

Leadership

- There was a lot of general discussion about the mistrust that faculty have across campuses with the administration
- Feeling that the administration doesn't take faculty governance seriously
- Hidden agenda that administration takes with faculty
- Not much faculty input in admin. decisions - example, merit raises
- How to change the tone?
 - Administration needs to be more transparent in dealing with the faculty. Example: "this is what merit means"
 - Feeling that the University moving too much towards a business model, not necessarily a good thing
 - State of faculty governance - on some campuses they feel like it's in good shape, on other campuses some concern
 - Faculty being more assertive in what do we want from the administration, particularly behind the scenes, rather than confrontational "this is what the faculty needs vs we need help, how can you help us solve this problem"
 - Recognition that it takes a lot of time and effort to change the tone, but need to work together.

Incentives

- Redefined topic and thought of it as "how do you build incentives and remove disincentives toward building a community of scholars"
- Focused on word "community." Community requires two things: engagement and accepting responsibility for running that community
- We have a role in shared governance and our colleagues aren't sharing that burden/responsibility
- Switching thinking about this service in the interest in the community from a burden to something that is positive
- Started looking at the untenured - focused almost exclusively on TT faculty because that's the body of people to become most engaged and take responsibility for governing the community
- Taking faculty when they first come, before tenured and thinking about things we can do with faculty orientation to make it more meaningful and to get across the message of being on committees. Will work better in the second year rather than first year. Need to get teaching, labs, etc. running. Appears that faculty orientation done by administrators, faculty needs to take responsibility for designing orientation
- Mentor at departmental level. Formal mentoring programs in departments, others are more informal.
- Have a departmental lunch every two weeks. Nothing attracts faculty to get together than food.
- Faculty becoming a commodity of the administration, are the faculty more accepting of this?
- Shared element taking responsibility for shared governance
- Post-tenure period - when some colleagues never serve on a committee again and how to build community when people don't participate. Incentive we have is merit raises. The administration can't just put out a strategic report and not put resources into it. Reward service, reward people who substantially assist with shared governance process, then why should anyone do it?
- The entire university system - some examples of competition, non-cooperation. How do you build a community outside of one's own campus

- One of the suggestions made there is an English department on every campus, have a once/twice a year conference, rotates around various campuses. Not going to work in every discipline, but there are core disciplines where everyone can share teaching, research experiences. Go all the time to present research at other campus, not IU.
- Have to have some resources. We allocate a lot of resources to dismantling community, to sew dissension among faculty - large salary gaps, giving some people fewer teaching loads - we need some resources put into making these things work.

JSA

Thrilled to hear about faculty orientation. HR 2020 talks about orientation, been on personal to-do list for a long time. Something that varies tremendously among campuses. Always kind of defaults to administrative things you need to know. All of which is important and is a huge information dump on your first day/week but doesn't convey other expectations about culture. That would be a great topic to get UFC more involved, FACET does some things like that, so there are lot of different things that could be done and some sensible orientation between U-wide and campus-specific information.

Resources

- Taking about physical and other ways to create a better sense of community, mix of IUB, IUPUI and regional people at table
- Doable, promising opportunities
- Prioritize dedicated, nice space for faculty to do drop-in stuff. When we think about a master plan for a campus, a place to faculty to do stuff should be on the list of priorities.
- Example from IUB: non hierarchal things that take you out of your normal department/school/structure writing groups, multiple groups but each group is only 8-10 people. Commit to writing and sharing their writing weekly. Provost's office put resources into with logistical stuff. That was way to include people from across campus.
- Teaching space. Are we looking at how things impact faculty, schedule of classes, meetings, informal things to schedule
- Fun aspect. That you can create community by having non-work activities (regatta at IUPUI, first Thursday at IUB) or other "fun" things that bring people together outside of the normal channels of action.
- Virtual ways to accomplish writing groups. There are ways to create these opportunities to learn more about each other beyond "hi I'm from this school and have this role"
- Shared fun and common enemy
- Community and structure are different things. Already have a whole lot of structure.

Students - Staff - Faculty

- Doing community based research studies (IPFW) research connections at IUSB and Notre dame and getting more students there involved in research areas.
- How to build on idea of scholars across campuses, cross-campus conference idea. Where would that initiative come from?
- The crucial thing is that while the community of each campus is distinct, and so it would be a bit artificial to unify the entire university into a tight-knit group. Tink about ways of building that sense

of shared purpose on each campus locally so that there was no campus where staff, students or campus would think that there is “no there, there”

General Discussion

Tanford: We worry about disincentives in the current structure. Example the trend toward letting the administration to make more and more decisions about the how the university runs as opposed to the balance between faculty and administration. The problem is as much the faculty have acquiesced, not a power grab by administrators. Thought some of those incentives are just there in the system that says we are going to do what every other research institution is going to do. We're 50% of the leadership and we haven't done anything about this. Two part process: administration controls budget and resources they have to use their resources and allocate that and say no to someone who demands a higher salary and then make that money available for other kinds of ... faculty guilty of self-marketing, they're guilty of going along with it.

Downs: I think we have to look outside the university and see what ICHE and general assembly have to tell them. There are a lot of chancellors who had to do things they didn't want to because of edicts from on high

Marsh: Faculty think it's easy for one group to be paranoid about the other when you don't have any interactions outside of work. Need to see others as human.

R. Applegate: There no place to go with up. We have prioritized student success, but have neglected the fact that faculty community needs time and space.

Wert: We were actually were saying good things about administrators as well. There's a feeling that it's a two way street. We need to be helping our administrators by participating in shared governance.

Spang: BFC archives, there was a discussion in 1971 about “no longer having the kind of community we had a decade ago” This is an eternal search for a golden age that may not have ever existed. The point at which community at a campus like IUB was the point at which the big state university decided they needed to compete in the ranking with the private universities. We would save a lot of money and energy if we'd say “we're different, we serve the public”

Johnson: Sometimes find on administration and faculty sides of things were we tried to come together share values there is always an answer that IU is larger, complex institution. Maybe we can agree on one thing - unlike any other university, IU is an institution where serving on one committee or making some describable constitution to service is expected, not a bad idea.

Applegate: At the IFC we maintain a list of charges to committee, what we need to do is carry things over from year to year. Wondering if the co-chairs and executive committee could work on creating a list so UFC isn't starting with a blank slate next year.

Spang: Agree with Colin. Would love if the message about IU is that it is a place where contributing to community, serving on committees is valued. Research service teaching are 5-3-1. Why don't we send a different message with our ratings - 1-1-1. Resistance - I need to write a book and now you're telling me I need to do more? That's where the second-year orientation comes in.

Tanford: Takes cooperation from the administration that if we tell them 2-1-1 or 1-1-1 then there has to be truth to it. That message about the value of being a part of community has to be from when they walk in the door. There has to be a policy.

Kravchuk: Message has be consistent all the way down.

Johnson: We over proceduralize. One of the issues is it's a simple question "name one thing that you've done to contribute to community" on the annual report. Saying very clearly that it is not a bad decision for everyone to be picking their service contribution and reporting. If the message is handed down from provosts and chancellors and deans ... We do it to our colleagues "this is the official line but here's how it actually works"