

Indiana University  
Special Meeting of the Bloomington Faculty  
May 9, 2022

TRANSCRIPT

Gavel, Gavel, Gavel

Marietta Simpson: Good afternoon everyone, I'd like to begin this afternoon's special meeting of the faculty by extending a warm welcome to all of you, our faculty colleagues on behalf of executive committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council. This year has been difficult for faculty across the campus. I am sure each person here if given the opportunity could share equally touching stories of sacrifice and resilience from throughout the pandemic. I want to say thank you. Thank you for how you've been the key to how things were able to keep going through uncertainty and adversity for your families for our students and for this campus. I want to thank these individuals who have given more than they have ever imagined this year on behalf of us all: Steve Sanders, Kelly Eskew, Brian Gill, Scott Libson, past-president John Walbridge, president-elect Cate Reck, and joining me on the stage secretary Rebecca Spang and our parliamentarian Rachael Cohen. You'll hear more from Rachael in just a few moments. My name is Marietta Simpson and I'm the president of the Bloomington Faculty Council. I'd like to point out that the last time there was a special meeting called for the council, the faculty, the leadership looked slightly different than it does now. There are several people to acknowledge before we proceed any further in our session. We'd like to thank the IU Auditorium management and staff for accommodating our last-minute request for this space for this gathering.

Clapping

In the midst of their already extremely busy event schedule, Doug, Maria and everyone, Jacob, we appreciate your graciousness and hospitality. We also thank the Provost's office for providing the rental and associated fees for this event which total over \$26,000. We also thank our colleagues from the libraries who have served today checking us in and counting the ballots. Thank you to all of you.

Clapping

I particularly want to thank our colleagues who have submitted resolutions and rationales for us to consider today. Your thoughtful engagement and valuable time in preparing materials to be distributed are very much appreciated. Thanks to each of you for being here. I would remind you that as we discuss these resolutions there will be opposing viewpoints. We have chosen not to have pro and con microphone to allow individuals to speak from either position. I will ask however so that no one viewpoint dominates the discussion that after we have heard from three successive views on the same side of an issue we allow for equal time for the opposing view. I look forward to a spirited and professional discussion this afternoon. I now present our parliamentarian Rachael Cohen who will give the rules for this afternoon session. Rachael?

Rachael Cohen: Hello, I want to thank all of you for being here. The meeting today is conducted under the Article 5 of the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty of Indiana University. This is a special meeting of the faculty called in response to a petition of 50 or more faculty members. Such a meeting requires a quorum requirement of 200, I think we've met that. Unless 800 are present, I can't tell you if we've met that but I'm guessing we have, any action today taken by the meeting has to be ratified by an email ballot of the full faculty. In terms of ground rules itself, these are the following rules: voting and speaking privileges are limited to the voting members of the faculty. Voting members must sign in, which you've all done this, to ensure a quorum is maintained. If you need to leave for any reason you must turn in your unused ballots. If you come back you will receive the ballots that have not been voted on at that time. If for some reason we drop below 200 people, I will first wonder what is happening but just know we can have a discussion but no vote can happen. The motion to suspend the rules will not be allowed during this special meeting. Speaker comments are limited to three minutes with follow-up remarks limited to one minute for each resolution. Speakers are only allowed to speak once per resolution until everyone has had a chance to speak. Each item on the agenda has a time limit assigned to it. We will need to be very strict with that time in order to get through all items. Now voting overview, items for the agenda will be passed by paper ballots, you all have very nice colorful ballots in front of you any amendments to an agenda item will be passed by a show of hands. We have people about exec who will count your show of hands so we ask that you do not lower them until asked. At the end of the time limit for each resolution we will vote. Please use the specific color, or if you are color blind, shaped ballot of what was listen on the agenda for the resolution. BFC exec has boxes and will come around and will come around and collect all of the ballots at the end of the vote. Please fold them and pass to the end of the row to be collected. Vote counting will be counted on the stage by our wonderful volunteer librarians and we will announce the results of any votes we know at the end of the meeting. For resolution number 3, resolution 3 has two resolutions to vote in an A or B vote. The reason we did that is that exec felt we couldn't put two resolutions forward that were so similar but we were also reluctant to pick between them. During the vote there are essentially two separate votes and the majority rules in each the first vote is yes or no vote. The second vote is if yes A or B. Those are the rules. I pass it over to Marietta Simpson.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you Rachael. So now we come to the agenda. This meeting was called in response to a petition requesting it, signed by approximately, can't say that, by 204 members of the faculty. The agenda of the meeting was chosen based on the four points from the petition. The executive committee has the authority to set the agenda and the authority to ask for additional agenda times. We do not have an unlimited amount of time and consequently the committee chose the best formulated agenda items. Each resolution submitted for consideration by the faculty was prepared by a member of the faculty or by a group of faculty members. The executive committee did not edit the resolutions that were submitted. We received a resolution of the Bloomington faculty concerning the academic calendar that endorsed extending the grading period for spring 2022, the calendar issue was in opposition to the UFC policy ACA-66. The executive committee did not place this resolution on the agenda as the Bloomington faculty's legislative authority over the academic calendar does not extend to changing deadlines beyond that calendar. The executive committee did vote for a one-time extension of the grading period to

align with the more generous UFC policy which permits grades to be submitted 4 days from the end of the term. We also received a motion though called a resolution entitled a resolution of the Bloomington faculty considering the future governance in our campus which laid out contingencies that shall trigger a full faculty meeting to consider a condemnation of the IU administration for its handling of the strike. The Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty is very specific regarding who and what can trigger a full faculty meeting, namely, the university president, the Bloomington provost by petition to the Bloomington faculty president of 50 members or by majority vote of the Bloomington Faculty Council. That's from section 4.3 given the passage of that motion would not do what it purported to do and the fact that we have limited time, the executive committee determined that it could not include this motion on the agenda. We are fully cognizant of the real need of our faculty colleagues to be engaged in meaningful discussions and to be heard by one another and administrated on the important issues of our campus as they arise throughout the year. To that end we have scheduled to first of several faculty town halls for September 27, 2022 in Whittenberger Auditorium and are in the process of securing additional dates for additional sessions. We hope that we will continue the strong tradition of faculty shared governance and increase the ways in which we meaningfully come together to advance the policies that improve teaching and wellbeing for all of our community on this campus for our faculty, staff and our students. There were other resolutions received but those were withdrawn for consideration. Moira Marsh, who is the librarian for anthropology, folklore and sociology has withdrawn her resolution concerning student academic appointee stipends and has requested this item be referred to the newly appointed Student Academic Appointees Committee and other appropriate BFC committees. So, we will not be using the green arrow ballot today, for all of you who were interested in that green arrow ballot. So now that you've heard about the items that do not appear on the agenda we will turn to item one on the agenda. The proposed resolution of the Bloomington faculty concerning shared governance and graduate student supervision submitted by Will Winecoff associate professor, director of graduate studies in political science. This will be presented by associate professor Margaret Graves in art history. Professor Graves thank you. Can you go to mic one please?

