IUPUI
Indianapolis Faculty Council (IFC)
Minutes
February 4, 2020 ~ Campus Center 450C ~ 3-5 p.m.


Agenda Item I: Welcome and Call to Order
IUPUI Faculty Council Vice President Jeff Watt called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

Agenda Item II: Adoption of the Agenda as the Order of Business for the Day
The Agenda was adopted as the Order of Business for the Day.

Agenda Item III: [Action Item] Approval of the Minutes of the January 14, 2020, Meeting
The minutes of the January 14, 2020, meeting were approved and entered into the record.

Agenda Item IV: Updates/Remarks from the Chancellor
Nasser Paydar, Indiana University Executive Vice President and Chancellor of IUPUI

Paydar read the following statement regarding the coronavirus.

With regard to IUPUI's response to the novel coronavirus, the campus and Indiana University as a whole are following recommendations of federal agencies including the U.S. State Department, the Centers for Disease Control, and Health and Human Services. The university's Executive Policy Group, of which I am a member, is working in coordination with emergency management teams from all campuses to discuss and coordinate our efforts university wide. Together, we are carefully monitoring this fluid situation. The latest university updates as well as policies and information can be found at the Protect IU website.
As in every situation, the health and well-being of our faculty, staff, and students are our number one priority. Our goal is to create a safe and productive environment where all of us feel welcome and included. We will follow university policies and recommendations in order to keep our faculty, staff, and students safe, but this health situation does not provide an occasion to discriminate or exercise bias against people because of their countries of origin. To report a bias incident, go to the Office of Equal Opportunity website. We will remain vigilant in protecting the core values that make our campus an inclusive academic community that welcomes people from around the world.

I ask the campus community to join me in supporting our colleagues, students, and friends across IUPUI who are being impacted by this health crisis.

Paydar reported on the following:
- Thank you to Phil Goff (School of Liberal Arts) for heading the task force charged with reviewing the new structure for research and graduate education. This task force has met once.

**Agenda Item V: Updates / Remarks from the IFC President**
John Watson, President, IUPUI Faculty Council

Watson reported on the following:
- The Executive Committee and co-chairs of the University Faculty Council (UFC) are forming a new task force to focus on faculty affairs. The previous UFC Faculty Affairs Committee was disbanded. In the last few years, several items have come up that should be addressed by a Faculty Affairs Committee. The Policy Review Committee cannot handle all policy matters regarding faculty and currently there is no committee to get this kind of feedback from. This task force is formed for a trial run and have guidelines to follow. The new task force will have six members and two from each campus (one non-tenure-track and one tenure-track faculty member). Tina Baich from University Library and Lin Zheng from the Kelley School of Business will represent IUPUI on this task force. There is no timeline on the trial yet.
- The UFC is continuing their work on the non-tenure-track faculty voting issue.

**Agenda Item VI: [First Read] Bylaw Change: Ombudsteam**
Dan Griffith, Director, Conflict Resolution and Dialogue Programs on behalf of the IFC Constitution and Bylaws Committee

Circular 2020-02: Proposed Changes to the Bylaws of the IUPUI Faculty Council

Griffith reported on the appended presentation.

Watt said that this is a first read for the bylaw change and there will be a vote at the next meeting on the changes.

**Agenda Item VII: [Action Item - Vote] Election of the Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel**
(Election to be held electronically after February 4)

Watt suggested the vote on the election of the Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel be suspended until after the council votes on the bylaw change for the Ombudsteam.

**IUPUI Faculty Council: Slate for Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel**
Term: February 1, 2020, through January 30, 2022
Number to Elect: 4; Number to Slate: At least 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>TT03</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolchini</td>
<td>Davide</td>
<td>T02</td>
<td>Informatics and Computing</td>
<td>Human-Centered Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodlett</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>T01</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Josette</td>
<td>T02</td>
<td>Informatics and Computing</td>
<td>Biohealth Informatics/Health Informatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>T02</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vemuri</td>
<td>Gautam</td>
<td>T01</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidal</td>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>T01</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Pathology and Laboratory Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Marquita</td>
<td>T02</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Labor Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watt</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>T01</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[First Read] Slate for the Election of the At-Large Representatives
Ed Berbari, Chair, Nominations Committee

Berbari shared the following slate with the council.

IUPUI Faculty Council: Slate for At-Large Representatives
Term: June 2020 through June 2022
Need to elect 30; number to slate 45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Middle Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andersson</td>
<td>Fredrik O.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-SPEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ando</td>
<td>Masatoshi</td>
<td></td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-DENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anwar</td>
<td>Sohel</td>
<td></td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-ENGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baich</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>LT1</td>
<td>IN-LIBR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boehm</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boukai</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td></td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brant</td>
<td>Herbert</td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-LART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Lance</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-OACA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conner</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>M.</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-COLU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Waal</td>
<td>Cornelis</td>
<td></td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-LART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>Simone</td>
<td></td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-DENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-LART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavrin</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacker</td>
<td>Eileen</td>
<td>Danaher</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-NURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kani</td>
<td>Justin</td>
<td></td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>LT3</td>
<td>IN-LIBR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keefe</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>LT2</td>
<td>IN-LAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>NiCole</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-SHHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td></td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-LART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Il-Man</td>
<td></td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koskie</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td></td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kostroun</td>
<td>Daniella</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-LART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahiri</td>
<td>Debmoy</td>
<td>K.</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Lei</td>
<td></td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Lingxi</td>
<td></td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-E NGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macy</td>
<td>Katharine</td>
<td></td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>LT3</td>
<td>IN-LIBR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mao</td>
<td>Weiming</td>
<td></td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Agenda Item VIII: [First Read] Teaching Professor Criteria
Rachel Applegate, Convener, IFC Ad Hoc Committee to Review Promotion and Tenure
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs
Circular 2020-01: Campus Criteria for Senior Lecturer and Teaching Professor Ranks

Applegate share the proposed guidelines. The next step is to have a vote on the guidelines at the next IFC meeting. Afterward, those interested in applying for promotion in the fall may begin the process.

- Questions / Comments:
  - A faculty member commented that they would like to see data on the reasoning for removing the requirement of disseminated scholarship. There are 240 lecturers on campus, around 80 are senior lecturers. He would like data on the percentage of cohorts that have applied and were denied. He also requested the philosophical rationale and would like to know who benefits in a tangible way. They stated that they worked through 40 years to make sure the academic standards are high, and it feels that they are being asked to lower the bar.
  - Applegate responded that Executive Vice Chancellor Kathy Johnson articulated the philosophical reason in the email update that was disseminated in September. Data regarding teaching professor is available on the Office of Academic Affairs website. Faculty (including clinical assistant and clinical associate faculty) were surveyed in their schools. Applegate reemphasized the inclusive nature of the process.
  - Berbari commented that this is the campus policy, which would be the lowest requirements for the promotion. Schools can go above the campus policy for requirements.
  - Mendonca said that we only have two criteria for professorship, as an example. This is the way it has been on campus for lecturers. The reason for doing this is if you only have two ranks, the jump is high (from one to another). If there are three ranks, the jump does not have to be as high from one to the other. This is why it is necessary to have the extra step in between.
  - Marrs commented that the new middle rank for lecturers will not require the same level of work as is needed for the clinical assistant to associate promotion.
  - Applegate said that the emphasis on peer-reviewed dissemination is related to the requirement to demonstrate teaching excellence. Peer-reviewed dissemination has had so much focus that demonstrating teaching excellence has fallen. There are units where no
one has ever become a senior lecturer. In some cases, upon survey, respondents reported there was no reason to be promoted because nothing would change as a result of going through the process.

**Agenda Item IX: [Information Item] IUPUI Workplace Wellness Survey Results**

Tess Weathers, Research Associate, Richard M. Fairbanks School of Public Health  
Circular 2020-03: Workplace Wellness: Progress Toward a Healthier IU

Weathers spoke to the appended presentation.

There are Healthy IU survey results on the Healthy IU website which can be reviewed item-by-item for the campus.

Questions/Comments:

- One faculty member asked if they looked at turnover for this survey and if there was a report on the (n). Weathers said they did not look at turnover because this survey is not to track individuals year to year, it is to look at population-level results.

**Agenda Item X: [Information Item] Next Gen 2.0 Update**

Kathy Grove, Director, Office for Women  
Gina Sánchez Gibau, Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Diversity and Inclusion

Grove and Gibau spoke to the appended presentation.

**Agenda Item XI: [Information Item] Faculty Census**

Margie Ferguson, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Ferguson spoke to the appended presentation.

Questions/Comments:

- For those 30 percent of people who have actively searched for a new position, does it match the Harvard study? Yes, it matched.
- Is there a cost benefit ratio in how much it costs to hire someone new versus how long it costs to keep that person? It is never good to lose people and it is costly. Vice Chancellor Camy Broecker would be able to answer this question.
- Regarding the slide for the breakdown between adjunct and full-time faculty, how much of this information relates to adjunct faculty? Ferguson said that in this presentation, she discussed full-time faculty, but could present on adjunct. The faculty member stated they felt there should be more adjunct in Herron School of Art + Design than was represented in the slide. Ferguson said that she could share more information about adjunct faculty.

**Agenda Item XII: Call for IFC or UFC Standing Committee Reports**

- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee (L. Jack Windsor, Chair):
  - Windsor reported on the appended handout.

**Agenda Item XIII: Question / Answer Period**

There were no questions.

**Agenda Item XIV: Unfinished Business**

There was no Unfinished Business.
Agenda Item XV: New Business
There was no New Business.

Agenda Item XVI: Report from the IUPUI Staff Council
Aimee Brough, First Vice President, IUPUI Staff Council

Brough reported on the following:
- Caleb Keith, Institutional Research and Decision Support, presented to the Staff Council last month on the climate survey.
- Staff Council continues to support IUPUI athletics and plans to attend an upcoming women’s basketball game. Some members also recently attended a men’s basketball game.
- In February, Staff Council members will be participating in random acts of kindness. Members will be handing out bracelets to campus and community members performing random acts of kindness with a link to the Staff Council website and #randomactsofkindness to help bring awareness to the council.
- Staff Council will buy tickets for both staff and students to attend the Cesar Chavez dinner.

Agenda Item XVII: Final Remarks and Adjournment
With no further business appearing, the meeting was adjourned.

Minutes prepared by Kasey Cummins, communication and administrative specialist of the Office of Academic Affairs
University Hall 5002/274-8974/fcouncil@iupui.edu/http://www.facultycouncil.iupui.edu

Detailed final reports are available on the IFC committee webpage.

Committee Assignments

**Academic Affairs Committee**
Assigned:
- Student Engagement Roster: Review proposal and provide feedback on IFC endorsement to the Executive Committee. The Student Affairs Committee is reviewing as well.
- Voting rights of non-tenure-track faculty within the schools (working with the Faculty Affairs Committee)
- IU Online (Face-to-Face and residency) – Collaborate with the Student Affairs Committee.

Ongoing:
- Credits transferred from campuses within both the IU and Purdue systems, how credits outside these systems are viewed by IUPUI, and how many credits must be taken at IUPUI before an undergraduate diploma may be granted at the IUPUI campus.
- Review of credit transfers and residency.
- How degrees are awarded on diverse campuses and internationally by programs within the IU and PU systems and how they may affect programs on the IUPUI campus.
- Review and recommend to the Faculty Affairs Committee standards used in hiring adjunct faculty.
- Use of LMS (Canvas) data for instructional monitoring (online courses)
- Use of Boost, software that “proactively prevents students from missing assignments.”
- Percentage of a certificate that needs to be completed using IUPUI courses (from 2018-19 Annual Report). Needs endorsement by the IFC.

