

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
April 12, 2022

MEMBERS PRESENT: Banks, Karen; Calloway-Thomas, Carolyn; Carini, John; Cohen, Rachael; Daleke, David; Dederichs, Madeline; Deeds, Anna' Deliyannis, Constantine; Desawal, Danielle; Doucette, Kaitlin; Duncan, J; Eskew, Kelly; Fleming, Jackie; Freeman, Ky; Guerra-Reyes, Lucia; Gupta, Nandini; Herrera, Israel; Johnson, Colin; Knapp, Douglas; Kravitz, Ben, Kunzman, Robert; Lester, Jessica; Letsinger, Sally; Libson, Scott; Lion, Margaret; Loring, Annette; Northcutt Bohmert, Miriam; Ossi, Massimo; Pavalko, Eliza; Peters, Chuck; Raymond, Angie; Sacks, Dan; Sanders, Steve; Shea, Eliabeth; Sherman, Jim; Singh, Kashinka; Sterling, Thomas; Svetina, Duravka; Thomassen, Lisa; Walbridge, John; Willis, Erik; Wyczynski, Stephen; Yanites, Brian, Zaleski, Jeff; Zorn, Kurt

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ansaldo, Jim; Arcuri, Toni; Banai, Hussein; Davis, Allen; Frazier, Lessie; Gill, Brian; Giordano, Anthony; Gold, Jason; Hodgson, Justin; Kolbaum, Pete; Lipschultz, Nancy; Luketa, Valentina; Machado, Pedro; Olcott, Courtney; Potter, Rob; Shy, Katie; Tirey, Samantha; Wu, Jiangmei

GUESTS: Johnson, David; Lundell, Michael; Mincey, Sarah; Perry, Jim; Thieme, Sacha; Winterman, Brian

AGENDA:

1. **Approval of the minutes of April 5, 2022**
2. [Memorial Resolution for Dennis G. Peters](#)
3. [Memorial Resolution for Michael L. Tracy](#)
4. **Approval of special meeting of the Bloomington Faculty Council**
Pending concurrence of the Bloomington Faculty Council, the BFC will hold a special meeting starting 10 minutes after the adjournment of the regular meeting.
5. **Executive Committee Business** (10 minutes)
Marietta Simpson, Faculty President
6. **Presiding Officer's Report** (10 minutes)
Rahul Shrivastav, Provost
7. **Question/comment Period** (10 minutes)
Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to Provost Shrivastav or President Simpson by emailing bcoff@indiana.edu. Questions should be submitted no less

than two business days before the meeting.

8. **Proposed amendments to BL-ACA-D9 Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of Indiana University regarding standing committees** (5 minutes)
Rachael Cohen, Parliamentarian and Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee
[Second reading – action item]
 - [Current BL-ACA-D9 Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council](#)
 - [B37-2022: Proposed amendments to BL-ACA-D9 Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of Indiana University regarding standing committees](#)
 - [B38-2022: Proposed policy on Bloomington Faculty Council Committees](#)
9. **Questions/comments on the proposed amendments to BL-ACA-D9 Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of Indiana University regarding standing committees** (10 minutes)
10. **Recommendation to redefine Statewide Transfer General Education Core (STGEC) requirements at Indiana University Bloomington** (5 minutes)
Kelly Eskew, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
David Rutkowski, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
Kurt Zorn, Acting Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
Michael Lundell, Senior Assistant Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
[Second reading – action item]
 - [B39-2022 Recommendation to redefine Statewide Transfer General Education Core \(STGEC\) requirements at Indiana University Bloomington](#)
11. **Questions/comments on the recommendation to Redefine STGEC Requirements at Indiana University Bloomington** (10 minutes)
12. **Proposed extension of the special exception for test-optional applications for specific applicant populations** (10 minutes)
Kelly Eskew, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
David Rutkowski, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
David Johnson, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management
Sacha Thieme, Assistant Vice Provost and Executive Director of Admissions
[Action item]
 - [Current BL-ACA-H11, Undergraduate Admissions Policy](#)
13. **Questions/comments on the proposed extension of special exception for test-optional applications for specific applicant populations** (15 minutes)

14. Proposal to add sustainability literacy as a shared goal in the IUB General Education (10 minutes)

Kelly Eskew, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee

David Rutkowski, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee

Sarah Mincey, Co-chair of the Sustainability as a Shared Goal Task Force

Brian Winterman, Co-chair of the Sustainability as a Shared Goal Task Force

[Second reading – action item]

- [Current BL-ACA-H9, Indiana University Bloomington General Education](#)
- [B14-2022 Proposed revisions to BL-ACA-H9, Indiana University Bloomington General Education](#)
- [B15-2022 Proposal to Establish a Sustainability Shared Goal](#)

15. Questions/comments on the proposal to add sustainability literacy as a shared goal in the IUB General Education (20 minutes)

TRANSCRIPT

SHRIVASTAV: Good afternoon, everyone. I would like to call our meeting to order, today's April 12th and this is, believe it or not, our last BFC scheduled meeting, regularly scheduled BFC meeting for the semester. I will get things started as usual.

