimee. That brings us to 4:30 just in time. Perfect. Thank you very much. Please continue to engage with Ash and Aimee. Use those emails and thank you for joining us. The meeting is adjourned.