Completed:

**Budgetary Affairs**
Assigned:
- Change in Resource Planning Committee
• Follow up with Chris Foley about IU Online budget.
• Follow up with ad hoc Library Committee (recommendations on how to move forward).
• IUPUI Budget Updates (continue to follow budget and issues about it).
• Continue conversation with IU Online especially a) support services and b) effect on course.
• Financial Aid—coordination between campus and school efforts.

Ongoing:
• Campus Conversations
• Banded tuition results
• Midwest Student Exchange
• IU Fort Wayne
• RCM Review of University Assessment/Tax
• Continue meetings with deans one on one.
• Conversations with UFC Budgetary Affairs Committee to follow IU budget issues.

**Campus Planning Committee**
Assign:ed:
- Review all surveys that come out during the year.
- Higher Learning Commission mid-cycle report about IUPUI meeting criteria.
- Invite leadership of IU Fort Wayne to meet with the committee and then report to the EC. (Contact: Ann Obergfell)
- Review Summer 2018 IU Communications Audit
- Review student surveys.
- Monitor changes in medical school impact.
- Updates/refreshes of campus strategic plan.
- Results of faculty survey.

Ongoing:
- Campus Conversations
- Examine faculty vitality (IUPUI and School of Medicine)
- IU Branding

**Constitution and Bylaws Committee**
Assign:ed: No assignments as of August 2019.

**Distance Education Committee**
Assign:ed:
- Follow up on CTL “Faculty Crossing”
- Support structure for students who are fully online.
- Follow up on Quality Matters
- Continue follow-up conversations with IU Online.
- Update with eDS.
- Coordinate with Online Director/Faculty Group (revived from 2016-17; to be organized by Rachel Applegate).
- Use of LMS (Canvas) data to assess instructional interactivity and collect date for pro-active compliance (with Academic Affairs).
- Changes to infrastructure given Watermark acquisition of Taskstream, etc.
- Forum Fellows with CTL working on the forum space and resources for instructors.
- Recognition of Online Teaching Faculty.
- Proctoring
- Canvas as a source for data
- Support structure for faculty who are teaching online. Create resources.
- Time faculty are spending on online courses.

**Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee**
Assign:ed:
- Coordinate with Faculty Forum Network (overall structure for faculty development/support)
- Address the strategic plan’s goals and objectives of:
  - Create pathways for success for underrepresented students, faculty, and staff
  - Develop cross-cultural awareness and competence among all members of the IUPUI community (focusing on faculty)
Becoming an employer of choice for faculty by providing meaningful work, improved workplace culture and communication, and advancement opportunities

- Climate Survey
- School diversity strategic plans
- Policies/procedures for incident reporting

**Faculty Affairs Committee**

Assigned:

- Review of Draft Research Disclosure Policies
- Voting rights of non-tenure-track faculty within the schools (working with the Academic Affairs Committee)
- Need for systematic analysis of policies and procedures in the Faculty Guide to assure definitions for “faculty” and “full-time,” for example, are consistent and correctly and appropriately applied: The SAVCAA and the Constitution and Bylaws Committee need to be involved in coordinating this effort.
- Review policies and procedures for tenure, practice plan, and compensation in the School of Medicine.
- Determination of “full-time” faculty, especially for School of Medicine faculty, especially with those whose “effort” and compensation is primarily in IU Health.
- Discuss the creation of a subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee and the campus P&T Committee to review core school policy of P&T at IUPUI.
- Discuss matching Kelley School of Business (IUB) promotion and tenure up through IUPUI.
- Continue with NTT career paths, potential new classifications or ranks.
- How does the Ombudsteam operate? Should the Ombudsteam replace the Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel? Is there training? Can the Ombudsteam sole a faculty member’s issue? Coordinate with new Ombudsteam for methods of addressing faculty concerns.
- Update the language of the policy on Faculty Access to Student Evaluations in the Faculty Guide to reflect the use of Blue.
- Update the language of the Policy on School or Program Restructuring in the Faculty Guide. Clarify the language regarding faculty. Does faculty refer to non-tenure-track or clinical?
- Unit Recommendation Report from Board of Review 18-02.
- Propose Pinnell Award guidelines for the IUPUI campus.
- Lecturer Rank Criteria
- NTTF Voting
- Emeritus status eligibility (in light of changes to include teaching professor)

**Faculty and Staff Relations Committee**

Assigned:

- Bias training
- Discussion on communication across campus including all units and positions.
- Evaluation of the campus pedestrian safety: report back to the committee.
- Search committee training (better and more systematic across campus and at all levels)

**Faculty Guide Committee**

Assigned:

- Need to link to a policy on creating a new department within a school that isn’t in financial distress. Kathy Johnson is willing to construct new language to point to this.
- Addition of language describing clinical rank (similar to language of lecturers).
- Addition of language describing the new teaching professor rank, when available from the campus.

Ongoing:

- Review the guide and updated all links.
- Review the guide and update for obsolete language.
- Review of the term “faculty” throughout the document and particularly in Section 1. Are definitions for faculty clearly defined? Are there definitions that are missing or confusing? Create annotation guide.

**Fringe Benefits Committee**

Assigned:

Ongoing:

- Monitor benefits
- Review forthcoming changes in retirement benefits provider and plan changes.
Library Affairs Committee
Assigned:
- Explore adding doctoral student thesis information to IUPUI transcripts.
- Collaborate with Research Affairs Committee regarding support for R1 university status.
- Link open access uploading to Activity Insight.
- Library Town Halls and Campus Tour
- Improve communication with faculty
- Discuss scholarly communication situation.
- Review and expand the Promotion and Tenure service offered by UL staff.

Ongoing:
- Providing input to and advocating for the University Library at IUPUI
- Continue to monitor Open Access policy
- Evolving nature of the scholarly record
- Training for chairs and associate deans for research (Open Access/ScholarWorks)
- Consider methods of educating general faculty regarding information-access issues.

Promotion and Tenure Committee
Assigned: No assignment given as of August 2019.

Research Affairs Committee
Assigned:
- Limited submission assignments to campuses
- Review of Draft Research Disclosure Policies
- Policy on Centers and Institutes
- Indirect Cost Recovery guidelines to the IFC. Review campus, university, and unit (school) use of ICR funds.
- Center designation process – inventory of active/inactive centers as a first fact-finding step.
- IUCRG Program – faculty input into future directions/funding priorities if the program continues.
- Collaborate with Library Affairs Committee regarding support for R1 university status.
- Monitoring of the Grand Challenges
- Policy on Proposing funds coming from tobacco companies
- Research strategic direction plans
- Use of Academic Analytics to help with incentives for awards for faculty.
- Description of effort of funded studies for dossiers developed for promotion and tenure.

Student Affairs Committee
Assigned:
- Student Engagement Roster: Review proposal and provide feedback on IFC endorsement to the Executive Committee. The Student Affairs Committee is reviewing as well.
- Course Networking (work with Technology Committee)

Ongoing:
- Discussion and vote on the permanence of a grade given as the results of academic misconduct (working with Academic Affairs Committee).
- Review of sexual misconduct policy brought forward by the UFC
- Off-campus student conduct (note new Greek policy)
- Campus climate for adult learners / co-curricular aspects
- Use of LMS (Canvas) for student intervention.
- Elaboration of co-curricular aspects of the Profiles.
- Review of Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct in relation to hate speech.

Technology Committee
Assigned:
- Intellectual Property and ability to share materials
- Communication with UITS
- Update on electronic and IT accessibility
- Find a better way to keep faculty informed. (A task force chaired by Margie Ferguson is underway for 2019-2020.)
• Potential replacement of Taskstream.
• Coordinate with communications task force for faculty information dissemination.
• Digital learning (discussion with Kathy Johnson who serves as a digital scholar with ACUE)
• TopHat
• Pearson’s integration with Canvas.
• Pressbooks (substitute for eTexts or student portfolio) – Open Access link to ScholarWorks.
• Digital Measures changes. The School of Medicine is beginning to use the tool and the changes added will affect the rest of the campus. The changes are felt to be positive.
• Course Networking (work with Student Affairs)
With regard to IUPUI’s response to the novel coronavirus, the campus and Indiana University as a whole are following recommendations of federal agencies including the U.S. State Department, the Centers for Disease Control, and Health and Human Services. The university’s Executive Policy Group, of which I am a member, is working in coordination with emergency management teams from all campuses to discuss and coordinate our efforts university wide. Together, we are carefully monitoring this fluid situation. The latest university updates as well as policies and information can be found at https://protect.iu.edu.

As in every situation, the health and well-being of our faculty, staff, and students are our #1 priority. Our goal is to create a safe and productive environment where all of us feel welcome and included. We will follow university policies and recommendations in order to keep our faculty, staff, and students safe, but this health situation does not provide an occasion to discriminate or exercise bias against people because of their countries of origin. To report a bias incident, go to the Office of Equal Opportunity Website Report an Incident tab and select the Report Bias button. We will remain vigilant in protecting the core values that make our campus an inclusive academic community that welcomes people from around the world.

I ask the campus community to join me in supporting our colleagues, students, and friends across IUPUI who are being impacted by this health crisis.

Nasser H. Paydar
Chancellor
BYLAWS OF THE IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL

BYLAW ARTICLE IV. FACULTY GRIEVANCES PROCEDURES

Section A. Purpose

1. To further the aims of IUPUI in teaching/performance, research/scholarly activity/creative work/professional development, and professional/public service, the faculty has established grievance procedures. These grievance procedures serve the full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty and librarians, full-time clinical and scientist/scholar rank faculty, and full-time lecturers of the IUPUI campus, by providing peer evaluation with respect to administrative actions of dismissal, academic freedom, non-reappointment, tenure, promotion, salary adjustment, and the nature or conditions of work. Equity for the individual and the good of the university shall always be considered.

2. The IUPUI Faculty Ombudsteam Grievance Advisory Panel is an elected faculty group designed to be available early on in the course of developing emerging concerns or potential grievances. It is further designed to provide designated places and persons for faculty to voice concerns and learn about options for channeling criticisms and addressing complaints so that faculty can be fully informed about possible actions and consequences before they make a decision as to what steps, if any, to take next. The IUPUI Faculty Ombudsteam serves all IUPUI faculty, including both full- and part-time faculty and librarians who may utilize these grievance procedures and other faculty and librarians who may wish to voice concerns but otherwise lack standing to file a formal grievance pursuant to these procedures.
   a) The Faculty Ombudsteam Grievance Advisory Panel members are available to serve as impartial consultants for faculty/librarians and administrators who seek confidential informed advice from senior faculty colleagues.
   b) The Ombudsteam Panel members also are available to help resolve situations informally by the following means:
      • encouraging and facilitating discussions between the parties to the grievance, identifying and evaluating options and possible solutions to respond to concerns
      • providing coaching, shuttle diplomacy or informal mediation
      • making referrals to appropriate resources within and outside the university for additional support
      • with the faculty member or librarian’s consent and without serving as an advocate for the individual, making formal inquiries and ensuring concerns are heard with relevant university administrators, offices and representatives
      • advocating for fair, objective processes for addressing and resolving concerns and potential grievances
      • encouraging and facilitating discussions between the parties to the emerging concern or potential grievance.
   c) At the conclusion of its work, the Faculty Ombudsteam Grievance Advisory Panel shall not compile any report or file containing the specific information of any concern or potential grievance brought to it.