Margaret Graves: Thank you. Umm I'm going to begin by saying that there's been a friendly amendment that's been proposed for the resolution. I believe many of you have a paper copy of it, could you wave it in the air if you've got it. Alright, okay that looks like a pretty clear that people know what we're talking about. I'm going to introduce...

Marietta Simpson: Excuse me, could we have a copy of that?

Margaret Graves: Yes.

Laughing

Margaret Graves: Someone, does somebody have a spare copy?

Marietta Simpson: Thank you.

Margaret Graves: If we can proceed, I would like to introduce and then I think do I need to read all the whereas's when I read the resolution or do should I simply read the friendly amendment?

Marietta Simpson: I believe you need to read the whereas's.

Margaret Graves: The whereas's alright, okay I'm Margaret Graves. I'm associate professor of art history I'm also the DGS for art history and I'm the co-chair of the Graduate Faculty Council. The Graduate Faculty Council for those who don't know is an advisory body that represents the graduate faculty across the entire IU system. I am the only currently member of the executive committee who is on Bloomington. Hence my role in this. The GFC is actually a place for many of the faculty concerns that were growing across campus have really uh they really coalesced with an increasing sense of urgency. Accordingly, the faculty town hall that took place two weeks ago which many of you attended um that was called by a group of Bloomington faculty members of the Graduate Faculty Council including myself. Along with a representative of the AAUP and this resolution number one that comes directly from the petition that was created at the town hall and was subsequently signed by over 200 faculty. Because I know there's been questions about this I want to stress that resolution one on the agenda today is identical with resolution one as it was submitted by us to the BFC. So, this resolution asks you to reassert the authority departments, programs and schools to appoint SAA that as granted by the Bloomington Faculty Constitution. I would like to emphasize very strong that the resolution seeks to ensure that all grad students receive the due process that's guaranteed by BFC policy. We have two main concerns that have compelled this reassertion, one is the unprecedented withholding by the provost and VPFAA of SAA appointments as they were duly authorized by departments. The other is the sanctions against striking SAAs that's implied by this withholding and imposed on them without the protection of due process. The immediate consideration before you is that only those in departments, programs or schools who work with graduate students in an academic capacity have the relevant knowledge and experience to judge their suitability for an academic appointment. The fact that the VPFAA with no academic knowledge of individual appointees has withheld reappointments can only be interpreted we believe as a sanction against them for participation in a legal, collective, bargaining activity. Speaking briefly for myself as a DGS in the college, the situation created by the provost office and the VPFAA this semester has trapped faculty at the intersection where they're feeling the worst of both worlds. The provost and the VPFAA have attempted to compel faculty to act as enforcers of VPFAA decisions about termination and non-reappointment for SAAs while simultaneously denying faculty any determining voice on the legitimacy of those actions. We are being told to line up heads for the chopping block, essentially in a highly questionable corporate governance model that seeks to make faculty into line managers and disciplinarians while I think erroneously framing graduate students as an unskilled bottom tier workforce that is both expendable and replaceable. This I think is damaging to IU on very very many levels. So to the resolution itself I've been informed that there's been a friendly amendment I accept it, umm im going to read the full the resolution in full but I believe Rachael has a hand up.

Rachael Cohen: This is a complete rewrite of the Resolved and is not considered a friendly amendment.

Margaret Graves: So, what can we do, can I move to have it accepted?

Rachael Cohen: It needs to be moved, a motion to move to accept the new text and needs a second and then will be debated.

Margaret Graves: Okay, I'm going to read the whereas's first and then I'm going to ask if we can move that motion or I move it in fact?

Rachael Cohen: That is fine but just remember you have a time limit.

Margaret Graves: Okay, so whereas's first, whereas IUB policy of AAUP standards both guarantee the SAAs may not be sanctioned without due process, whereas supervisory authority over SAAs rests in with faculty within the units for schools and departments, whereas the graduate academic appointees guides states that reappointment of SAAs is determined by the specific appointment policies of the department or school whereas supervisory units departments and schools are the appropriate offices for assessing the criteria for the reappointment listed in the graduate academic appointees guide. Whereas the principles of shared governance call upon the faculty to review the performance of campus academic officers and administration on an on going basis as specified in Article 2 section 2.1 a12 of the constitution of the Bloomington faculty. Whereas the legislative authority of the campus regarding the academic mission as well as student conduct and discipline resides with faculty as specified in article 2 of the Constitution of the Bloomington faculty. Whereas the IU Bloomington faculty observe any sanction or non reappointment of the SAA most follow normal appointment and or disciplinary procedures as determined by the supervisory units and I would now move to propose the amendment which has been agreed by Elizabeth Housworth and Will Winecoff the two authors of this amendment I would move, would anyone second?

Inaudible sounds from audience

Okay can we have a show of hands in favor of the amendment resolution, alright that seems pretty straight forward.

Marietta Simpson: I'm sorry, excuse me, I'm sorry, I'm sorry I don't believe that you get to call for that vote.

Margaret Graves: Oh I'm sorry I was getting excited.

Laughing

Marietta Simpson: I appreciate your passion.

Laughing, clapping

But I think it's really important that if we're going to do this we do it in order and so I think it's great and I appreciate all the hands I saw as well okay.

Rachael Cohen: So we have a second so it is now at the point where it is debatable, so it is open to debate. Does anyone have questions or comments?

Margaret Graves: Elizabeth would like to speak to it.

Elizabeth Housworth: Some of you know that I had objections to that language because I actually thought that it was bad policy and had other problems with it so I sat down with Will before this meeting and we came up with language that we both agreed on that I think is good policy and does a little bit more than I believe that language does to protect the current SAAs who are on strike so I support it.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you Elizabeth, any other comments? Seeing none.

Rachael Cohen: All in favor please raise your hand and keep them raised?

Marietta Simpson: I think we're at time. I don't think we need to count.

Rachael Cohen: All opposed please raise your hand, alright the motion passes and the new resolution will have this text instead.

Margaret Graves: Shall I read it?

Rachael Cohen: Yes.

Margaret Graves: Alright. Okay so the new amendment. Resolved the IU Bloomington faculty asserts 1) as per the academic graduate appointees guide reappointments of SAAs are determined by departmental and school policies 2) no SAA will fail to be reappointed in Fall 2022 due to participating in the Spring 2022 SAA strike, including failure to turn in spring 2022 grades in a timely manner 3) the VPFAA will immediately release the SAA appointments for summer 2022 4) as per the constitution of the Bloomington faculty the faculty will review the performance of the administration with respect to future labor disputes 5) the BFC will ensure that disciplined students receive due process for grievances via the SAA mediation and review structures of the BFC 6) the BFC will reconstitute and empower the new SAA committee to strengthen and clarify IU policy for SAAs particularly emphasizing the central role of the department program or other supervising unit concerning SAA reappointment

Marietta Simpson: Thank you.

