

Minutes of the University Faculty Council Meeting

December 13, 2022 | 1:30 - 4:30 p.m. EST

Meeting held via zoom.

Meeting start time: 1:30 pm.

Executive Committee Business

Cate Reck, Joseph Wert, and Philip Goff, Co-chairs of the University Faculty Council

Updates provided regarding the following, with documents attached to the agenda.

Bloomington campus updates provided by Cate Reck:

- Bloomington is involved in strategic planning; Working groups will be handing suggestions to the planning committee, and subsequently to the Executive committee. It is anticipated that the strategic plan will be sent to President Whitten the first week of March.
- BFC task force on general education issued a report for suggested improvements. Many of the suggestions overlap those identified as student success pillars. This will be revisited after strategic planning process has been completed.
- Update of the new UFC Research Affairs Committee. Committee constituted in August in 2022.
- Bloomington campus also has the BFC Task force on research reorganization. They began in August and issued a report in Nov, that is posted on the website
- Search for VP for Research has begun; search firm is soliciting applicants for qualified candidates at IUVPR@storebacksearch.com
- BFC is working with GSPG to continue to help improve graduate student issues; reconstituted the student appointee academic affairs committee (SAAAC), who are charged with anticipating future problems for graduate students, recommend improvement in policies regarding SAA's on campus and implement changes and improvements.
- Graduate school has been decentralized back to regional campuses.
- SAA task force/committee is working to increase transparency around exiting policies related to SAAs. Existing policies around mediations and board of review committee policies hare being reviewed and updated. Internal and external review documents created for mediations; scripts created to ensure consistency and equity between parties; website being developed.

Philip Goff provided IFC updates

- Ombudsman team: The faculty grievance team was created who are ombudsman advisory team; the team is not investigatory and doesn't render judgement, is informal and is involved in shuttle diplomacy between parties and sometime mediation, without issues going to board of review
- IFC strategic planning also nearing its end
- IFC paying attention to Purdue split from IU. Decision came from the Board of Trustees; Purdue is making personnel decisions. Trying to focus on decisions of the home departments, IUPUI was not involved in these discussions even though these faculty were tenured at IU, and although their promotions go through Purdue. These faculty are having to apply for positions in departments again. There is no appeals process. There are Issues for lecturers also. Working closely with faculty behind the sciences to help colleagues during this transition.

Joseph Wert provided update on regional campuses

- Chancellor searches underway
- Statistic planning underway
- Working on getting a common calendar approved.

President Whitten's update:

- Progress to date on realignment of Indianapolis and Bloomington campus; Vision 2024. Launched a website: vision.iupui.edu for transparent communication, including opportunity for public input. Created a governance structure, committees were established and launched 10 task forces. Also appointed team of Indianapolis business, non-profits and civic leaders to provide insight and expertise to the process
- Working to plan a joint biosciences/biomedical engineering institute that will be a combination of IU and Purdue. This is separate from transition to IUPUI. This will leverage health science strength of IU and IUSM and portfolios along with the engineering strengths of Purdue; and setting up initial priorities, funding requirements and other resources required for launching
- Already established a data sharing agreement between IU and Purdue
- At the trustees meeting in December 2022, announced intention to create a dedicated science and technology corridor that seeks to extend stem education and curriculum to accelerate IUPUI and IU.
- Biannual budget request 2023-25 was presented to the state budget committee. Full state budget will be finalized in April 2023. Tuition and fee guidance will be issued in May; In June, Board of Trustees will tuition and fees for that biannual.
- State appropriations for Indiana for higher education falls into 3 areas: operation, line item/special projects capital funding. Operational funding is determined by an outcomes-based funding formula. Currently, there are efforts for developing recommendations for a new formula. Line item requested 2.5% increase. Capital project request is focused on deferred maintenance for regional campuses and for renovations on Bloomington and IU.

Graduate Faculty Council Updates

David Daleke, Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Health Sciences and Interim Dean of the IU Bloomington University Graduate School, IU Bloomington

Janice Blum, Dean of the Graduate School Indianapolis and Associate Vice Chancellor for Graduate Education, IUPUI

Bala Arshanapalli, Associate Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, IU Northwest

Natalia Rybas, Associate Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, IU East

- GFC offers a forum to discuss best practices and has been leaning towards making policy decisions.
- At Indianapolis, the graduate affairs committee is well established.
- One of the challenges is subject not focused on policy, diversity....some issues are not relevant to all campuses
- An important part of the graduate faculty councils at regional campuses is discussions of policies that cover multiple campuses; develop extension of policies and how they can be applied and implemented.
- The GFC sets the policies for the graduate school and those are recorded in graduate bulletin; these include the PhD and research based master' degrees. Professional programs that confer their own degrees are outside of those policies, although typically all of our graduate programs follow policies similar to the GFC policies.
- A concern for the GFC council meetings is that they sometimes veer into areas that fall out of focus of the GFC
- GFC constitution has specific details about responsibilities of the council