3. A Faculty Board of Review is to consider grievances, via a Formal Hearing, to gather appropriate information, and to consider its findings in light of existing policies and
principles of fairness. The Board of Review shall file a written report of its findings and recommendations in a timely and expeditious manner.

4. In each formal grievance case, the Faculty Board of Review acts in an impartial way. It is not an advocate for the faculty member or librarian, nor is it an advocate for the administration. The Board shall determine:
   a) whether appropriate procedures were followed;
   b) whether the grievance arose from inadequate consideration of the qualifications of the faculty member or librarian;
   c) whether presentation of erroneous information substantially affected the decision; and
   d) whether essential fairness was accommodated throughout the decision-making process.
   e) The Boards of Review may consider the issues set forth in 4 a-d regarding promotion and/or tenure grievances, but a Board of Review shall not function as a substitute Promotion and Tenure Committee.

5. In those cases in which the Board of Review concludes that the rights of a faculty member or librarian have not been adequately protected, the Board is expected to formulate a recommendation for remediation.
Section B. Submission of Grievances

1. A faculty member or librarian seeking advice about or informal assistance with review of an administrative action may contact:
   a) the President of the IUPUI Faculty; or,
   b) the Chair or any member of the Faculty Ombudsteam Grievance Advisory Panel.
   1) The Ombudsteam Panel roster will be available in the IUPUI Faculty Council Office.

2. A faculty member or librarian may consult informally with a member of the Faculty Ombudsteam Grievance Advisory Panel before filing a formal grievance for a Board of Review.

3. A faculty member or librarian may request that a grievance be considered by a Faculty Board of Review without first presenting it to the Faculty Ombudsteam Grievance Advisory Panel.

Section C. Composition and Election of Faculty Ombudsteam Grievance Advisory Panel

1. The Faculty Ombudsteam Grievance Advisory Panel shall consist of seven members of the IUPUI tenured faculty and librarians nominated by the Executive Committee and elected by the IUPUI Faculty Council at its January meeting. Members of the IUPUI Senior Academy who have served as tenured faculty or librarians are also eligible for election. The President of the IUPUI Faculty serves as a member ex officio.

2. In offering nominations for election to the Faculty Ombudsteam Grievance Advisory Panel, the Executive Committee should give consideration to representation across the academic units of IUPUI.
   a) At least four members of the Ombudsteam Panel shall be tenured full or emeritus professors.
   b) At least five members should have served on the IUPUI or a Unit Promotion and Tenure Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee, Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee, on a Faculty Board of Review, or as President of the IUPUI Faculty.

3. Ombudsteam Panel members shall hold office beginning February 1, for staggered terms of three years. Members should complete their work on any grievance on which they have begun work, even if their terms have expired.

4. The members of the Ombudsteam Panel shall elect their own chairperson, who should be a tenured full Professor or Librarian.

5. No faculty member serving on the Faculty Ombudsteam Grievance Advisory Panel may serve concurrently on a Faculty Board of Review or as the Grievant’s representative before a Faculty Board of Review.

Section D. Procedures of the Faculty Ombudsteam Grievance Advisory Panel

1. When an Ombudsteam Panel member has been contacted by a faculty member/librarian or an administrator seeking advice, that member will:
   a) meet with the Individual to discuss the case; and
   b) inform the Individual concerning the types of further assistance the Ombudsteam Panel members can provide and other resources available on campus.

2. The Ombudsteam Panel members who are contacted by or designated to assist the Grievant faculty member/librarian or administrator shall keep all information shared by the Grievant/individual in confidence.
3. The faculty member or librarian may terminate the assistance of the Faculty Ombudsteam Grievance Advisory Panel at any time.

4. The meetings of the Ombudsteam Panel and the process of assistance employed by the OmbudsteamPanel members should be informal, neutral, impartial and confidential consistent with the International Ombudsman Association Standards of Practice as permitted by applicable University policy and law.

5. The full OmbudsteamPanel should meet regularly to review its methods and update facilitation techniques.

6. Reports:
a) The Ombudsteam Panel shall not report case-related or summary data that include any specifics of individual cases.

b) The Ombudsteam Panel shall prepare an annual summary of its work for the Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council. This report shall include only the number of cases, the categories of the concerns and potential grievances, the number or cases in which the Ombudsteam Panel was successful in resolving concerns and potential grievances, and the number of cases in which the individual Grievant withdrew the request for assistance prior to the Panel completing its work.

7. A faculty member requesting the assistance of the Ombudsteam Panel may also utilize assistance offered by other faculty or other organizations, except that an attorney representing the Grievant faculty member or librarian or the Administration may not participate in the Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel facilitated by the Ombudsteam.

Section E. Composition and Election of Faculty Boards of Review

1. Each Faculty Board of Review shall consist of five members appointed by the Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council from a group of 20 faculty members and librarians elected by the Faculty Council.
   a) Members should be appointed to a Board of Review as needed on a rotating basis.
   b) No more than two members of a Board may be from the same academic unit.
   c) No more than four members should hold the same academic rank.
   d) At least four of the members shall be tenured.
   e) No person with the authority and responsibility to sign an administrative document concerning the title, pay, or working conditions of a faculty member or librarian may serve on a Board of Review.

2. At its January meeting, the Faculty Council shall elect members to serve on the Boards of Review from a slate of eligible faculty members and librarians presented by the IUPUI Nominating Committee.
   a) The number of nominees should be at least half again as many as the number of positions to be elected.
   b) If there is a tie vote that affects the election of a member, an individual vote of the Council involving only the tied nominees shall be taken.
   c) If during the course of the year the Executive Committee determines that there is a need for additional Board members, the nomination and election process may be repeated.

3. Faculty members and librarians elected to be members of Boards of Review shall hold office beginning February 1 for staggered terms of two years. Members should complete the review of any case that they have begun to consider, even if their terms have expired. (If a member leaves after the Formal Hearing has begun, that member shall not be replaced. The Board shall continue with four members and may continue with only three members with the consent of the parties concerned.)

4. An orientation session for all elected members shall be provided annually by the President of the IUPUI Faculty or his/her designee. An IUPUI Faculty Board of Review Current Practices Manual, approved by the Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council and the Dean of the Faculties, will be provided.

5. Faculty members or librarians elected to be members of Boards of Review shall be eligible for re-election, except that no person may serve more than two terms consecutively.

6. In the event legal actions are brought against faculty members or librarians in connection with or as a result of their membership on a Board of Review, the Trustee's Liability Insurance Policy, resolution of May 22, 1971, shall apply.
Section F. Procedures for Beginning a Formal Board of Review Hearing

1. A faculty member or librarian desiring a formal review of administrative action shall submit to the President of the Faculty a specific written request for review stating:
   a) the category or categories of the grievance actions involved (dismissal, academic freedom, non-reappointment, tenure, promotion, salary adjustment, and/or nature and conditions of work);
   b) the nature of the grievance in a concise summary of the grievance scenario;
   c) the steps taken to have the grievance redressed prior to contacting the President; and
   d) the redress of the grievance sought.

2. The Dean of the Faculties of IUPUI shall immediately be informed of the request. If discrimination or sexual harassment is alleged in the complaint, a copy of the complaint shall also be sent to the IUPUI Office of Equal Opportunity.
   a) The determination of whether discrimination or sexual harassment has occurred is in the purview of the Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity. The Board of Review shall not render an opinion concerning the existence of discrimination or sexual harassment.
   b) The Board of Review can proceed, however, with a formal hearing concerning the conditions of work, essential fairness of treatment, and other aspects of the grievance generally in the purview of Boards of Review. A simultaneous investigation of charges of discrimination or sexual harassment by the Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity shall not delay the Board of Review process.
   c) A faculty member or librarian may not file a Board of Review grievance against the Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity. Rather, any faculty or librarian complaint concerning the Office of Equal Opportunity may be brought to the Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council, which shall gather appropriate information and advise the Chancellor.

3. If the Dean of the Faculties of IUPUI is unable to resolve the problem to the satisfaction of the faculty member or librarian within two weeks, the President of the Faculty shall submit the grievance to the Faculty Council Executive Committee to determine that:
   a) administrative reviews have been completed;
   b) the complaint was brought within one year, for good cause; and
   c) the complaint falls within the purview of a Faculty Board of Review.

4. If the conditions of Section F.3 have been met, the Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council shall constitute a Board of Review to consider the grievance (See Section E). In the motion approving the appointment of a Board of Review, the Executive Committee shall specify a reasonable time period during which the hearing should be conducted and the final report issued. The time period should allow for the timing during the academic year, but should not generally exceed six months.

5. Disqualification
   a) A potential member of a Board of Review who is a member of a department (or a school which is not departmentalized) from which a case arises is disqualified from considering that case.
   b) A member of a Board who believes that he/she may not be impartial shall disqualify himself or herself, and a replacement shall be appointed by the Executive Committee provided that the formal hearing has not yet been initiated.

6. The Grievant may withdraw a complaint at any time. If the complaint is withdrawn prior to the appointment of a Board of Review, the grievant has up to one year to ask for the complaint to be reopened. If the complaint is withdrawn after the appointment of a Board of Review, it is up to that board to determine at that time whether a future request by the grievant to reopen the case will be considered. If so, the grievant will have up to one year...
from the date of the appointment of the Board of Review to ask for the complaint to be reopened.

7. Among other things, Boards may be asked to review cases of Dismissal and Non-Reappointment
   a) Dismissal shall mean the involuntary termination of a tenured faculty member’s or librarian’s appointment prior to retirement or resignation, or the termination of the appointment of a non-tenured faculty member or librarian prior to the expiration of his or her term of appointment. Dismissal shall be deemed legitimate only by reasons of:
      1) incompetence,
      2) serious personal professional misconduct, or
      3) extraordinary financial exigencies of the University.
   b) Non-reappointment shall mean the involuntary termination of a non-tenured faculty member or librarian at the time of the expiration of his or her term of appointment.

Section G. Board of Review Meetings and Reports

1. Before the first meeting
   a) Upon notice that a Board of Review will be convened, the Dean of the Faculties of IUPUI shall have the appropriate administrator promptly furnish a written statement of the reasons for the action which led to the grievance. This document should be a concise narrative that provides pertinent background information and that addresses all of the points made in the Grievant’s written request for review of administrative action.
   b) The Grievant may provide for the Board of Review a written response to this statement of reasons.
   c) In setting the date for a Formal Hearing, sufficient time must be allowed for the Grievant and other parties involved to prepare their case.

2. General Considerations
   a) The Faculty Council Office will provide logistical support for the Boards of Review.
   b) The Board of Review proceeding does not delay the timing of administrative actions related to other policies and procedures.
   c) Throughout the Board of Review process, the Grievant and the Administration should communicate only with the Chair of the Board and not with the other members of the Board.
   d) The Board may consult concerning clarification of legal matters at any time with the members of the Law School faculty who have been designated as the IUPUI Board of Review consultants by the School of Law Executive Committee.