Rachael Cohen: Do we have any other comments about this resolution?

Marietta Simpson: Yes?

Will Winecoff: Thank you very much and colleagues thank you all for being here this is incredibly impressive and I think for this resolution item in particular a reassertion of the centrality of faculty governance it is incredibly important to see you all here. I would like to begin by agreeing with something that the provost said in a meeting with chairs and directors in the college in mid April. The provost in that meeting said that he agreed with many of the grievances of these SAAs in fact he acknowledged that they had been neglected by the administration of IUB for years up to a decade I believe he said. I think that all of us in this room

probably share that sentiment. The provost argued in that meeting that he could not discuss these grievances with the Indiana graduate coalition because there was a philosophical difference between them and himself and it is that philosophical difference which has apparently led to the withholding of all SAA appointments on campus to my knowledge at least I can't be sure the communication from the administration on this issue has been as poor as their decision making in my view. But I do think it is essential for us to claim reclaim the authority we already have. The graduate SAA appointees guide which is linked in this document you can read it yourself clearly states the reappointment authority resides within departments and schools not within the provost office which is not even mentioned in that section. And so in some ways this resolution should be unnecessary but given the fact that that authority has been challenged the chairs have been tasked with investigating and beginning to discipline their own students against their will another thing that the provost office does not have authority to do at least has not shown in the policies where that authority exists. Given all of these things we must vote yes on this resolution to reassert faculty governance and the centrality of the faculty in the policy making at this institution. Thank you.

Clapping

Marietta Simpson: Thank you. Are there any other comments? John Walbridge.

John Walbridge: Yea, I would like to say that while agree with much that is in here and the role of faculty governance that university policies do not allow the reappointment of people who have not satisfactorily completed their contractual duties and in this case specifically submitting grades. It's not about the union to protest however not meeting classes and not submitting is a violation of their contracts and by university policies this is justification for their not being reappointed.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you, John. Are there any other comments?

Clapping

Marietta Simpson: Yes, Yes?

Jeff Isaac: As I understand this, as I understand this excellent resolution brilliantly outlined by my colleague Will Winecoff who didn't announce who didn't identify himself, that's Will Winecoff. As the purpose of it is to explain and clarify and assert that the ultimate authority for determining whether or not graduate workers have fulfilled their duties are the departments with whom they work and for whom they work and it is the chairs and the directors of graduate studies who are best positioned to do that. So, I believe in fact the resolution John's comment doesn't really touch the resolution.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you.

Clapping

Marietta Simpson: Yes?

Steve Sanders: Yes my name is Steve Sanders. I think Professor Issac makes a valid point philosophically where appointment authority resides. I'm not really intending to speak in favor or against the language I just think it's necessary to clarify I'm not sure if this is intended as a resolution in the sense of it is our feeling that in so forth or if people actually believe this would have binding authority the faculty acting collectively have no binding legal authority to tell the provost or vice provost for faculty and academic affairs what do to and what not do. The legal authority runs from the trustees to the president, to the president's appointees to the appointees and the faculty have been given authority to set standards for appointments and it's certainly true that in the normal course of things decisions are made at the department level as to what kinds of what the needs are and how SAAs should be appointed and who should be appointed. I'm trying to make a neutral point that legally in terms of how the university is structured in terms of where the faculty sit in relation to administrators and their authority the BFC neither the BFC nor this meeting has any binding authority to tell the provost or VPFAA to do something or to not do something. It would certainly express the sense of the faculty as to what's appropriate and where authority should reside but I just want to be clear that if the provost and the vice provost don't follow the advice or the sense in this resolution they may have gone against the expressed will of the faculty they have not violated any kind of authority because the faculty do not give authority to the people who are making these decisions administratively on these appointments and budgets.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you. Professor Robinson?

Ben Robinson: Thank you, thank you everyone. I'm Ben Robinson, chair of the Germanic studies department and president of the IUB chapter of the AAUP. Um yea thank you Steve for your point, the basic issue here is that since 1915 there have been standards established by the AAUP of good governance shared governance and in accord with the AAU policy as laid out in the Red Book, there are standards of due process that all our SAAs would be should be governed by. The contention behind the behind the resolution is that the administration has failed in that due process. The force that we have in this room is that the assembled Bloomington faculty has addressed or will address the provost to say that is unacceptable leadership. That is unacceptable to the faculty, it is unacceptable to the spirit of shared governance.

Clapping

Just to be clear the statement on graduate students points out that graduate assistants like other campus employees should have the right to organize to bargain collectively. Graduate students must not suffer retaliation from professors or administration because of their activity related to collective bargaining. It's a clear and simple standard that has been AAUP policy for 50 years. I think this is a violation of that but not only is it a violation of due processes set out by the AAUP we do have in the SAA guide a full review process we have heard no charges we have had no hearings or no findings about what process um we don't have grades aren't due yet so I have no idea why this withholding is happening but it clearly doesn't meet basic standards of due process whether set out by the faculty or established by the AAUP. Thank you everyone.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you.

## Clapping

Joshua Kates: I'm Joshua Kates and I very much agree on the one hand that the students should not be punished. I agree with them that they should have due process but I'm here mainly it's a point that was raised by the first speaker which I've tried to get an answer to in other forms but have been unable to. The first speaker said that it was owing to a philosophical difference that the provost would not recognize the union and I guess while admitting and being aware of the issues that are in large part valid which I also think are valid and I would hate to see the students suffer come to any harm from trying to organize but my question is does the provost have the power to recognize the union does somebody have a clear answer about that question which I have not been able to get a clear answer from anyone at least at the departmental level when I've raised that question.

Marietta Simpson: John was up first and then Professor Issac.

John Walbridge: The provost does not have the authority to recognize the union. Only the Board of Trustees do nor does the president for that matter and I asked him to his face if that was the case and he told me that it was and that is what is in policy.

Joshua Kates: It was asked who has the power not who has the authority. This body has the power to register its view. How that gets litigated there are lots of good lawyers and legal scholars to deal with that. Can he get away with doing what he wants perhaps. We can say what we think is right. That's why we're here. That's what this resolution states and there's absolutely nothing that's been said by anyone that goes against that uh what Steve has said doesn't it go against it John with all due respect wants honor what the provost has said that is his right we are entitled to say what we believe.

## Clapping

Ken Dau-Schmidt: I'm Ken Dau-Schmidt, I'm a professor of labor and employment law at the law school and I teach private sector and public sector labor law and I've been answering questions at least for department chairs and for the union on this and reporters too. I have studied public sector collective bargaining in this state in in 2012 so I think I can give an authoritative answer on this although structure of the university is a little opaque.