AGENDA ITEM ONE: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

SHRIVASTAV: Our first item on the agenda, as always, is the approval of the minutes of April 5th, which was barely a week ago, or exactly a week ago. So, I need a motion for the approval of minutes. And Carolyn seconds it, the motion is on the table all in favor, please raise your hands. All opposed? Nobody. Motion passes. We have our minutes.

AGENDA ITEM TWO: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR DENNIS G. PETERS

SHRIVASTAV: We will as always again start with a memorial reading for two of our dear colleagues, Dennis G. Peters and Michael L. Tracy. I would like to invite Eliza to read the memorial for us.

PAVALKO: Thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM THREE: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR MICHAEL L. TRACEY

PAVALKO:

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you, Eliza, I would like to ask all of you to stand for a minute of silence if you're able to.

Thank you.

[BACKGROUND]

AGENDA ITEM FOUR: APPROVAL OF SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you very much. Before we move forward, there is a new item on the agenda that if you haven't seen it in the latest iteration, it is a motion to approve a special meeting of the BFC. This will be held after the end of this regular meeting. This comes from the Executive Committee. It does not need a second, but it does need a vote.

And to the Parliamentarian, is there a discussion before the vote?

There is no discussion. So, basically, it is a motion to have a special meeting of the BFC to be done 10 minutes after this meeting ends. All in favor, please raise your hands.

All opposed?

Motion passes. So, we will have a second meeting at the end of this meeting later today.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

SHRIVASTAV: With that, let me move this onto the Executive Committee Business and pass it onto Marietta.

SIMPSON: So good afternoon, everybody. Hard to imagine this is our last regularly scheduled meeting. Last week I had so many difficulties with my iPad that I decided to bring my laptop. Unfortunately, all the notes for my remarks are on my iPad.

[LAUGHTER]

So this laptop, although it looks great, is doing me absolutely no good.

[LAUGHTER]

Yeah, I was going to make a really snarky remark that I won't because it'll be in the record. And I hate to speak off the cuff, but I did want to give you an update from the UFC meeting. First, before I do that, I'm really emotional today. So, forgive that, but it's just who I am. I want to thank you. And that's what this card is. An attempt to thank each of you for your service to the BFC. I know it's a pain in the neck for a lot of you, but I hope that you get the value of serving all of our colleagues on this campus. Not everybody gets that, but I know you do because you're here.

So just want to say thank you. It means a lot for a lot of our colleagues who don't have a voice for you to be that voice. So I really do appreciate the sacrifices that you make to sit in this room

at least twice a month and for all the committee work that you do for speaking up, for taking the time to get your colleagues voices, to get their comments, and to come here and represent them, even when we don't agree. I appreciate that you come back and that we have discussions and that we sometimes don't agree, but that at least we're able to sit around a table and to have conversation. So, thank you for that. We really, forget the way, I truly appreciate that you're here and that we have this body to have these conversations.

Secondly, I wanted to report back that the UFC Executive Committee had a meeting this morning and, in that meeting, we approved the agenda for the March 26th meeting of the full UFC. And in that meeting, the bylaws for the formation of a Research Affairs Committee are on that agenda. And so, the idea of the research affairs committee being formed are now going to be at the UFC level. I have full faith that that will be approved, so just know that that is going forward. We already know that on the other campuses, task forces are being formed to collect data about the proposed merger of research, moving from the campus level up to the university level. And at our campus that is also happening. So, I just wanted to report back to you on that.

Faster transitions happening. We know we'll hear further from the provost about doing searches and all of that. We know for this body, a lot of transition happening in the fact that new leadership comes in, we're having nominations and elections coming up, but we also know one of the huge transition things that has me very emotional today is Elizabeth. This is her last official day and she's going on to be the Policy and Compliance Manager at IU Human Resources on the human resources team. It's some big, long fancy title to which she is singularly qualified. I said that she's irreplaceable and that's true. Somebody else will sit in the seat, but nobody can replace Elizabeth. And we're very sad about that. Very happy for her because we never want to hold back someone else's progress, but we're really sorry that she's going. So we have several things that we'd like to give to Elizabeth to honor her time with us today. Danielle, do you want to come forward? And we also have something that John has read a resolution from the Executive Committee on behalf of the Council. I'm going to ask John if he would read the resolution as Danielle comes.

Thank you.