3. The President shall call the initial meeting of the Board of Review. At the first meeting;
   a) the President shall respond to procedural questions;
   b) the President shall present the Grievant’s written statement, the Administration’s written response, and the Grievant’s written response to that (if any); and
   c) the presiding officer of each Board shall be elected by the Board’s members from among its members.

4. At formal hearings before the Board of Review,
   a) The Grievant shall be required to appear in person, video conferencing or other forms of electronic participation should not be used.
   b) Both parties shall have the right to counsel or a representative of their choice. If external or University legal counsel are present, they shall offer private advice to their clients but may not speak during the hearing unless special permission to do so is granted by the Chair of the Board of Review. If the Grievant wishes to have another
faculty member or librarian present as a representative, that person may speak during
the hearing to help the Grievant present his/her case effectively, as long as the Chair of
the Board deems that the representative’s participation is not disruptive to the Board
of Review process.

 c) The faculty member or librarian and the administrative parties shall be permitted to
present witnesses and other evidence relevant to the case, and to hear and question all
witnesses who are called to appear before the Board. So that the hearing is not
unreasonably delayed, a witness may reply in writing to questions drafted by the board
if the witness is unable to attend the hearing. Witnesses shall not be present in a
hearing during the presentation of other witnesses unless all parties concur.

d) The faculty member or librarian making the complaint is responsible for stating the
grounds upon which he or she bases the complaint.

e) The hearing may also include observers, but observers will not be permitted to attend
the hearing of the Board of Review if either the Grievant or the University
Administration objects.

5. The Board of Review may request and secure further information from the Grievant
and/or the university administration when it feels this is necessary to render a proper
decision. The Dean of the Faculties (or Chancellor) Administration and Grievant shall
make available to the Board of Review all materials relevant to the decision against which
the faculty member or librarian had complained, provided that:

 a) confidential faculty records of other faculty members and librarians shall not be made
available to the Board of Review; and

 b) all further information obtained by the Board shall be shared with the parties to the
grievance.

6. An electronic record of the hearing shall be prepared at the University’s expense through
the Office of Academic Affairs. The tape will be available to the Board during their
deliberations. It also will be made available for confidential listening in the Office of
Academic Affairs on request to either party in the dispute. Copies of the tape may not be
made for either party in the dispute. Upon completion of the Board’s review, this tape,
along with the Board’s written documentation and correspondence, shall be kept in the
Office of Academic Affairs; provided that if the Board reviewed any letters of
recommendation that had been obtained under pledge of confidentiality, such letters shall
be returned to the original confidential file and shall not be part of the Board’s stored
materials. Four years after the completion of the Board of Review, the material shall be
destroyed.

7. Board recommendations.

 a) Upon completion of the Formal Hearing and submission of additional written
materials, the Board of Review shall meet in executive session to assess:

 1) whether a reasonable case has been made by the Administration to support the
decision complained of by the aggrieved faculty member or librarian;

 2) whether essential fairness was accommodated in observing the formalities and in
following the procedures; and

 3) whether the challenged actions are inconsistent with the policies of Indiana
University or the policies of the school or division involved.
The Board shall render a decision within two weeks.

 b) If the Grievant withdraws the grievance, the Board of Review process shall cease and
no Board of Review report shall be compiled.

 c) If the Grievant voluntarily leaves the University (not because of dismissal or non-
reappointment) during the period of time in which the Board is considering the
grievance, the Board of Review may choose to continue its work when doing so appears
to be in the best interest of the University. If the Board chooses not to continue, it shall
report the decision and reasons to those listed Section G, Subsection 9, paragraph b. If
the Board continues, it shall submit a Final Report as specified in Section G,
Subsection 9.

8. The final report.
a) The Board must make a Final Report that includes:
1) the nature of the grievance and redress sought,
2) a summary of the findings of the Board,
3) conclusions of the Board based upon the findings,
4) recommendations of the Board based upon the conclusions, and
5) signatures of the Board members.
b) Copies of the Final Report must be communicated to:
   1) the Chancellor of IUPUI;
   2) the Grievant;
   3) the appropriate School administrative officer;
   4) the President of the Faculty;
   5) the Dean of the Faculties;
   6) the Office of Academic Affairs; and
   7) each member of the Faculty Board of Review.

a) Any review by the University Administration of the final report of the Board of Review
shall be limited to information that has been presented to the Board of Review, and
shall remain within the confines of sections A.4 and G.7.a of the present article, as will
any determination by the Administration to agree or disagree with the
recommendations of the Board.
b) Should the Administration in its review chance upon any information that affects in
any way the decision-forming process but that was not previously communicated to the
Board of Review, this new information must be shared promptly with all parties to the
grievance. The President of the IUPUI Faculty Council, upon consultation with the
Board of Review, shall then determine whether the new information warrants a
reexamination of the grievance.
c) In cases where any such information cannot be legally disclosed to all parties, the
Administration shall promptly inform all parties to the grievance of its existence,
identify it under a general nondisclosure category, and clarify the extent to which that
information influences its final decision.
d) The Chancellor of IUPUI shall report the Administration’s final decision within four
weeks after receiving the report of the Board of Review. Copies of this report shall be
sent to all parties that received the final report of the Board of Review in accordance
with section G.8.b of the present article.
e) If a recommendation of the Board of Review is not followed by the Administration, the
Chancellor’s report shall state in detail the reason(s) that the Administration disagrees
with said recommendation, pointing out divergent interpretations of facts or erroneous
representations of procedural handlings.
f) If the Administration fails to state its reasons against the Board of Review’s
recommendations, the President of the IUPUI faculty shall
   1) inform in writing all parties that received the final report of the Board of Review of
      the fact, and
   2) include it in his or her report for the May meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council as
described in section G.12 of the present article.
g) Should the Administration agree with the findings and recommendations of the Board
of Review but form in the end a decision not in harmony with the latter, the
Administration shall clarify the extent to which its final decision was shaped by reasons foreign to the Review.

10. Further appeal by the Grievant may be made to the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.

11. A copy of each final Faculty Board of Review Report and the Chancellor's response shall be kept in confidence in the Office of Academic Affairs.

12. The President of the IUPUI Faculty shall prepare a report for the May meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council on Faculty boards of Review activity for the year. The report shall include no confidential information related to any case but shall include:
   a) the number of cases brought to the Faculty Boards of Review in each of the following categories: dismissal, academic freedom, non-reappointment, tenure, promotion, salary adjustment, and the nature or conditions of work; and
   b) in each category for each Board of Review:
      1) the number of cases in which the findings and recommendations of the Board supported the position of the grievant,
      2) the number of cases in which the findings and recommendations did not fully support the grievant,
      3) the number of cases in which the recommendations of the Board were sustained by appropriate and sufficiently documented Administrative action,
      4) the number of cases and the extent to which the recommendations of the Board were denied by the Administration and, within the latter,
      5) the number of cases that involved violations by the Administration of section 9 of the present article, and the general character of those violations.

Section H. Confidentiality

1. The activities of the Boards and the Faculty OmbudsteamGrievance Advisory Panel shall be carried out in confidence.

2. Confidential material shall be treated in accord with the Indiana University Policy ACA-27 “Access to and Maintenance of Academic Employee Records.”

3. Public statements concerning the details of any case are to be avoided by the principals involved, including Board members, Faculty OmbudsteamGrievance Advisory Panel members, the Grievant or other faculty member or librarian raising a concern or potential grievance, witnesses, observers, and administrative officials, prior to and during the hearing, and to the extent practicable at all times thereafter.
IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Campus Criteria for Senior Lecturer and Teaching Professor Ranks

Background:

In his 2017 State of the University address, President Michael McRobbie called for a redoubling of efforts to assure pervasive excellence in teaching and learning through a number of new initiatives aimed at underscoring the central importance of excellent teaching on all campuses of Indiana University. One such initiative focused on strengthening career paths for faculty devoted to teaching and learning. In particular, President McRobbie asked that:

...the UFC and other faculty governance organizations work with campus academic leadership to consider developing new, well-defined, rigorous pathways for tenure and promotion based specifically on excellence in teaching. The pathways should be evidence-based, use multiple types of evidence of excellence, consider evidence of student learning, and be peer reviewed. I also ask that they consider changes to the non-tenure-track ranks to provide stronger career paths that recognize the professionalism of these important and growing segments of IU’s instructional community. In this connection, UFC might also consider other full-time faculty ranks to recognize long-term commitment to excellence and mentorship in teaching. (President Michael A. McRobbie, 10.10.2017)

Following considerable discussion among faculty governance groups across the campuses of Indiana University, the UFC recommended the creation of a new tier within the lecturer career path, Teaching Professor, to ensure that the professional path for lecturers was parallel to that for the tenure stream and clinical professor ranks, both of which include three tiers. This recommendation was approved by the Indiana University Board of Trustees in June, 2019. The rank of Teaching Professor is situated at the top of the lecturer rank, beyond Lecturer and Senior Lecturer.

IUPUI Campus Standards and Expectations for Documenting Teaching Performance:

Campus-level standards are developed to serve as a foundation for evaluating faculty performance across the domains of teaching, research and creative activity, and professional service. When the new tier of Teaching Professor was approved, it was important for campus standards to be developed quickly in order to help serve as a guide for the development of school-specific criteria and standards (and in some cases, department-specific criteria and standards). The table below reflects recommendations of the Promotion and Tenure ad hoc Task Force. These standards reflect an initial effort to establish minimum expectations for promotion to Senior Lecturer and Teaching Professor for all academic units at IUPUI, IUPUC and IU Fort Wayne. School criteria (and department criteria, when applicable) are expected to meet or exceed these levels of performance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Standard for Excellence</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Senior Lecturer</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Teaching Professor</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Documented student learning</td>
<td>• Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distinct teaching philosophy</td>
<td>• Documented student learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Achievement of excellence in a teaching-related domain</td>
<td>• Distinct teaching philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Achievement of excellence in instruction (see below)</td>
<td>• Achievement of excellence in a teaching-related domain, sustained over time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Achievement of excellence in instruction (see below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Documentation of Student Learning</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Senior Lecturer</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Teaching Professor</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Student learning outcomes (e.g., at course, program levels)</td>
<td><strong>Excellent achievement in Instruction and also in at least one of the other domains (course or curricular development, mentoring/advising, service in support of teaching/learning), depending on responsibilities.</strong>&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student input into teaching (e.g., student evaluations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peer evaluations of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Documentation of Distinct Teaching Philosophy</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Senior Lecturer</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Teaching Professor</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching philosophy statement</td>
<td>• In addition to producing effective course and curricular products, shows evidence of having disseminated ideas <em>locally or internally</em> through administration, mentoring, publication, presentation, or other means.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reflection on input from student learning outcomes, student evaluations, and peer evaluations</td>
<td>• In addition to producing effective course and curricular products, shows evidence of having disseminated ideas <em>within the profession or generally</em> through administration, mentoring, publication, presentation, or other means.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Excellent Achievement in Instruction</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Senior Lecturer</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Teaching Professor</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Documentation of extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes.</td>
<td><strong>Excellent Achievement in Instruction and also in at least one of the other domains (course or curricular development, mentoring/advising, service in support of teaching/learning), depending on responsibilities.</strong>&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The case for teaching excellence is grounded in a sophisticated teaching philosophy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Excellent Achievement in Course or Curricular Development</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Senior Lecturer</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Teaching Professor</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• In addition to producing effective course and curricular products, shows evidence of having disseminated ideas <em>locally or internally</em> through administration, mentoring, publication, presentation, or other means.</td>
<td>• In addition to producing effective course and curricular products, shows evidence of having disseminated ideas <em>within the profession or generally</em> through administration, mentoring, publication, presentation, or other means.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Excellent Achievement in Mentoring and Advising</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Senior Lecturer</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Teaching Professor</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mentoring and advising (of students) is characterized by a scholarly approach. High accomplishments of students mentored or advised are consistently linked to the influence of mentor, demonstrating impact. Scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring and advising is documented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Excellent Achievement in Service in Support of Teaching and Learning</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Senior Lecturer</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Teaching Professor</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Course coordination, training of other faculty, support of student learning experiences, support of community in area of expertise, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External Reviewer Requirements:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>External Reviewers: 2020-2021 Cycle</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Senior Lecturer</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Teaching Professor</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewers can be from IU, PU or IUPUI as long as they have no close associations with the candidate and are outside the candidate’s department (or school, if there are no departments).</td>
<td>At least two reviewers must be outside the IU and PU systems. Up to 4 reviewers may be from IU, PU or IUPUI as long as they have no close associations with the candidate and are outside the candidate’s department (or school, if there are no departments).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>External Reviewers: 2021 and beyond</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Senior Lecturer</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advancement to Teaching Professor</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 2 reviewers may be from other IU or PU campuses; at least 4 reviewers must be outside of the IU and PU systems.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>1</sup> Most of this description comes from current excellence-in-teaching criteria that is intended for all faculty types. It is more common for tenure-track faculty to demonstrate excellence in student mentoring, particularly of graduate students. Current language does not include mentoring of adjunct or junior faculty.