## Laughing

In 2012 the legislature and the governor adopted a prohibition on collective bargaining in the public sector in Indiana unless you have an exception. Some public employees have an exception with a statute such as the teachers and the firefighters but other public employees have an exception expressly in the prohibition and Indiana University was excepted in the prohibition and I believe that was done because Indiana University at the time had a collective bargaining relationship with the staff. Now so we are legally allowed to recognize and collectively bargain with any of the employees Indiana University is allowed to do that in the past the way they've done that is they've had the trustees pass a policy under which the staff could demonstrate majority representation and then collectively bargain towards a contract and they could do the same things with the graduate students if they wanted to. So, you could certainly ask the trustees

to propagate another policy like that or the provost could ask the trustees to propagate another policy like that. Whether provost could just do it on his own that's more of a question of how the university is structured. Certainly, the trustees approve contracts that are made by administrators that are made retrospectively all the time. My contract approved after it was already negotiated by my dean certainly President McRobbie's \$600,000 kiss goodbye was approved retroactively by the trustees so I'm not sure they legally in other words probably the safe thing for the provost to do is to ask the trustees give me a new policy and I will go forward under that policy. It's not clear to me that he really couldn't negotiate a contract and then ask them to approve it and they could reject it if they wanted to I suppose. But they approve contracts retroactively all the time.

Clapping

Joshua Kates: That's helpful I appreciate an actual answer to my question. I just wanted to say that of course we can pass and say what we want it's obviously not the question the question whether we are pushing on a string or not. And I think it's still meaningful at this point in the proceedings to support

Inaudible sounds

I'm sorry I thought I had one minute rebuttal

Inaudible sounds

Rachael Cohen: There's a 1-minute rebuttal.

Marietta Simpson: There's a 1-minute rebuttal.

Joshua Kates: A lot of people have spoken twice now.

Marietta Simpson: Okay so we're all good, we're all good, we're all good.

Laughing

Joshua Kates: Apparently not.

Marietta Simpson: No, you're fine, and you have your opportunity.

Joshua Kates: Well, thank you. All I wanted to say is that I think at this point I think we have to support the students, but I continue to question I guess the tenor of that and what the actual outcomes we anticipate are. Thank you for your time.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you. Would you like to comment?

Inaudible sounds

Clapping

Marietta Simpson: I'm assuming you said you would like to call the question.

Female Voice: I would like to call the question.

Marietta Simpson: The question has been called.

Inaudible sounds

Marietta Simpson: It needs a second.

Inaudible sounds

Rachael Cohen: For those who may not know what call the question is because I'm not going to assume everybody understands Roberts Rules a call the question halts all discussion and sends it to an immediate vote. So, a call the question requires a second and then needs a  $\frac{3}{4}$  majority vote to go basically to the vote. So, we have a call the question.

Marietta Simpson: We had a second.

Rachael Cohen: We had a second and I oh and I'm sorry.

Marietta Simpson: I'm sorry.

Rachael Cohen: I truly am sorry now will need people to vote by raising their hands this is the voting to call the question.

Inaudible sounds

Rachael Cohen: Okay and if you are against it, please raise your hand, alright the call the question passes we will now go to the vote for resolution number 1 which is, which has been amended but is also ballot blue star. We ask that you vote, tear it off the ballot packet fold and sent it to one of the ends where it will get picked up.

Marietta Simpson: are we missing anyone's blue ballot, once these boxes come up they're not coming back. Okay thank you everyone. Alright. Alright let's move ahead to the next item. We are now on resolution 3. Resolution 3 is divided into 3A and 3B. The first will be presented by Erik Tillema. Professor Erik Tillema he's an associate professor in the school of education. Professor Erik Tillema. And he's coming down the aisle.

Erik Tillema: I'm going to ask actually if we can debate 3B first, would that be okay?

Marietta Simpson: Okay.

Erik Tillema: We will then debate 3B first I wanted to make sure that the 2 polices that the...

Marietta Simpson: We need to have them introduced before we debate them.

Erik Tillema: Oh okay. Excellent.

Marietta Simpson: Okay.

Erik Tillema: So I...

Marietta Simpson: So we need to read them first.

Erik Tillema: Go down thanks okay whereas SAAs play an essential role in the educational and research mission of IU Bloomington; whereas SAAs are both students and workers; whereas workers SAAs have the right to organize and associate collectively whereas as students SAAs

have rights of academic freedom and shared governance that are best protected when they are organized; whereas the IGWC has been campaigning responsibility and effectively on behalf of SAAs and has gained significant support from IUB graduate students at least 1,600 of whom have signed union cards. Now therefore be it resolved that the Bloomington faculty call on Provost Shrivastav, President Whitten and the Board of Trustees to recognized the SAAs request to unionize as a request to change HR policy 1270 to include IGWC or a similar entity as a union with which the university will negotiate. We further call on the provost president and board of trustees to recognize the SAAs request as a request to change the scope of policy HR 1270 to include the word students to indicate that both students and staff are recognized under this policy. Additionally, we urge university administration and leadership of SAAs to engage in dialogue aimed at meaningful compromise because of the negative impact the further impasse has on all members of the university as part of this dialog we encourage leadership of SAAs to outline specific financial requests to the administration that makes definite indefinite terminology like living wage and fairness to international graduate students so that the administration and leadership of the SAAs can negotiate on specific financial requests as opposed to broad ideas.

If they have not already, we further urge the SAA's to familiarize themselves with the RCM financial model under which Indiana University Bloomington operates to ensure that the structure of their proposed union takes into account the financial structure of the university.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you. Alright. And, now we have resolution 3B which will be presented by Professor of History, Alex Lichtenstein.

Alex Lichtenstein: Thank you all for being here. Alex Lichtenstein. I'd like to introduce myself as a former member of the united faculty of Florida. Florida International University. And as a member of the American Historical Association. The country's premier association of professional historians which has unequivocally stated that graduate students should have the right to organize. And, I am also professor of history and American studies. So and I also would like to say that I am not sure I accept Erik's suggestion that we debate 3B first. But let me explain before I read the resolution why this is the resolution, we would like to see support for rather than 3A. First this like resolution #1 that was raised so eloquently. This is the original resolution that grew from the townhall 3A is something else. 3B is a clear unequivocal statement that IU should negotiate with the IGWC-UE unlike 3A which we believe waffles on that. 3B recognizes the fact that there is and will be a union organized on this campus. 3B recognizes that there is as Ken Dau-Schmidt outlined so eloquently in the previous debate. There is already a mechanism with which this can be done and there is no need to modify a policy. 3B also does so without any condescending language that presumes to instruct that the IGWC-UE on how they should conduct their bargaining. (clapping). 3B treats the students here as colleagues as grown adults who know what they are doing and whose trust we have already given, we have already recognized in their efforts to organize a union. So no necessity for such condescending language. And, 3B was straight forward insistence points out that this is not out of the ordinary for public R1 university to treat with the union of organized graduate students. That I would say is the thrust of the whereas's which I will now read to the best of my ability.