Q/A period

- Q: During the question and answer period, it was stated that what the UFC and executive committee are trying to determine are the implications of policy making authority for the separation of the graduate school. If the idea of separation of the graduate school is to facilitate and encourage the development of graduate programs on different campuses that are appropriate for the campuses, what happens for example when a change needs to be proposed? Jurisdictional questions become relevant. Who is the responsible body?
- GFC: There is a challenge on how not to have policies deviate too significantly between campuses; recognize opportunities for each campus to have slightly different policies that are specific for the individual campuses. This is major topic of the GFC agenda. We have always had different programs for Purdue. GFC will try to align policies as much as possible. Each campus will continue to have some significant differences.
- Q: Operational funding discussed by President Whitten? Does the new revised state formula for funding affect graduate funding and if not, is that going to be an ask for the university?
- GFC: Meetings scheduled with CFO for each campus to separate budgets, with thought that each campus will support their graduate schools.; re-evaluate offices and structures in each school; GFC will continue to support regional campuses degrees; possibility for collaboration and discussion between campuses; For example, transfer credit, capstones, GFC is discussing questions and concerns at the level of collaborative programs.

- Q: Applicability of policies reflected in the graduate bulletin. Is the understanding that when the graduate school is separated into different units that that existing policy jurisdiction transferred and be applicable to all existing regional campuses.
- A: Whitten: Grad Deans and along with campus leads are looking through that now; reviewing; and are on task addressing that question now.
- GFC: GFC submitted a document to state requesting name changes in which it was indicated that we would not make any changes to our practices or policies at Bloomington or Indianapolis, and we would continue to engage and help regionals if any problems arise with conferring of degree awards. These are ongoing discussions.

Report on Commission for Higher Ed Funding Formula Proposal and Affirmative Action

Dwayne Pinkney, Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration

Trevor Foughty, Associate Vice President of State Relations

- New performance funding model is being considered which tries to reconcile some of the needs of institutions that are not similarly situated. New formulae ties to address and accommodate differences.
- Existing budget model: Start with prior year's operating appropriations which becomes your base, then a reallocation is applied. Generally, 5% of base is removed, and any new funds that the state provides go into a common pot. Several different metrics are applied to determine distribution. Problems arose with large high-performing campuses because they contributed the greatest amount but the reallocation was a flat rate for all. Current formula is slow to respond to data as it based on up to 10 years of previous data. All institutions were viewed relatively the same and didn't take into account differences in campus's missions, student populations etc.
- Working group was established and recommend changes to the formula - completed last fall.
- Moving forward the new formula will be a prospective funding model rather than a retrospective funding model; that could cover current year and future years; there will be prospective appropriations which will be contingent upon hitting benchmarks or goals over the course of the biennium and beyond. Some benchmarks will be similar will be somewhat similar for all institutions while others will be different. Importantly, will try to respect the institution's mission differentiation for example student population, size etc, and will include institution specific metrics.
- The new model is a performance funding model. Start with prior year base, there are no reallocations, and each institution is eligible to prospective appropriations.
- One of the concerns raised against the reallocation model is that it was meant to be rate sizing mechanism. In theory, if a campus saw a sharp drop in enrollment, then reallocations would decrease, whereas those that saw a growth in enrollment would see an increase in reallocations. In practice, this created disincentives for large institutions.
- In the new prospective model, each institution has the ability to earn more than they have had in the past. School of Medicine and Dentistry are held out of the formula because they produce different type of degrees. Similarly, IU FW is held out of the formula until they have 10 years of data- this will need to be addressed in the future with the IUPUI split
- Formula is not approved yet.

Q/A period

- Q: The prospective model addresses undergrads used in funding model, but grad level degrees are not being considered?
- A: In the existing formula, grad degrees are counting as total degrees completion. However, while they are in there now, grad degrees are funded at a lower rate than undergrad degrees. The reason the focus has been on completion, it the state has had the goal of 60% college degree attainments, shifted over time to post-secondary credential attainment, so all funding has been going there. However, funding rate has not yet reached 60% degree rate; but there are ways we can impact the state.
- For Bloomington and IUPUI there will be research metrics; e.g. NSF and NIH funding; with state hitting a set number; or align it with specific state goals, for example the state is interested in the area of micro-electronics; for regional campuses those metrics may look at where we have shortage areas, such as nursing. Conversations are ongoing for what metrics would look like.
- Note: Proposed funding formula has not been approved yet.