<sup>2</sup> The same expectations apply to tenure-track and clinical faculty appointments.
Standards for Satisfactory Service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Advancement to Senior Lecturer</th>
<th>Advancement to Teaching Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Service to University</td>
<td>• Routine department expectations; chair’s determination that service is more than mere participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Service to Discipline or Community</td>
<td>• Routine, required or expected service to the discipline or community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note on criteria formatting: Currently, the IUPUI P&T Guidelines present criteria in two grids. One has expectations for particular faculty types and ranks without regard to area of excellence. The other stipulates expectations for areas of excellence, without regard to faculty type. A formatting change is in development which presents expectations for each faculty type and rank, by area of excellence. A separate document, “Standards for Excellence in Teaching,” provides the old and new formats.

Key Highlights of Proposed Changes:

1. There are no changes to the current standards for tenure-track and clinical cases based on excellence in teaching. Tenure-track cases require an emerging (associate) or achieved (full) national reputation, dissemination in teaching, and disseminated scholarship in one’s research area. Clinical cases require national-level peer reviewed dissemination in teaching (clinical associate professor), sustained over time (clinical professor).

2. No changes are proposed for any requirements pertaining to student input on teaching or to peer evaluations.³

3. Senior Lecturers and Teaching Professors must both establish strong teaching records (student learning outcomes) and a distinct teaching philosophy.⁴ Candidates may choose a specific domain within teaching to demonstrate excellence⁵ (e.g., curriculum development, student support, mentoring, classroom instruction, technological innovation).

4. Senior Lecturers would not need peer-reviewed dissemination, whereas Teaching Professors would.

5. Senior Lecturers would not need external reviewers beyond IUPUI, whereas Teaching Professors would.

6. Teaching Professors would need to demonstrate sustained excellence over time. While a specific period of time is not stipulated, it is assumed that faculty will demonstrate 5 or more years of excellence at the Senior Lecturer rank, similar to current language regarding advancement to full professor. For a transition period through 2023-2024, each promotion case would be examined for a sustained record of excellence, regardless of the exact rank held at the time (e.g., a candidate may have met the criteria and standards for Senior Lecturer while holding the rank of Lecturer).

---

³ Current senior lecturers who have not had a recent formal peer evaluation should take steps to engage in the process before applying for promotion. This can be achieved by setting up and documenting a discussion of teaching with peer faculty.

⁴ See the Scholarly Teaching Taxonomy

⁵ See the FACET Statement Concerning Criteria for Promotion to Teaching Professor
Appendix: Additional Resources and Summary of Process

Additional Resources:

On this page, use link to get to a Box folder with materials. These include:

- **Scholarly Teaching Taxonomy** - Post Review Draft
- **FACET Statement Concerning Criteria for Promotion to Teaching Professor**
- **Definitions and examples** related to lecturer activities (include examples of peer review and dissemination)
- **Faculty by school, type, and highest degree across lecturer, senior lecturer and clinical ranks**

Process for Developing Campus Standards:

- Fall 2019: Ad Hoc Committee to Revise P&T produces, “Moving the Middle” document, based on input from FACET and from a group working on a Scholarly Teaching Taxonomy. Ad Hoc Committee includes NTT faculty, representation from large schools, and members of the campus promotion and tenure committee as well as the Faculty Affairs Committee from the IUPUI Faculty Council.
- Timeline developed by Kathy Johnson and John Watson (IFC President).
- Workshop held October 31, 2019
- January 2020: Information item for IUPUI Faculty Council. Questions asked, answered; feedback, incorporated into new proposal (after distribution to Ad Hoc Committee)
- **Due: January 30, school-level criteria**
- Next steps:
  - February 4, 2020 IFC meeting: 1st reading of change
  - March 3, 2020 IFC meeting: 2nd reading of change; vote
  - If adopted:
    - First candidates for Teaching Professor may apply for the 2020-2021 cycle, including completing submission of a dossier in summer 2020 and preparing materials for external review in spring 2020. **Future reviewer requirements:** Candidates for Senior Lecturer may use new criteria for the 2020-2021 cycle, but may also use existing criteria. **Reviewers need not be external.**
    - From 2020 through 2024, “time in rank” will be interpreted on a case by case basis.
1 INTRODUCTION

In 2013, Indiana University implemented the first university-wide survey of employee health and wellness. In support of building a culture of health and wellness across all campus locations, the IU Workplace Health & Wellness Survey has encouraged broad participation, inviting every full-time employee to participate. Survey results have been shared widely with employee groups, and have guided Healthy IU and wellness champions across the university in taking action toward organizational policies and programs that foster a healthier IU.

The survey has been repeated twice now – in both 2015 and 2019 - since the inaugural survey of 2013. In this report, we present the 2019 results alongside those of prior years to assess our progress toward a healthier IU during this six-year span.

2 METHODS

2.1 SURVEY IMPLEMENTATION

Core question content remained intact across all survey years, enabling valid year-to-year comparisons. Some questions were removed due to limited usefulness and a desire to shorten completion time. Other questions were added or modified to improve the survey’s value in organizational planning. In 2019, new items were added in these topic areas: 1) stress; 2) social connection and isolation; 3) employee participation with Healthy IU programs; 4) management of chronic illnesses; 5) barriers to the flu shot; 6) frequency of alcohol intake; and 7) employees’ greatest strength and challenge to wellness. The survey was fielded via email to a roster of the university’s full-time employees between 3/1-4/5/19 using Qualtrics©. E-mail addresses were used solely within Qualtrics© to deliver invitations and reminders; no personal identifiers were collected in the survey data itself.
2.2 APPROACH TO COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Quantitative data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26 (IBM Corp., 2019). Campus-level survey results were weighted to the 2013 employee population using three weighting variables: sex (female or male), race/ethnicity (Hispanic/Latino, African American/Black, other minority, or White), and job type (faculty or staff). These variables were selected for weighting in 2013 to compensate for differences between the demographic makeup of survey participants and the employee population, yielding results that are more representative of the employee population on the whole. The 2015 and 2019 survey data presented in this report were also weighted to the 2013 population to improve validity of year-to-year comparisons.

In the tables that follow, we compare results from 2019 to 2013 so that the change reflects a six-year span. In some cases, results from 2013 are not available because the question was not included in the initial year. In those instances, the comparison shown is between 2015 and 2019. Please note in the tables that follow, “NA” identifies questions that were Not Asked or Not Asked in a comparable way in all years.

For each question being compared, we calculated and considered two measures of change, described and explained in the table below: 1) absolute change, and 2) relative change. Further, we considered both the statistical and practical significance of these changes. Chi-square testing was conducted to assess whether the absolute difference between the 2019 and 2013 results was statistically significant. However, given the large number of respondents to the survey (5,100), differences may be statistically significant though not practically meaningful. Therefore, we also set a benchmark for practical significance at >10% relative change, either better or worse.

Table 1. Examples Demonstrating Approach to Year-to-Year Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Absolute Change</th>
<th>Relative Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>The simple difference between the two rates being compared</td>
<td>Expresses the change relative to the starting point; allows us to compare the degree of change across factors that vary widely in prevalence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation</td>
<td>= 2019 Rate – 2013 Rate</td>
<td>= ( \frac{(2019 \text{ Rate} - 2013 \text{ Rate})}{2013 \text{ Rate}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 1: Employees told they have pre-diabetes or borderline diabetes</td>
<td>= 9.8% - 5.6% = 4.2%</td>
<td>= ( \frac{(9.8% - 5.6%)}{5.6%} \times 100 = 75.0% )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 2: Employees who had a seasonal flu shot during the past 12 months</td>
<td>= 69.2% - 60.3% = 8.9%</td>
<td>= ( \frac{(69.2% - 60.3%)}{60.3%} \times 100 = 14.8% )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Differences</td>
<td>Statistical significance evaluated at ( \alpha=0.05 ) using Chi-square testing</td>
<td>Practical significance if &gt;+/10% relative change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Participation

A total of 5,100 of IU’s 19,000+ full-time employees who received the invitation (26.6%) participated in the 2019 IU Workplace Health & Wellness Survey, with campus participation rates ranging from a low of 24.9% to a high of 34.9%. The IUPUI participation rate was slightly higher than the overall rate for all locations combined at 27.2%. Over 2,200 IUPUI employees participated, representing 42.5% of all survey participants. While the proportion of full-time employees who participated was similar across all locations, 86.9% of participants were affiliated with IUB or IUPUI due to the size of these campuses. Figure 1 demonstrates the proportion of total survey responses affiliated with each campus location.

Table 2. 2019 Participation Rates by IU Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU Campus Location</th>
<th>2019 Survey Participants</th>
<th>Participation Rate (% of FTEs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IU Bloomington</td>
<td>2265</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUPUI, Indianapolis*</td>
<td>2231</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUE, Richmond</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUK, Kokomo</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUNW, Gary</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU South Bend</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUS, New Albany</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All IU Locations Combined:</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Administratively, IUPUC-Columbus and IUFW-Fort Wayne are included with IUPUI for total employee counts.

Figure 1. Proportion of 2019 Survey Participants by IU Location
4 Comparative Results

The survey’s main content areas are shown below along a continuum of change (Figure 2). Moving from left to right along the continuum, the difficulty and time required for change increases. Areas further to the left represent the greatest potential for rapid change when organizational interventions are implemented; right-most areas are anticipated to take far longer to reflect change. We will consider the changes observed between 2013 and 2019 in the context of this continuum, proceeding through the six content areas from left to right along the continuum of change.