Marietta Simpson: Yes. Yes.

Alex Lichtenstein: I am merely following the precedence that it says with number 1.

Marietta Simpson: No. I will agree that editorializing before it would be one thing to give the background for your.

Alex Lichtenstein: Ok. So, I am prepared to read the resolution.

Marietta Simpson: Wait a second. We talked about not – maybe I didn't talk about this. But it just felt a little disrespectful to the first person. So, I would like for us not to do that to one another.

Alex Lichtenstein: I apologize. Whereas student academic appointees play an essential role in the educational and research mission of IUB. Whereas SAAs are both students and IU employees. Whereas, as employees SAAs have the right to organize. Associate collectively and when necessary to strike. Whereas, as students SAAs has rights of academic freedom and shared governance that are best protected when they are organized and well represented. Whereas campus administration has ignored resolutions from the Indiana University Student Government, the GPSG and the Bloomington Faculty Council.

Marietta Simpson: I am going to stop you. I am sorry. You are technically at time right now.

Alex Lichtenstein: Ok. You all can read the resolution. I urge you to vote for 3B.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you. (clapping). Alright, so you have the 2 resolutions. We are now. Rachael. For discussion.

Rachael Cohen: Yes. We are now open for discussion on either of the resolution. As you are discussing them, please be clear 3A or 3B for all of our sanity.

Marietta Simpson: And I encourage us once again. We are colleagues. Please be respectful of your comments of one another. Thank you. Ben Robinson is at the microphone.

Ben Robinson: Thank you Marietta. I am going. Most people I need to hold it.

Marietta Simpson: I see that.

Ben Robinson: In any case. Yes. I think respect is important here and I thank Erik for the other resolution. I think the main difference is the point Ken Dau-Schmidt laid out at the beginning. That resolution 3B that I am speaking for directs us to conditions of cooperation. So if you look at the history of collective bargaining among graduate students in the United States. Where there is not a statutory obligation as in the case of Indiana. It is affected voluntarily by conditions of cooperation. 3B directs us to HR1220 which is the conditions of cooperation. Which allows the establishment of a sole collective bargaining agent among the graduate students. That is the relevant policy not only here but in other examples of universities across the country. HR1270 which the other resolution 3A refers to is a downstream policy. And, usually it is called the

determination of the collective bargaining unit. And the determination of the collective bargaining unit is usually done with hearings including both parties. The administration and the graduate students. And would not be necessary for us to legislate on HR1270. The HR policy committees can change that based on the conditions of cooperation. So we urge a vote on. I urge and the townhall petitioners confer a vote on 3B because it is clear. It addresses the relevant policies, and it fits precedence of other recognition efforts by collective bargaining agents among graduate students in the country. Thank you.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you. Ben (clapping). Are there any other comments. Someone is approaching the mic. Yes. Ok. Yes you can come while she is coming.

Female Voice: Me? Yes. I just actually have a question. Because this seems relevant to this particular resolution that we are debating. This packet of information like this handout. I don't know there is some stuff that is pro union and anti-union. What is this and where did it come from?

Marietta Simpson: It is an information sheet that has come from – one came from – go ahead Rachael. My brain is all over the place right now.

Rachael Cohen: So every group that submitted a resolution was allowed to also submit a background or informational sheet. As well as the SAA union. And the administration. It was felt that no one wanted to sit through a power point of background information so this was our way of letting everyone read all of the sides presented. And, so everyone was given the same opportunity to present their side through one sheet informational.

Female Voice: Sorry?

We are not going to holler out if you want to make a comment. (anonymous)

Marietta Simpson/Rachael Cohen: Truthfully, I have not seen them. We just printed what was sent to us. Yes. We just didn't.

Female Voice: So. Ok. So this isn't being like. I mean do not know how it could consistently be since there are internal disagreements between different parts of document. This isn't being like – it doesn't have your stamp of approval that everything in it is factually true? I realize there is differences of opinion too being expressed here. But, we don't know if any of this being expressed is true or not.

Rachael Cohen: Correct. Did not edit or change any of the resolutions submitted. We did not change any of the...

Marietta Simpson: We just printed what people sent us.

Rachael Cohen: One pager that was given to us on their side or case.

Marietta Simpson: Yes.

Female voice: Ok. Does anyone know whether the part about BDS is true? Boycott divestment and sanctions? I don't see page numbers but the second to last page. Oh thank you.

Someone else is going to speak to that. The next speaker.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you. Yes, Ken you are next.

Ken Dau-Schmidt: Just briefly. I see a lot that I like in both in 3A and 3B. A lot that I can agree with. To me, and I was not involved in drafting either one at least not directly. I think I had some questions that went into some of this. The advantage of 3A is that it – what I worry about with 3B is the university counsel has been arguing that if we going into HR1220 then the SAAs are staff and lose their rights as students. I see that largely as a make way argument. There is no reason why the university has to take rights away from these students. But, 3A tries to deal with that argument. Ok we are going to petition the trustees to directly recognize these people because they have already made enough of a majority showing or at least they are going to amend their policies to include students. And so therefore, we don't have this argument– this spurious argument from counsel that if they go under HR 1220 then suddenly, they are staff and lose rights. There is no legal reason why they have to do it that way. But that is the argument raised by counsel.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you, Ken.

Amy Applegate: Hi, my name is Amy Applegate. I am faculty member at the Maurer School of Law. I am addressing issue 3. I guess I am addressing both 3A and 3B which is the call for recognition of the union or a union or however you want to look at it. What I wanted to say is that graduate students are employees, I actually believe that. Obviously, but the relationship is more complicated than just an employment relationship. Graduate students choose to be here at IU and are here for a limited amount of time. Primarily to earn their graduate degree. They enjoy the benefits of tuition remission and free health insurance. Really good free health insurance. That said. They deserve to be paid fair wages for their employment. The union is proposing to represent the students for more than fair wages. Now, the union I'm talking about the I guess the, IGWC-UE is among other things seeking to establish binding arbitration to resolve grievances over authorship, intellectual property, workloads and other academic matters. The UE is openly anti-Israel. You can go to their website to check this out in ways that include endorsing the boycott divestments sanction movement and urging the union and its members to support and become engaged in BDS. As a Jewish woman of the Bloomington faculty I ask how our faculty can support this kind of anti-Semitism. I can't support that union. (clapping).

Marietta Simpson: We will go to microphone 1 and then 2.