WALBRIDGE: The resolution reads as follows, "A resolution of thanks to Elizabeth Anne Pear. Whereas Elizabeth Anne Pear has served for half a decade as Director of the Officers of the Bloomington and University Faculty Councils. And whereas she is overseeing the operation of the Faculty Council Office with exemplary efficiency and conscientiousness. And whereas she has served the cause of faculty governance within variable tact and dedication. And whereas she has patiently attended meetings too numerous even for her to count. And whereas she has seen to it that the faculty council committees and the council itself met, functioned, and usually turned in their minutes. And whereas she has tactfully tutored a series of Faculty Council presidents, officers, and committee chairs as they tried to do their duties. And whereas she has kept the Faculty Council Office functioning during the COVID crisis, working herself to near exhaustion. And whereas despite carefully avoiding usurping the functions of faculty leaders, her words, there is something you want to know, invariably reduced to meeting to attentive silence.

[LAUGHTER]

And whereas the announcement of her departure brought cries of shock and horror from the floor of the Faculty Council. And whereas during all her service in this office, she has shown her respect for and pride in the University's faculty by her steadfast support for faculty governance. Be it resolved that this body, the Bloomington Faculty Council of Indiana University, a body conceived in and dedicated to the ideals of shared governance, collectively expresses its respect and gratitude for Elizabeth Anne Pear's service to Indiana University and offers its hope that she will have many happy and more restful years in her next position.

[LAUGHTER]

Given this day, Tuesday, April 12th, 2022, in the 2000 and third year of Indiana University."

SIMPSON: Thank you, John. As you know, John, this is his last regularly scheduled meeting. He's our past president. We thank John for his service during a really turbulent COVID year. We didn't get to have a sendoff for him face-to-face, so thank you, John.

WALBRIDGE: You're very welcome. It's been a privilege.

SIMPSON: Danielle. Yes.

DESAWAL: Elizabeth, we have something for you that Kate and Marietta and I collaborated with over the weekend. And it's crafty. So, you get to open it and then I'll give instructions to the rest of the BFC.

[LAUGHTER]

[BACKGROUND]

[LAUGHTER]

So we customized a pillow, especially for Elizabeth. It is also able for us to sign the back of it as a thank you. So gratitude is important. So, one of the things that we'll do is we'll put this little piece of cardboard in the back, I have to use these pens please [LAUGHTER] so that it doesn't bleed. [LAUGHTER] And we'll pass it around so that we can all sign it to thank Elizabeth for her tremendous service, dedication, friendship, and always being there for us.

[APPLAUSE]

There are a couple of other things that are coming Elizabeth's way, but we'll do that at a later time. I want to pass the torch, so to speak. I'm going to let Elizabeth have this next moment.

PEAR: Thanks.

As Marietta has already said, the last academic meeting of the year brings forward a couple of important BFC traditions. Apparently, I have been on the council long enough that I'm yet

again, here to serve as the council's institutional memory in this regard. What I'm referring to, of course, is the passing of the torch, here.

[LAUGHTER]

[APPLAUSE]

There's more. Over the past several years, presidents have handed down symbols of the office. Moira Marsh's torch being the first. Next, we have the Tiara of Power.

[LAUGHTER]

Legend.

[LAUGHTER]

I am not putting that on.

[APPLAUSE]

I got one more meeting.

[LAUGHTER]

Put it on.

[LAUGHTER]

Legend has it that this was bestowed upon the BFC by one of Cassidy's supermodel's daughters.

[LAUGHTER]

But with it, presidents have handed down various gems from year-to-year. But I think Alex Stanford said it best when he warned that the job as new President of the faculty will be harder, will take longer, and you will get less done than you think.

[LAUGHTER]

Agreed. Alex also added his own token, which is the all-important asterisk of reality.

[LAUGHTER]

This is probably self-explanatory.

[LAUGHTER] And now it is Marietta and my turn. We all know that I'm incapable of leaving well enough alone.

[LAUGHTER]

And many of you know, well now everyone knows that I'm always looking for an excuse to craft. So when we thought that these items were lost to COVID, [LAUGHTER] I went ahead and memorialize them in a different and perhaps a little more practical medium. So I present to you if I can find them, the Tiara of Power and the asterisk of reality in coaster form.

[LAUGHTER]

SIMPSON: So in addition, we offer our own reminders and unsolicited advice. First, know that this work requires a little bit of luck. There is so much out of your and the council's control so sometimes it is perfectly reasonable to just cross your fingers and hope for the best. And the most important piece of wisdom we can offer, however, is to always be true to yourself, grounded in your values, and confident in your qualifications for this position. This role, much like mine, will consume you if you let it. And this goes for everyone in the room, you are so much more than this position, this job, than what you do for your department, the council, or the university. Always remain true to who you are and what's important. Thank you.