Figure 2. Survey Content Areas along Continuum of Change

In comparing the survey measures comprehensively, we color-coded our interpretations based on the combination of statistical and practical significance. The color-coding is intended to provide a quick visual impression of the strength and degree of change observed in each content area. We compare results from 2013 to 2019 so that the change over the six-year span is shown. In some cases, results from 2013 are not available because the question was not included in the initial year. In those instances, the comparison shown is between 2015 and 2019 (a four-year span).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Code Legend</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Improvement is statistically and practically significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worsening</td>
<td>Worsening is statistically and practically significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Lacks</td>
<td>Change lacks statistical and/or practical significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following tables, the question number (e.g. Q10) is shown as a cross-reference to a separate document providing full results for each question in the order of the survey (“2019 Results in Survey Form”). This document will be available online through Healthy IU for each campus as well as IU Overall at [https://healthy.iu.edu/campus-programs-services/university/workplace-wellness-survey.html](https://healthy.iu.edu/campus-programs-services/university/workplace-wellness-survey.html).
### 4.1 Organizational Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Survey Items Regarding Organizational Support</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
<th>Comparison of 2019 to 2013¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Overall, how supportive is IU of your personal health? (Percent rating 7-10 on scale of 1-10)</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Overall, how safe do you think your workplace is? (Percent rating 7-10 on scale of 1-10)</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job? (Percent satisfied/very satisfied)</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Q11 Employees who Agree or Strongly Agree...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Change Code³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>The people you work with take a personal interest in you.</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>In your workplace, your co-workers support your efforts to be healthy.</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Your supervisor is concerned about the welfare of those under him or her.</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>In your workplace, management considers workplace health and safety to be important.</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>IU has provided you with the opportunity to be physically active.</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>IU has provided you with the opportunity to eat a healthy diet.</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>IU has provided you with the opportunity to live tobacco free.</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>.004*</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>IU has provided you with the opportunity to manage your stress.</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>IU has provided you with the opportunity to work safely.</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹In cases where 2013 results were "NA" (not asked), the Comparison is made between 2019 and 2015; ²NA=not asked/not comparably asked in given year
³See Change Code legend on page 5; *Statistically significant
**Key Findings – Organizational Support**

The content area of Organizational Support showed statistically and practically significant improvements in four of the twelve measures (green). The greatest relative improvement (44.1% increase over 2013) was in the percentage of employees who say that IU has provided them with the opportunity to manage their stress, increasing from 29.7% in 2013 to 42.8% in 2019. Levels of stress reported by employees in the initial 2013 survey were a top concern, and substantial efforts were subsequently focused on addressing stress. There was also a 32.2% increase over 2013 in the percentage of employees who say that IU has provided them with the opportunity to be physically active. Perceptions of University support for health and for providing the opportunity to eat a healthy diet also were statistically and practically significant, although to a lesser extent. The remaining eight measures remained stable per our criteria.

**Engagement with Healthy IU**

In the 2019 survey, we asked participants for the first time about their engagement with program(s) offered through Healthy IU. As the university’s employee wellness department, this is a main avenue through which organizational support for employee wellness is conveyed. While we do not have these data for prior years to compare, it is useful in assessing the reach of Healthy IU over the past two years.

We asked two questions. One indicates the degree of engagement Healthy IU is having with full-time employees: *Over the past two years (or since you were hired if less than two years), in which of the following Healthy IU programs have you participated? (Mark all that apply.)* The second question attempts to capture the potential “ripple effect” of Healthy IU programs from employees who directly participated in programs to others within their sphere of influence. We asked: “Did you share any information or skills you learned in the Healthy IU program(s) with any others in your life? For example, did you involve your co-worker in climbing stairs, choose healthier foods when shopping for your family, or pass on a deep-breathing tip to a friend under stress? (Mark all that apply.)”

![Figure 3. Engagement with Healthy IU](image-url)
Key Findings – Engagement with Healthy IU

Nearly 3 of every 4 IUPUI employees said they had participated in at least one Healthy IU program in the past two years (Figure 3). Among those who said they had participated in a Healthy IU program, the percentage in various types of programs is shown in Figure 4. More than half of all respondents said they had completed the incentivized health screening in the past 2 years, and nearly one-third said they participated in a “challenge.” Roughly one in ten reported participating in single or multi-session programs. About two-thirds of all IUPUI employees who participated in Healthy IU program(s) report sharing that information or skill with others in their life. Those who shared the info/skills most commonly report sharing with family, followed by co-workers, and least with friends.

Both the broad improvements in measures of organizational support at IUPUI and the 2019 information about the reach of Healthy IU into the lives and social networks of these employees demonstrate strong and steady progress toward an organizational culture of health encompassing the IUPUI campus.
### 4.2 Resources & Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
<th>Comparison of 2019 to 2013¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Are the following PROGRAMS OR RESOURCES currently available at your workplace? (Percent who said yes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Healthy food options in vending machines</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Healthy food options (like fresh fruits and vegetables, available) to purchase in the cafeteria or other food service [2019 wording change inside parentheses]</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>1-on-1 nutritional counseling</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Healthy weight/weight loss programs</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Access to clean drinkable water</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Resources to support physical activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>A convenient place to work out or exercise (2015, 2019) - A place to work out or exercise such as an onsite exercise room (2013)</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>A place to bike or walk</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Signs that encourage stair use</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Markers that identify walking trails</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Easy to access maps of walking trails</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other resources to support health &amp; wellbeing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Flu shots at work</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Programs to help people stop smoking (of current smokers)</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>A true smoke-free workplace</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Blood pressure monitoring device available for self-assessment</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Stress management or stress reduction classes/programs</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>Employee Assistance Program (access to professional counseling)</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-continued-
Question # | Q13: Are the following PROGRAMS OR RESOURCES currently available at your workplace? (Percent who said yes) | Survey Results | Comparison of 2019 to 20131 | Change Code
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
| | | 2013 | 2015 | 2019 | Absolute Change | Relative Change | p-value | |
| q | Ergonomics (work station or computer setup, proper lifting, etc.) | 44.5% | 57.5% | 58.5% | 14.0% | 31.5% | <.001* | Green |
| r | A private area/lactation room for moms who are breastfeeding (of women aged 18-44) | 36.6% | 44.7% | 54.2% | 17.6% | 48.1% | <.001* | Green |
| s | A designated person who communicates health and wellness information to your work group |  | 24.0% | 18.8% | -5.2% | -21.7% | <.001* | Red |

1In cases where 2013 results were "NA" (not asked), the comparison is made between 2019 and 2015; 2NA=not asked/not comparably asked in given year
3See Change Code legend on page 5; *Statistically significant

Key Findings – Resources & Programs

Improving employee awareness and access to health-supporting Resources & Programs in IU workplaces was identified in 2013 as an opportunity for rapid change and organizational action. Broad action was taken in this area. Improvement is clearly evidenced with interim changes that are both statistically and practically significant for 10 of the 19 measures (green). In fact, relative increases over the baseline 2013 rates were over 100% for several resources/programs, including: a place to work out or exercise, blood pressure self-monitoring devices, and signs encouraging stair use. Four measures significantly worsened (red): the percentage who had a designated wellness advocate in their work group, access to a smoke-free work place, programs to help people stop smoking, and 1-on-1 nutrition counseling. The proportion of current smokers at IUPUI reporting access to programs to help them stop smoking decreased significantly, though significant increase was seen across IU on the whole.
### 4.3 Lifestyle Influences on Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Survey Items Regarding Lifestyle</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
<th>Comparison of 2019 to 2013¹</th>
<th>Change Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>Getting enough restful sleep to function well in job and personal life - always/most of the time</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q59 &amp; 60</td>
<td>Body Mass Index (BMI) falls within normal range (18.5-24.9)</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>Does not smoke cigarettes</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>Current smokers who stopped smoking for one day or longer because they were trying to quit</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>Employees who participated in some physical activities or exercises...during the past month</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31 &amp; 32</td>
<td>Employees meeting the aerobic physical activity guidelines</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>(Of those who mostly sit on the job) Employees who are able to get up and move around 8 or more times during a usual 8 hour work day</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23a</td>
<td>How often do you get the social and emotional support you need? (Always/usually)</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23b</td>
<td>How often do you feel you lack companionship (Always/usually)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23c</td>
<td>How often do you feel isolated from others (Always/usually)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23d</td>
<td>How often do you feel left out? (Always/usually)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>Employees who reported drinking alcohol on one or more of the past 30 days</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹In cases where 2013 results were “NA” (not asked), the comparison is made between 2019 and 2015; ²NA=not asked/not comparably asked in given year

3See Change Code legend on page; *Statistically significant;

**Key Findings – Lifestyle Influences**

The content area of Lifestyle Influences on Health moves us toward the middle of the continuum of change. No significant improvements were found among the 8 measures that could be compared with prior years’ results. Three measures significantly worsened: 1) the percentage of employees whose BMI was in the normal range; 2) the percentage of employees in sedentary jobs who are able to get up and move around at least 8 times per work day;
and 3) the percentage of current smokers who stopped smoking for at least one day in a quit attempt. The drop in smokers attempting to quit was significant at IUPUI, though not for IU on the whole, and is consistent with the significant decrease in IUPUI smokers who say they have access to programs to help them stop smoking. In 2019, four items were added to the survey. Three of the new items are indicators of social isolation, a growing health threat in the U.S. that is also reflected in the persistent 40% of IUPUI employees getting inadequate social and emotional support. Based on three new questions, approximately one in eight IUPUI employees is socially isolated. We also added a question about frequency of alcohol intake (number of days in past 30 in which the employee drank alcohol), and found that over two-thirds of employees drank alcohol at least one day in the past 30.

### 4.4 PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Survey Items Regarding Preventive Health Care</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
<th>Comparison of 2019 to 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>Employees who visited a doctor for a routine checkup within the past 2 years</td>
<td>86.1% 85.0% 86.4%</td>
<td>Absolute Change 0.3% Relative Change 0.3% p-value 0.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>Employees who had blood pressure checked by a health professional within the past year</td>
<td>90.7% 91.4% 91.2%</td>
<td>Absolute Change 0.5% Relative Change 0.6% p-value 0.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38</td>
<td>Employees who last had a cholesterol test less than 5 years ago</td>
<td>95.9% 96.5% 94.4%</td>
<td>Absolute Change -1.5% Relative Change -1.6% p-value &lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>Employees who had a lab test for high blood sugar or diabetes within the past 3 years</td>
<td>75.9% 78.7% 75.4%</td>
<td>Absolute Change -0.5% Relative Change -0.7% p-value 0.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>Employees who had a seasonal flu vaccine during the past 12 months</td>
<td>71.3% 65.8% 76.7%</td>
<td>Absolute Change 5.4% Relative Change 7.6% p-value &lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Change Code legend on page 5; *Statistically significant

### Key Findings – Preventive Health Care

Preventive health care measures remained stable across time. Given the excellent baseline rates reported by IU employees for routine checkups, blood pressure checks, and cholesterol testing, there is little room for improvement in these. While seasonal flu vaccination rates did increase at IUPUI, the increase was not significant per our dual criteria as they were IU-wide. IUPUI, as the health professions campus, has had higher flu vaccination rates in every survey year than observed IU-wide, thus there was less room for improvement. The top three reasons cited for not getting the flu shot were: 1) thinking it does not work well to protect from the flu (24.9%); 2) thinking they are healthy and do not need it (19.2%), and 3) thinking the shot/spray made them sick in the past (13.7%). (See Question 41 of the “Results in Survey Form” document for full results.)
### 4.5 Stress