Elizabeth Dunn: I am Elizabeth Dunn. I am from Geography. The question of Israel and Palestine is irrelevant to the matter at hand. (clapping). I urge you not to get involved into what is a red herring.

Erik Tillema: I just want to speak to the reason that I put together. 3A.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you.

Erik Tillema: So, its related to the fact that the administration has put together what feels like a flimsy argument about staff and students. And, it seems to use both HR1220 and HR1270 to make that argument. Seems to me like a simple solution to that is changing the actual policy HR1270. However, I am happy to withdraw 3A. Because I recognize that this is the policy that the union would like us to support. (clapping)

Rachael Cohen: Erik, I am not sure if most people know this Robert's Rule so I am going to inform you in case the fact you want to make this decision. There is a Robert's Rule of division of a question which allows you to split a motion or resolution in two. And, so you would be able to propose to split A and B into separate ballots. If that is what the faculty would want to do. It is a basically just a motion to split a majority vote needs a second. I just want to let people know what their option is with Robert's Rules. As most people are not as conversant as I am. So, if you are happy to withdraw but I want to give that option to if you want to go that way as well.

Will we still be able to use this paper ballot?

Rachael Cohen: Yes. We will use the green arrow.

Marietta Simpson: Yes, because we have a rainbow ballot that we can use.

Rachael Cohen: We will use the back of green arrow to use for 3A and then go to 3B.

Marietta Simpson: Erik, do you want to do that or do you want to withdraw your number 3? You want to withdraw. Ok. Thank you. (clapping).

Steve Watt: I am Steve Watt. I am emeritus professor of English. What I really want to say is I taught here for 35 years. I retired 2 years ago. The issues that sort of inform this conversation have been here the entire 37 years I have been in Bloomington. That is to say, the can has been kicked down the road when it comes to compensating graduate employees fairly. A bunch of us wrote a volume called "Will teach for food." That was published in 1997 which talks about company towns paying graduate students with one hand and taking money back from the other. My experience of 37 years here is that the way we've been approaching this has not been effective. And, the way it's been approached in the last 3 months has been in my judgment the absence of effective leadership. Anybody can threaten people. It's time for real dialogue. And, this may not be the means a lot of people like but it – something has to be done. The last think I will say. I have been on 65 or 70 dissertation committees here and other universities. A lot of those universities – Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois are unionized. I have never once had a union representative at a dissertation defense (laughter, clapping).

Marietta Simpson: Ben you are back again.

Ben Robinson: But for a very brief comment. I do want to respond to Professor Applegate's comment because I was I grew up in Schenectady NY. My dad, a first generation Jewish

immigrant grew up in Schenectady, NY with the AFL its famous sitdown strike against racism and against unequal wages for women when all the AFL unions went back to work and its leaders said that time is truly were two Jewish American first generation. So as a Jewish member of the faculty I reject any insinuation that the UE is an anti-Semitic organization. It is a powerful representative of racial, gender and social inequality which has played a historical role in the labor movement in this country.

Jeff Isaac: I am Jeff Isaac. I want to fully endorse what Ben just said. And, I am actually a little nervous. It kind of pains me to say what I'm about to say. Which is I love Amy Applegate. She is my former next door neighbor. And, I am also a Jewish American. And, I'm not a supporter of BDS although I do not believe BDS is anti-Semitic. More importantly, this is about a bargaining unit in Indiana or within IU about graduate worker wages, benefits and policy issues. It has nothing to do with foreign policy. Nothing. And, these students chose to affiliate with UE. It's not my choice. And, it's not anyone else's choice. Do we respect the right of graduate student workers to collectively organize and to bargain? Yes or no. If we do then we support this union. This union is not anti-Semitic. Ben explained the history of the union. It is a progressive union. There is nothing anti-Semitic about BDS either. I don't want to debate BDS now but I want to make really clear that it is really beside the point (clapping).

Marietta Simpson: Yes. Somebody is behind you (sorry).

Sarah Knott: Good afternoon. This is Sarah Knott from history. I would like to call the question please.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you. (clapping).

Rachael Cohen: Can I please get a second. (second) As a reminder this requires a  $\frac{3}{4}$  majority. All in favor, please raise your hand. All opposed. Alright. At this time we will vote on 3 as single ballots. Ignore the A and B. It is just a yes and no question.

(inaudible silences)

Rachael Cohen: Hi all. So apparently, I missed something. I knew you can withdraw before an agenda with no second. But since we have started the meeting we needed a second and a majority vote. So just to be following the rules, can I get a second for 3A to be withdrawn. Thank you. Can I get a show of hands for withdrawing 3A. Thank you. Against. Thank you. Again it was just procedurally I needed to do that.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you. The final item on our agenda this afternoon is the proposed resolution of the Bloomington faculty concerning cooperation among graduation student and administration. This will be presented by Professor John Walbridge, middle eastern languages and cultures. John.

John Walbridge: Before I start can I get a clarification of the procedures first and third motions that were proposed. The proposers had an opportunity to give comments.

Marietta Simpson: Yes.

John Walbridge: Before the second one was told that he could only read the.

Marietta Simpson: No, it was the editorializing about his colleague that was the problem. So.

John Walbridge: So, my understanding is that I would have 3 minutes plus a minute of response.

Rachael Cohen: Yes.

John Walbridge: And continue reading the item or...

Marietta Simpson: No. it is not a minute of response. You have 3 minutes to give your...Go ahead Rachael explain it.

John Walbridge: Yes please. Because I think the first one ran about 5 minutes.

Marietta Simpson: Really, John are you going to drag us through this?

John Walbridge: Yes. I am a stubborn sole.

Marietta Simpson: I know you are. It is one of the things I love and hate about you. (laughter)

Rachael Cohen: Present your resolution and then we will give you an extra minute for any commentary.

John Walbridge: Ok. Because I understand I would have 3 minutes and then a minute to respond.

Marietta Simpson: John, you are wasting time. You have 3 minutes to give your commentary. Right? And then you have your minute and then you are going to read it.