- Q: Who is setting the metrics? What is the composition of committees? How often will they be reviewed?
- A: Discussions are still ongoing; may need individuals in different roles, including academic people, research people, people with different regions. Would like to see continued legislative input into the formula; currently it is not very opaque.
- Q: Do you anticipate new metrics will include progress towards degree completion and on-time completion?
- A: Yes, elements on that will still be there. There are a lot of conversations on the leaky workforce pipeline. Funding in this area may go in 3 areas (college going rate; completion rate and economic impact to state).
- Q: Whitten: request to ask you to speak about potential changes to affirmative action and what it could mean.
- A: there are two cases; one against Harvard and UNC. At this point there is nothing in federal law that prohibits affirmative action or race conscious admissions procedures. However, there are some state laws that prohibit that. The supreme court ruling may block that in some way, or US congress could pass a law against it, or they could pass legislation that does allow it but is still consistent with the court's opinion; There is also some thought that the Department of Education under the Biden administration may look at making title IX link to diversity of the student campuses, but not sure how this is going to play out until the ruling come out in 2023.

Updates from UFC Research Affairs Committee

Sally Letsinger, Senior Research Scientist, IU Bloomington

Deborah Marr, Associate Professor, IU South Bend

Tom Stucky, Professor, IU

- New research affairs committee has been discussing 3 main responsibilities: advise the VP for Research and the UFC on research matters, collaborate on plans for strengthening research infrastructure, and develop university wide policies and procedures that improve the university environment.
- The Issues that have been discussed include:
 - centralization of research administration, particularly at IUPUI and Bloomington; the capacity model for the regional campuses which proposes that faculty who have been deemed to be unproductive in research will have their time reassigned to teaching responsibilities; research infrastructure issues on on all of the campuses; the importance of research certification and accreditations in order to do research and to attract and retain faculty; research funding transparency.
- One core point that will be repeated is that a world-class university research enterprise is best achieved through strategic input and planning from all of the campuses. We are a complex organization and we need information from people on the ground to see how new procedures and policies will affect
- Information has been organized into strengths weaknesses, opportunities, and threats.
 - Strengths: Multi-campus structure, unique missions of each region, diverse approaches to the research enterprise, human research capital. We cannot be homogenous in mission as each campus has a unique mission and therefor research contributions on each campus need be evaluated on those campus specific standards. Each campus contributes to local economy. Research experiences on all of the campuses are critical for meeting the IU mission.
 - Weaknesses: Minimal faculty engagement in some recent proposals; striking reduction in faculty engagement; Implementation of initiatives, for example the capacity model, appears to have had limited planning or limited information provided; examples of opaque-top down decisions have been regularly received over the last year; some research productive metrics undervalue research impact; experiential learning helps prepare students.
 - Opportunities: Leverage funding talent through shared true shared governance; recognize role of regional campuses in research; Indiana workforce development; Mentor and train student researchers and scholars; Develop a world-class research environment (retention, integrate research enterprise of all levels across all campuses/leverage research); Integrate research enterprise for undergrad, grad and faculty across campuses
 - Threats: System wide budget cuts; Lack of infrastructure resilience; proposals to centralize ICR/RCM limit local flexibility and innovation; Loss of voluntary certifications and accreditations that are critical to research; Difficulty in faculty recruiting and retention during transition; Research capacity model does not recognize or reward faculty for work in all areas critical to the IU mission. Every campus in the IU system has separate and important missions.

- Recommendations: Aim for clear communication, transparency and utilize faculty consultation; embrace shared governance; engage faculty in research administration reorganization and search for new VPR; delay the implementation of the capacity model; recognize the importance of program certificates, accreditations; Invest in research infrastructure and facilities; reduce barriers to cross-campus collaborations.
- Conclusions: it is critical to be good stewards at IU, but at some point it becomes difficult to achieve the strategic goals across the multiple campuses without investments; work together to be identify ways to be lean and efficient.

Q/A period

- Learning Technologies Steering committee has discussed Zoom renewal: Zoom has been renewed for at least two years (possibly three); system-wide.

Motion to Amend ACA-33 Code of Academic Ethics

James Alexander Tanford, Chair of the UFC Policy Review Committee, IU Bloomington [Action Item]

- Presented summary of the proposed amendment of language in the Code of Academic Ethics policy; consolidated certain areas to avoid redundances; three substantive changes made as follows:
 - Old policy required an instructor to present all instances of record to campus; changed so that minor honesty can be handled in the class as a teaching moment for plagiarism.
 - New section on work-life balance: avoid regularly scheduling outside of standard business hours
 - Language added on how complaints of faculty misconduct is handled; included provision that campus has the right to define set of faculty misconduct.
 - Specific definition of what is meant to be regularly on campus? No; this was not added to the language, due the complexity of the different campuses; need to be defined by the units, therefore this was not added.

Vote conducted via the chat function on zoom

- 28 = Yes vote, 0 = no votes (total votes will be confirmed at the conclusion of the meeting)
- Amendment passed

Meeting ended: 4:30 pm.

Minutes taken by Angela Bruzzaniti, UFC Secretary.