#### Survey Items Regarding Stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
<th>Comparison of 2019 to 2013$^1$</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td><strong>Stress</strong> means a situation in which a person feels tense, restless, nervous or anxious, or is unable to sleep at night because his/her mind is troubled. Within the last 30 days, how often have you felt this kind of stress? (Most of the time/all of the time)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>Employees who said <strong>stress</strong> (from all sources at work or at home) had a lot or some impact on their health in the past year</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>-8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td><strong>Thinking about sources of stress between work and home...</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a How often do you find your work stressful? (Always/often)</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>-9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b How often do things going on at work make you tense or irritable at home? (Always/often)</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c How often do things going on at home make you tense or irritable at work? (Always/often)</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$In cases where 2013 results were "NA" (not asked), the Comparison is made between 2019 and 2015; 2NA=not asked/not comparably asked in given year

#### Key Findings - Stress

Findings around stress and mental health from the 2013 baseline survey were concerning, with nearly 7 of 10 employees saying stress had affected their health in the past year. Plans and programs were put in place to address employee stress. In the interim, all four measures of stress significantly improved. Notably, the percentage of employees who reported that they found their work always/often stressful fell from 41.2% in 2013 to 31.5% in 2019. In 2015, we added two additional measures to help us better understand the interplay of stress between home and work. Based on these results, work stress affects employees at home more often than home stress affects employees at work, but significant reductions were seen in both. These are good signs of progress, yet stress remains a prevalent concern with one in five IUPUI employees feeling stress most or all of the time in the 30 days prior to the survey. We note the concurrent increase in the percentage of employees saying that IU has provided them the opportunity to manage their stress (page 5).
### Survey Items Regarding Health and Illness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
<th>Comparison of 2019 to 2013[^1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q50</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q53</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q58</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q57</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q57</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q55</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q59-60</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q59-60</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^1]: In cases where 2013 results were "NA" (not asked), the Comparison is made between 2019 and 2015; *NA=not asked/not comparably asked in given year

[^3]: See Change Code legend on page 5; *Statistically significant
Key Findings – Health & Illness

The final content area, to the far right of the continuum of change, describes the Health & Illness measures of IU employees. Interpretation of these results over time is less straightforward than in previous sections. Some of the measures coded red for significant increases may be, in fact, positive signs of pro-active screening and management as much as they are warning signs. For example, an increase in pre-hypertension or pre-diabetes may mean that employees are made aware of their risk at an earlier point where progression to disease can be prevented or slowed. Also, several of these health questions reflect lifetime prevalence (i.e. having EVER been diagnosed with the stated condition). Since it is impossible for employees, once diagnosed with a condition, to be “un-diagnosed,” we expect progress in these measures to be demonstrated through a slow and gradual leveling off, beginning with stabilization in rates (yellow).

Across all Health and Illness measures, 10 of 19 demonstrated statistically and practically significant increases (red), six remained stable (yellow), and three decreased (green). Three of the four self-reported global measures of physical and mental health (Q18-Q21) worsened significantly in the six-year span. Lifetime prevalence rates of pre-hypertension, pre-diabetes, asthma, arthritis, and depression all significantly increased, as did current prevalence of obesity and chronic/recurrent low back pain. In contrast, lifetime prevalence rates of hypertension, heart disease, and carpal tunnel syndrome remained stable, as did current prevalence of overweight and health problems thought to be related to the physical work environment. Significant decreases in the proportion of IUPUI employees reporting high blood cholesterol, diabetes, and current asthma were found between 2013 and 2019, though these rates did not decrease university-wide.

Employee Perspectives on Their Wellness Strengths and Challenges

The final two questions of the 2019 survey were newly added, providing some insight into what IU employees consider their main areas of strength and challenge to wellness today. After some introductory framing to describe wellness as encompassing many areas of our lives, employees were asked to select which of 8 dimensions of wellness they considered their “biggest challenge to wellness today – the area where (they) are farthest from where (they) want to be,” and their “main strength in wellness today – the area where (they) are closest to where (they) would like to be.” Figure 7 demonstrates results based on the responses of IUPUI employees. In the figure, the proportion who identified a dimension as their biggest challenge is charted as a negative value, while the proportion who identified that domain as their main strength is charted as a positive value.

Intellectual and Spiritual dimensions were more often considered a strength than a challenge. Physical and Financial dimensions were more often considered a challenge than a strength. The remaining dimensions (Emotional, Environmental, Occupational and Social) were more evenly split between strength and challenge. The top three dimensions employees identified as their biggest challenge to wellness were Physical (30.7%), Financial (21.1%), and Emotional (14.4%). On the other hand, the top three dimensions employees identified as their main strength in wellness were Intellectual (19.5%), Physical (16.4%), and Emotional (15.9%).
Figure 6. Main Strength and Biggest Challenge in Wellness per IUPUI Employees

- Emotional
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BIGGEST CHALLENGE
MAIN STRENGTH
The 2019 IU Workplace Health & Wellness survey results provide an opportunity to gauge progress toward a healthier IU, informed by thousands of IU employees who participated in each of the three surveys of 2013, 2015, and 2019. In 2019, 2231 IUPUI employees participated, for a campus participation rate of 27.2%. We summarize IUPUI findings by topic along the continuum of change (Figure 2).

![Figure 2. Survey Content Areas along Continuum of Change (reprinted)](image)

- Four measures of **Organizational Support** improved significantly among IUPUI employees in the six-year span, including an increase in the proportion of employees who say that IU is supportive of their personal health and that IU had provided the opportunity to be physically active, eat a healthy diet, and manage their stress. No measures worsened. For the first time in 2019, we asked about employees’ participation with Healthy IU programs and the extended impact (“ripple effect”) when employees share program information or skills with others. More than 70% of IUPUI employees said they had participated in at least one Healthy IU program in the past two years, for a level of engagement that was on par with IU employees on the whole. About two-thirds of program participants shared program-related information or skills with others in their life. These findings demonstrate strong and steady progress toward an organizational culture of health encompassing the IUPUI campus.

- Improving employee awareness and access to health-supporting **Resources & Programs** in IU workplaces was identified in 2013 as an opportunity for rapid change and organizational action. Broad action was taken in this area. Progress is clearly evidenced with significant improvements in 10 of the 19 measures. In fact, the proportion of IUPUI employees with access to several resources and programs at least doubled between 2013 and 2019; these included access to a place to work out or exercise, blood pressure self-monitoring devices, and signs encouraging stair use. Four measures significantly worsened (red): the percentage who had a designated wellness advocate in their work group, access to a smoke-free work place, programs to help people stop smoking, and 1-on-1 nutrition counseling. The proportion of current smokers at IUPUI reporting access to programs to help them stop smoking decreased significantly, though significant increase was seen across IU on the whole.
• No significant improvements were found among the 8 measures of Lifestyle Influences on Health that could be compared with prior results, and three measures worsened significantly (normal BMI, current smokers making a quit attempt, and ability of sedentary workers to get up and move around during their work day). The drop in smokers attempting to quit was significant at IUPUI, though not for IU on the whole, and is consistent with the significant decrease in IUPUI smokers who say they have access to smoking cessation programs. These findings warrant a closer look as plans are made for the future. Based on new questions in 2019, approximately one in eight IUPUI employees is socially isolated, a growing health threat in the U.S. that is further reflected in the persistent 40% of IUPUI employees getting inadequate social and emotional support.

• Across the survey years, IU employees on the whole have maintained excellent rates of Preventive Health Care. At IUPUI, these rates have remained steadily high with little room for improvement. While seasonal flu vaccination rates at IUPUI improved, the improvement was not significant for the campus as it was for IU on the whole. However, IUPUI has maintained a higher flu vaccination rate across all survey years than observed IU-wide. In 2019, we learned about employee’s main reasons for not getting the flu shot; this may inform efforts to further increase vaccination rates.

• Clear improvements were observed in the area of Stress. All four measures of stress significantly improved, as did the proportion of IUPUI employees who say that IU has provided them with the opportunity to manage their stress. Stress, including its reported impact on employees’ health, was one of the most concerning findings in the 2013 baseline survey. Concerted efforts made to address employee stress appear to have been beneficial. While these are good signs of progress, stress remains a prevalent concern, with one in five IUPUI employees feeling stress most or all of the time in the 30 days prior to the survey.

• The final content area, to the far right of the continuum of change, describes the Health & Illness measures of IU employees. Across these measures, 10 of 19 increased significantly, three decreased significantly, and six remained stable. Three of the four self-reported global measures of physical and mental health worsened in the six-year span. Several of the health measures reflect lifetime prevalence (i.e. having EVER been diagnosed with the stated condition). Since it is impossible for employees, once diagnosed with a condition, to be “un-diagnosed,” progress in these measures would be demonstrated through a gradual leveling off. Lifetime prevalence rates of pre-hypertension, pre-diabetes, asthma, arthritis, and depression all significantly increased, as did current prevalence of obesity and chronic/recurrent low back pain. In contrast, lifetime prevalence rates of hypertension, heart disease, and carpal tunnel syndrome remained stable, as did current prevalence of overweight and health problems thought to be related to the physical work environment. Significant decreases in the proportion of employees reporting high blood cholesterol, diabetes, and current asthma were found among IUPUI employees between 2013 and 2019, though these rates did not decrease university wide.

Focusing on IUPUI, this comparison of survey results from 2013 to 2019 demonstrates positive movement toward a culture of health through improved perceptions of organizational support for health, greater access to resources and programs, and substantial progress in stress management. While preventive healthcare utilization remains strong, lifestyle influences on health present persistent challenges to employees. Rates of some health conditions declined at IUPUI and many remained stable, yet several rates have continued to rise. The high rate of engagement IUPUI employees report having with Healthy IU is a strength that provides an avenue for continued progress toward health at IUPUI.
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In Spring 2013, we implemented the first IU-wide survey of employee health and wellness to:

- Know our starting point
- Identify employees’ health strengths and challenges
- Identify organizational strengths and challenges
- Guide Healthy IU and wellness champions across the university in taking action toward a healthier IU
- Repeated survey in 2015 and 2019 to gauge progress and guide planning
Key design features

- Anonymous
- Inclusive - ALL full-time employees are invited, not just a sample
- Transparent - results widely shared
- Trusted
  - Modeled after the CDC’s national phone survey of health, with guidance from the CDC’s Healthy Worksite Program;
  - IRB-reviewed

Survey content

- ~60 questions in 6 content areas along continuum of change
2019 Results
IUPUI

2019 participation rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU Campus Location</th>
<th>2019 Survey Participants</th>
<th>Participation Rate (% of FTEs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IU Bloomington</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*<em>IUPUI, Indianapolis</em></td>
<td>2,231</td>
<td><strong>27.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUE, Richmond</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUK, Kokomo</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUN, Gary</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU South Bend</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUS, New Albany</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All IU Locations Combined:</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Administratively, IUPUC and IUFW are included with IUPUI for total employee counts
Comparison of 2019 to 2013 results (p. 4)

- Campus-level survey results were weighted by position type (faculty/staff), sex, and race/ethnicity to better represent the demographic makeup of the employee population on the whole.
- We considered both absolute differences for statistical significance (p < .05) and relative differences for practical significance (>10% relative change) in identifying an improvement or a worsening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Code Legend</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Improvement is statistically and practically significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Worsening is statistically and practically significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Change lacks statistical and/or practical significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Support (p. 5)

4 of 12 measures significantly improved; the rest remained stable.
What improved?