John Walbridge: Ok so commentary. Read it. Alright. My printout is rather small so I'm going to have to do it from the screen. Resolution from the Bloomington faculty concerning cooperation among the graduate students and the administration. Whereas Indiana University has robust tradition of shared governance involving administrators, faculty and students going back to the storied days of President Wells. And, whereas SAAs play a critical role in the life of the university supporting the research mission and instruction of undergraduates and out of class campus experiences bringing energy and vitality to its classrooms, labs and offices. And, whereas the labor conflict between graduate students interested in forming a union and the faculty and IUB administration is continued to highlight the inequalities to graduate packages as uncompetitive. Whereas the institutional position on a graduate union has not changed over the course of 3 provosts and faculty and administration and students interested in creating a union have not found a path forward to end the labor dispute. Whereas it is not clear how a graduate student union would impact all the 11,000 graduate students at IUB less that a quarter are SAAs and whereas the current provost has only been on the campus since February 15, 2022. And it's first weeks began addressing these problems by raising stipends, eliminating restrictions on the

use of fee remissions and establishing with the Bloomington Faculty Council a task force to investigate these problems and how these problems might best be solved. And, whereas experience has taught us that major changes in the university require careful investigation and planning. And be it resolved that we call upon administrations, faculty and graduate students to collaborate with the universities efforts to investigate the problems and how these problems best be solved. And, whereas experience has taught us that major changes in the university require careful investigation and planning. And be it resolved that we call upon administrators, faculty, and graduate students to collaborate with the universities efforts. To investigate the problems faced by graduate students to determine how these complex issues might be best solved. Including reconsideration of established practices of undergraduate and graduate education. Budgeting systems, administrative habits and graduate student funding models. And we request that all parties in the dispute recognize the current policies and practices are established through shared governance to fulfill the mission of the institution. And that all members of our community are responsible to carry out their obligations to teach and make grades and participate in shared governance. Alright, my comments. My name is John Walbridge. I am a professor of middle eastern languages and culture. For the last 20 years I have been closely involved in graduate student issues. I was DGS for 6 years, chair for 3 with a small dept with about 70 graduate students. The bulk of my recent teaching is focused on my PhD students. I was also a leader in the movement to improve working conditions for the non-tenure track faculty. I have been a member of the BFC for 6 years including as your elected president. So one thing and another I have a sense of how things work around here. This afternoon I would urge caution and realism. First a graduate student union is not going to get recognized. Neither the provost nor president have the authority. And the trustees, even willing, given the climate of the state, this is Indiana, not California or Massachusetts. It is unwise in my opinion to accept something that will not happen. Second, of all should support better conditions for our graduate students. The real question is how to do it. The increase in stipends is a start. But the real big decisions will require time and consultation across campus. The fact that less than a quarter of our graduate students are SAAs also matters. Major changes require rethinking aspects of both graduate and undergraduate education. As well as changes to the RCM budget model that has been in place for three decades. Third, IUs shared governance model relies on the willingness of administrators to recognize the faculty and students play a useful role in university decision making. Most of our senior leadership is being replaced by entirely outside hires unfamiliar with our traditions here. It the provost or the president or the trustees decide that it is not worth working with faculty shared governance will be dead here. This has happened in many other campuses. Finally, I would like to say a few words in defense of our new provost. He wasn't my first choice. He was my fourth actually of five. But I have spent more time with him than 95% of the faculty. You laugh. He is also at the top of my list of the people I thought I might be underestimating. I find him to be hardworking, intelligent, logical and direct. The directness perhaps accounting for the complaints about his tone. I have never heard him say anything in private that contradicted what he said in public. Nor have I heard him say anything that I know to be untrue. Perhaps it is simplest to quote what my non academic Hoosier republican wife said...

Rachael Cohen: John. Sorry you are out of time.

John Walbridge: Alright, well my wife will have to stay out of it. (laughter)

John Walbridge: That is probably safer for you all.

Marietta Simpson: Great we are open for comments.

Rachael Cohen: Yes. We are now open for comments.

Micol Seigel: Micol Seigel professor of American studies and history. I want to speak against this amendment. To me it is a classic example of the kind of delaying tactics that the university has practiced. I think it is exactly what Steve Watt just so eloquently opposed by pointing out that in his 35 years here, he has seen this exact choice made. This exact route taken over and over and over. We need something else now. And, that something is union recognition. What I understand in fact from survey taken in my unit. From listserv conversations and from the shows of hands that I have seen so far in this meeting is that sentiment in this room is overwhelming entirely in the opposite direction from this amendment proposed so much so in fact that I think many of you were leaning towards the possibility of endorsing a path to a no confidence vote had that remained on this agenda. (clapping). I know that many of you are unhappy that is no longer on the agenda and I just want to pass on the reassurance that I have heard from Ben Robinson and others that in fact that we don't require this body to endure a call for path towards that kind of vote in order to hold one in the fall if in fact the provost and president continue on their ill-advised path. And in particular if they begin to fire SAAs beginning this week. So know that is entirely on the table even though it is not apart of this meeting. And, if things come to that – that is where we are headed in the fall.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you, Micol.

Diane Henshel: Diane Henshel, I am in SPEA. These days O'Neill. It is still SPEA. I seem to hear John much as I respect you having worked with you quite awhile. Even half of what you said supported the 3B and the resolution 1 and didn't even support your own resolution so I find your resolution to be confusing. And, obfuscating and a problem and I strongly recommend voting no. On the other hand that I would like to point out is that I would like to give a show of support for the Board of Trustees. There are unquestionably people on the Board of Trustees that are ideologically extreme. But most of the people on the Trustees really believe in the university. Many came from the university or came from the university and they honestly try to listen...and they honestly try to listen to what's going on. Please show at least some respect to the Board of Trustees and believe that they will listen to us, especially when we show such an overwhelming show of support for the union and for supporting our graduate students. I do not see that we are going to have a monolithic response back; I think that what we are going to do is be stimulating a huge discussion among them. I do think we need to make sure that we continue to put pressure on the Board of Trustees, but please at least show them some support, because I think that they really have our interests at heart.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you Diane.

[clapping]

Please—oh--please remember the mics are not pro/con, so you can line up at both—it's somewhat easier to do a back and forth. Yes.

Carl Weinberg: I'm Carl Weinberg. I'm a senior lecturer in history, PACE, and LAMP, and even once in mathematics. I um respectfully urge you to vote no on resolution number 4. I'm going to take it whereas by whereas. Whereas number one, which refers to the storied days of president Wells. Well, not all traditions from the storied days of President Wells are good traditions or ones worth continuing. For instance, President Wells collaborated with a notorious segregationist, Ora Wildermuth, then-president of the Board of Trustees, to exclude Japanese American students from IU during World War Two, a move that the university recently apologized for. It's time for IU to move into the 21<sup>st</sup> century and recognize the graduate workers union. Whereas number three, which refers to labor conflict between graduate students and the faculty and IU administration. The conflict is not between graduate workers and the faculty. It's between the graduate workers and the upper IU administration who answer to the IU Board of Trustees. Whereas number four, uh, refers to IU faculty, administration, and students being unable to find a path forward to end the labor dispute. They haven't found a path forward? Translation: despite massive support among graduate workers for union representation, and despite massive support for this effort from the graduate and professional student government and faculty, IU has refused to recognize the Indiana Graduate Workers Coalition as the collective bargaining agent for graduate workers. You want a path forward? Recognize the union.

[clapping]

Whereas number five—it's not clear how our graduate student union would impact all the 11,000 graduate students. It's also not clear if it will rain next Saturday. What that has to do with anything I'm not sure. The point is, there are graduate worker unions at Big Ten schools—six of them, I hear—and the sky has not fallen there, although it might be raining in Ann Arbor on Saturday. It's not clear. I'm not sure about that.

Whereas number six—the provost has only been on campus since February 15, 2022—well, he was hired, and he's done some great things – well, he was hired on the brink of a long-planned strike. All of his actions were designed to prevent this long-planned strike from happening to prevent any further progress toward unionizing graduate workers. Why is this cause for praising the provost? Finally, the resolution calls on administrators, faculty, and graduate students to collaborate to solve complex problems—in other words, “we need more time.” Here I cannot do any better than to quote Martin Luther King Jr from the letter from the Birmingham jail. Addressing so-called white Southern moderates, he wrote: One of the basic points in your statement is that our acts are untimely. Some have asked, ‘Why don't you give the new administration time to act?’ The only answer that I give to those inquiries is the new administration must be prodded about as much as the outgoing one before it acts. Frankly, I've never engaged in a direct-action movement that was well-timed. So...

Marietta Simpson: Thank you.

Carl Weinberg: So, uh, finally the resolution affirms that, uh, the parties in the dispute are responsible ...

Marietta Simpson: I'm sorry. I'm sorry—we've reached time.

Carl Weinberg: OK. Thank you very much.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you.

[applause]

Marietta Simpson: Because we have had a successive, successive opinions of the same opinion, I'm going to ask: Is there an opinion that is different than what we have heard? Steve and then Jay... since we've heard from you a couple of times, Steve. Jay, is your opinion the same or different?

J Duncan: Uh, mine is neutral in nature.

Marietta Simpson: OK, let's hear it.

J Duncan: Because I've served on faculty governance for a while now, though not quite as long as some of you. And I hope I have a little bit of a reputation of speaking up for people's rights. What I will say is to address directly your point, John. If you do this, and it doesn't work—if you have a right and you don't use it—do you have a right? And that is all I will say.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you, Jay. Steve?

Steve Sanders: I'd like to briefly just continue along a theme that John was starting down before his time ran out, and that is that from my observation, my work on the BFC, the extent to which I've been able to get to know him, I worry that faculty have been unfair to the provost by blaming him and threatening him with resolutions of no confidence. The provost in this situation, for better or worse, rightly or wrongly, can only do what the president or the Board of Trustees have allowed him to do, basically. Uh, and so, uh, if you want to focus your, your energy or your ire on a lack of progress, I would suggest not blaming him, because he is answerable to people, who have frankly, I believe, constrained his authority, the room he has to negotiate or meet with groups. And so I would just encourage people today and in your dialogue going forward to not just single out this particular officer who's brand new but to remember, it really is the trustees and the president who I think are setting policy here. And I would disagree with Professor Henshel just a little bit. I also respect the Board of Trustees and believe they, in their own way always believe they're working in IU's best interest, but I had some opportunity last fall to become very familiar with the ways the trustees, um, routinely – and who habitually violate the Indiana Open Door Act, the Indiana Open Meetings Law—and so there are no exceptions to that law that are applicable to this situation, yet we would be foolish to imagine that the trustees have not had many conversations about this issue, and many meetings with the president and the provost and so forth so, um, picking up on a theme that Diane began, what I would encourage all of us to do also is to insist that the Board of Trustees not only speak to this issue but that the Board of Trustees honor Indiana law and have a meeting at which all of them talk and address the merits of this issue what they see about the merits or lack thereof of unionization—how they are instructing their employees—the president, the provost—to handle the matter and to do that in public, because ultimately it really is only the Board of Trustees who are accountable, legally

to the public by vote, to the governor, to the alumni in the direction that Indiana University will take on these issues. So. Thank you.

Marietta Simpson: Thank you.

Jeremy Siek: Hello, my name is Jeremy Siek. I'm in the computer science department. School of Informatics. So I want to make two points. First the town hall meeting had four agenda items. The fourth was the question of a no-confidence vote. I believe that the BFC leadership went over their power to remove that completely from our agenda today and replace it with this, so that there would be no time to discuss the no-confidence vote. My second point I want to make is, we've all heard today about the actions—we've seen the actions of our provost. Are those the actions of a leader? We should hold our leaders to a high standard. He's threatened the grad students, he's threatened us. He's coerced the deans and the chairs to threaten us and our students. This is completely unacceptable. [clapping] I'd like a show of hands—how many of you...

Marietta Simpson: Excuse me, excuse me, excuse me.

Jeremy Siek: ...have confidence in the provost?

Marietta Simpson: Microphone one please.

Kon Dierks: I have a very practical thing. Can I leave a vote behind? I have to pick up a child. So can I leave a vote behind, otherwise I'll call the question.

Marietta Simpson: You can call the question.

Kon Dierks: I'm late to pick up a kid.

Marietta Simpson: Second? Do we have a second? All right.

Rachael Cohen: Alright. We've all done this before. We have a second? Can I have, uh, a show of hands in favor of the called question. Thank you. Can I see against the called question? Thank you. The call of question passes. We will now vote on Resolution 4—that is the red ballot—red triangle. As we have done in the past, please vote and pass to the end of the row.

Marietta Simpson: If you still have a red ballot and have not turned it in please make sure it is turned in; after the boxes get up here it cannot be turned in? Have all the ballots been handed in? OK. Couple of things before we part company today. I said this in a BFC meeting and I'll say it now. Long after the students graduate, we will be colleagues. And it's really important to me personally, and I'm sure to you, that we treat each other with a modicum of respect. Uh, there was a comment made about John Walbridge, that...John Walbridge is a respected member of this community. And no matter what or if we disagree with each other or not, John you deserve respect. As does Micol, as does every person in this room. There will be plenty of times when we don't agree with one another. And that's--we are all thinking people. So we are very passionate about what we believe. But it's never appropriate for us to disrespect each other. That's beneath all of us. So I think we have to respect each other. [applause] I want to say thank you to each of you who came out today—there were 732 people in attendance. So for all of you who sent those

emails—some of them not so nice, I will add—that encouraged everybody to attend, bravi tutti! It worked, but what that means is everything that we voted on today will have to be sent to the general faculty, so that everyone can vote. We've only been able—our friends, the librarians, thank you for the counting that they've done [applause/cheers]. They've successfully counted the first resolution there were 683 affirmative votes to pass that resolution, 39 nos, and two of you left them blank. But as I said that will go to the general faculty. Everything that we voted on today will now have to be sent to the general faculty which means that we will all have to vote again. Alright? But what was successful here today is that we heard each other, we had conversation together, I want to thank again the IU Auditorium management and staff, our faculty and colleagues and staff who helped—let's thank them [claps]. Thank you for coming and I hope that all of you enjoy a safe, and restorative summer. Thank you so much for being here today.

[gavel]

Meeting is adjourned.