IU is supportive of your personal health

Employees who agree that IU has provided (them) the opportunity to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2013 Rate</th>
<th>2019 Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be physically active</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat a healthy diet</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage your stress</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engagement with Healthy IU and the “ripple effect” (p. 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>IU-ALL</th>
<th>IUPUI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaged with Healthy IU program(s) over past 2 years</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared info/skills from the Healthy IU program(s) with others</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10 of 19 measures significantly improved
4 of 19 measures significantly worsened, and 5 remained stable

Of the 10 that significantly improved, 3 improved >100% relative to 2013

- Blood pressure monitoring device
- Signs to encourage stair use
- Convenient place to work out or exercise
What worsened?

- IUPUI employees reporting access to:
  - 1-on-1 nutritional counseling
  - A designated person who communicates health and wellness information to their work group
  - A true smoke-free workplace
  - (Among current smokers) Access to programs to help them stop smoking

Lifestyle Influences (p. 10)

3 of 8 measures significantly worsened; the rest remained stable.
What worsened?

- BMI in normal range: 2019: 33.2%, 2013: 38.7%
- Current smokers who made a quit attempt: 2019: 43.2%, 2013: 61.6%
- Sedentary workers who can get up & move 8+ times: 2019: 42.3%, 2013: 53.7%

Preventive Health Care (p. 11)

5 of 5 measures held steady at overall excellent levels.
We're so close to “Herd immunity” (80%) 😊

Preventive health care

Had flu vaccine in past 12 months

0.0% 20.0% 40.0% 60.0% 80.0% 100.0%

2013 2019

71.3% 76.7%

Stress (p. 12)

Organizational Support

Lifestyle

Stress

Resources & Programs

Preventive Health Care

Health & Illness

4 of 4 measures significantly improved.
What improved?

- Stress impacted health in past year (some/a lot)
  - 2013/2015: 68.7%
  - 2019: 59.8%

- Find your work stressful (always/often)
  - 2013/2015: 41.2%
  - 2019: 31.5%

- Work stress affects you at home (always/often)
  - 2013/2015: 27.1%
  - 2019: 19.8%

- Home stress affects you at work (always/often)
  - 2013/2015: 7.8%
  - 2019: 6.6%

Health & Illness (p. 13)

- 3 of 22 measures significantly improved
- 10 significantly worsened; 6 remained stable.
What stands out among health outcomes?

- Rates of high cholesterol, diabetes, and current asthma dropped significantly among IUPUI employees between 2013 and 2019 - a drop not observed IU-wide. Are we beginning to see population-wide health improvement?

- Increased rates may be positive in some cases. For example, the increase in pre-hypertension and pre-diabetes may indicate earlier attention and the opportunity to delay or prevent progression. (Diabetes prevalence dropped.)

Takeaways
Takeaways 2019

Overall, there is evidence of strong and steady progress toward a culture of health since 2013.

- Improved perceptions of organizational support and greater access to resources
- Significant improvements in employee stress management
- Consistently high preventive health care utilization
- Declining prevalence in a few health conditions at IUPUI that may signal a trend toward better health outcomes - time will tell

High level of engagement with Healthy IU provides an avenue for addressing persistent challenges, such as lifestyle influences, and continuing to build a healthier IU.
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Questions?

Tess Weathers, MPH
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Department of Social & Behavioral Sciences
Phone: 317.274.3830
Email: tweather@iu.edu

The comparison report and full results in survey form are available at:
https://healthy.iu.edu/campus-programs-services/university/workplace-wellness-survey.html
CRITERIA

• Faculty
  • Lecturer/Asst. Prof. post-Dossier submission; 5yrs
  • Assoc. prof.+, aspiring or within new leadership role
  • Assoc. prof.+ new to IUPUI; 2yrs

• Staff
  • Asst. Dir.+ or comparable

• Cost
  • $1,500, matched

*More information [here](#)
IUPUI NEXT GENERATION 2.0
2015 - 2020

84% women
16% men

45% leadership
55% non-leadership

90% people of Color
10% IUPUC

10 admin. units

17 RCs (incl. UL)

Apply

01/27/20
ENGAGEMENT/Impact

• “I am meeting people across campus and continue to challenge myself to gain new skills and strengthen the things I feel confident about.”
• “I had time to think about and evaluate my skills.”
• “Helped me see that I can’t do this alone and should seek out a mentor.”
• “I am feeling more confident in my role as a leader and in seeking additional growth opportunities.”
• “It helps me think of strategies to lead my unit through change.”
• “I am getting a sense of the larger issues confronting the campus on a number of levels.”
# Accomplishments*

*Some individuals received multiple awards and recognitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Awards/Honors National</th>
<th>Award/Honors Local</th>
<th>Promotions</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPORTANT DATES

- **January 27, 2020**: applications open for 2020-21 cohort
- **March, 15, 2020**: applications close (@11:59pm)
- **April 27, 2020**: Notification of selected participants
- **May 19, 2020**: Capstone presentations of 2019-20 cohort, Campus Center Theater
Full-Time Faculty - Gender (TN/FN/RS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>1,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>2,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N's are in bold

Full-Time Faculty - Race/Ethnicity (TN/FN/RS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2,839</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>2,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,358</td>
<td>2,839</td>
<td>2,932</td>
<td>3,129</td>
<td>3,236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N's are in bold
Faculty Retention
New Hire Tenure-Track Faculty Retention Percentage (IUSM Excluded)

Combined Cohorts of ‘04, ‘08, ‘12, ‘16

Female hires 65
Male hires 89
New Hire Tenure-Track Faculty Retention Percentage (IUSM Excluded)

- Asian hires 34
- Black/African American hires 11
- Latinx hires 6
- Two or More Race hires 4
- White hires 79

IUPUI Faculty Attrition & Turnover

Taken Active Steps to Pursue Another Position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Non-Tenure-Track</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Tenure-Track</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Importance of Reasons to Leave IUPUI

#### IUPUI Faculty Attrition & Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F Non-Tenure Track Full-Time</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track Tenured/Track-Track</th>
<th>Tenured/Track-Track</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advancement in position level and job scope</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved salary</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location of new opportunity</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved benefits</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Extremely Important
- Very Important
- Moderately Important
- Somewhat Important
- Not Important at all

---

### Importance of Reasons to Leave IUPUI

#### IUPUI Faculty Attrition & Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F Non-Tenure Track Full-Time</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track Tenured/Track-Track</th>
<th>Tenured/Track-Track</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved workload/life balance</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved interpersonal work environment</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved department climate</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved support from immediate supervisor</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Extremely Important
- Very Important
- Moderately Important
- Somewhat Important
- Not Important at all
## Importance of Reasons to Leave IUPUI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Non-tenure track Full-time</th>
<th>Tenured/Tenure-Track</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recipient of competitive recruitment from another institution</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to work at institution with different priorities</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Tenure-Track</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved relationships with colleagues</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Tenure-Track</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved campus climate</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Tenure-Track</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Very Important
- Moderately Important
- Somewhat Important
- Not Important at all

## Data Link

1. Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRDS) Dashboards
   - **Headcount Dashboard**
   - **Cohort Retention Dashboard**
   - **Other Dashboards:**
     - Faculty satisfaction
     - Faculty engagement in high impact practices
     - Faculty perception of development opportunities
Concluding Remarks

• Thanks to IRDS we are building better capacity to follow and understand faculty retention and hopefully avoid faculty loss

• We are making these data available to the campus community for your review by school and demographic features etc.

• Working with the Office of Employment Opportunity we are improving data gathered from faculty who leave IUPUI in hopes of improving retention
DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION

L. Jack Windsor and Wanda Thruston, Co-Chairs with Administration Leadership Co-Chair: Karen Dace

Charge
This committee is to advise and make recommendations to the IFC and campus leadership on issues relative to promoting and ensuring diversity, equity, and inclusion. To accomplish this charge, the committee shall have, but will not be limited to, the following duties: 1) Promote the recruitment, hiring, retention, and advancement of diverse faculty and staff; 2) Advocate for increased recruitment, enrollment, retention, and graduation of students from diverse backgrounds and experiences; 3) Disseminate information and successful practices related to diversity, equity, and inclusion in higher education; 4) Ensure the availability of mentoring opportunities for diverse faculty; 5) Review and make recommendations based on campus DEI plans and reports; 6) Provide guidance to academic and support units with their DEI plans upon request; 7) Provide a representative/liaison to meetings of the Chancellor’s Diversity Cabinet and the Vice Chancellor’s Diversity Group; and 8) Encourage campus development of DEI education and training opportunities for faculty, staff, and students.

Faculty:

Benjamin, Lehn (Philanthropy)
Bigatti, Silvia (Public Health)
Brady, Erin (Informatics and Computing)
Horváth, Robert (Herron)
Ji, Julie (Engineering and Technology)
Keller, Deb (Div. Undergrad. Education)
Merritt, Breanca (SPEA)
Strunk, Valerie (Health and Human Sciences)
Taylor, Kara (Education) (Karla Zaccor, alt.)
Thruston, Wanda (Nursing) (Co-Chair)
Vinson, LaQuia (Dentistry)
Alomari, Ahmed (Medicine)
Bravo, Karen (Law)
Henry Anthony, Ronda (Liberal Arts)
Jones, Kevin (IUPUC)
Laulhé, Sébastien (Science)
Lee, Peggy Daniels (Business)
Lemus-Rojas, Mairelys (University Library)
Mariscal, Susana (Social Work)
Meagher, Ashley (Medicine)
Thorington Springer, Jennifer (Liberal Arts)
Windsor, L. Jack (Dentistry) (Co-Chair)

Staff Council Representative: Valerie Decker
Graduate Student Organization Representatives: Dana Doan; Paige Klemme
Undergraduate Student Government Representative: Alexandria Murphy
IFC DEI Committee:

Newly formed IFC Standing Committee (year 2)
So still trying to find our groove

IUPUI Climate Surveys 2018 and 2014 (net results, no unit surveys)

2018 Survey more Inclusion so direct comparison difficult
Reported Bias/Harassment/Discrimination Overall results

Survey unit/school results needed to understand and impact issues
Not shared without Dean/Leader approval (thanks to all the Deans that has agreed to share with the IFC DEI committee)

IU School of Dentistry 2018 and 2014 Climate Surveys (thanks to Dean for sharing)
Response rate and group participation issues

Improving the Climate

The Committee would like to thank C.A. Murdoch-Kinch for joining the Committee to have a conversation around Climate Change.

The conversation was interactive and focused on process and transparency.
Process was inclusive and maintained a safe environment. Developed a survey that everyone could have a voice in generating. Resulted in getting people at all level meeting and talking about their climate. One conclusion might be that the process drove climate change and not the survey results. Getting to know others help remove bias!

Would this Process be useful at IUSD and other schools on campus?

Predoctoral Dental Education Climate Study of the Learning Environment for Faculty, Staff, and Students at a U.S. Dental School: Foundation for Culture Change

C.A. Murdoch-Kinch, DDS, PhD; R.E. Duff, DDS, MS; V. Ramaswamy, PhD; T.V. Ester, DDS; S.A. Sponseller, MSW, MUP; J.A. Seeley, PhD Abstract: The aim of this study was to assess the culture and climate for diversity and inclusion and the humanistic learning environment for students, faculty, and staff at the University of Michigan School of Dentistry