The last piece of advice [LAUGHTER] [APPLAUSE] from one president to another president is that one of Cate's favorite colors is yellow and in the job Cate, there's going to be some days we don't even feel like getting dressed, but you can always look good while you're doing it. So [LAUGHTER] here's a little gift for you. Now I pass the torch and the gloves on to Cate. [APPLAUSE] If you all knew that this was going to come as president- elect, you would all run, and you would all promote yourself because you're getting gloves, and a torch, and a tiara, and all this snazzy stuff.

RECK: This is fantastic.

[LAUGHTER]

I cannot begin to appreciate how much collegiality and help friendship, and just common sense, and good advice, and good conversations we've had over the last year. This is a really difficult task for all of us, it doesn't matter what position you hold, but this has been a challenging year and it's going to continue to be challenging so I really appreciate I've had a lot of communications with a lot of you more than I would've normally in a regular year so I'm very grateful for this position and I hope I continue to have communications with the rest of the council in the coming year. I'm personally terrified [LAUGHTER] so I'm open to any communications and I'm really looking forward to the next year.

I have the distinct pleasure of reading a resolution for Marietta Simpson. So if you will indulge. I'm going to read it from the big frame. A resolution of the Bloomington faculty council whereas the job of the Faculty President is even at the best of times, a largely thankless task characterized by endless meetings, growing stress, and innumerable emails. And whereas here have not been the best, but for so many reasons beyond our control, quite nearly the worst of times. And whereas Marietta Simpson has nonetheless served the council, the campus, and the university with dedication, selflessness, and unimpeachable integrity. And whereas she's

repeatedly called on us to believe the best of each other and to treat all our colleagues and campus collaborators with generosity, patience, and I've heard this word more than any other word all semester and all year, grace.

This should be her nickname, Grace.

[LAUGHTER]

Therefore, be it resolved, we do hereby express our heartfelt gratitude to Marietta Simpson for her leadership and for the model she is set for future faculty leaders and for all of us, given this day, Tuesday, April 12th, 2022. Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

SIMPSON: Wow.

Thank you all very much. I also want to say thank you to all the members of the executive committee [BACKGROUND] who have just been rockstars this year. Each of them brings something really unique to their roles and they've really been a team. So I want to say thank you to Kelly, to Brian. My father says don't start calling names because you're going to leave somebody out, [LAUGHTER] but I'm trusting them to yell somebody if I don't, but to John, to Rebecca. Rebecca who's a rockstar all on her own and Guggenheim people just confirmed that, to Steve, to Rachel, to Kate. Did I say Scott already? If I didn't Scott. [LAUGHTER] Did I catch everybody? Kelly. To Kelly. Did I say Kelly? [LAUGHTER] Yes, I thought I did. And lastly, to Elizabeth, to Sarah Bu, and to John who we talked about earlier, to Kelly Kish, and to our new provost. Thank you, all of you who have been in those meetings. I appreciate all of the work that you did as a team and once again, to all of you who are sitting around this table for the work that you've done to make things work this year. I really truly appreciate what you bring to this council. Thank you very much.

[APPLAUSE]

AGENDA ITEM SIX: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you, Marietta and Cate, and especially Elizabeth. So I'm going to start my remarks by again thanking the trio here, John, Marietta, and Cate who've I don't know if you know, but I meet with them every other week and we have an honest conversation about issues and I can't tell you just how incredibly supportive and gracious these three have been. Especially Marietta, true to her forum, you may remember my very first day I started at this meeting and like a week before that, Marietta sat me down, had these printouts and said, "This is what BFC is, this is how we sit during COVID, this is how we sit after COVID." Literally every little detail was in a folder for me to make sure things begin and continue to go smoothly.

So, we've had just a phenomenal president and I know BFC and the institution is fortunate for you being part of our faculty and our community. So, thank you very much. I look forward to

working with Cate moving forward and the rest of the committee and the BFC in the coming year as well.

I know we will all miss Elizabeth. Elizabeth, I'm not a craftsperson, but if I were, I would have added something to that [inaudible].

[LAUGHTER]

But congratulations again. Let me just give you a few quick updates and move on to the next set of business. We continue to have leadership changes and searches. We have finalized a dean for Jacobs School of Music. It will be announced tomorrow morning. I am reluctant to share that name here. We need to coordinate our release with the institution that person will be leaving just to make sure that nothing slips through the cracks. But watch your emails tomorrow, we should have an announcement and I'm pleased to have a new leader join our community.

For the Law School, we are continuing our negotiations with one of the finalists. I'm hoping if all goes well within 10-12 days, we will have a dean named there as well. We've had two more dean departures, our deans who have announced their departure. Dean Parrish at the Maurer School of Law has announced that he will be leaving at the end of summer to become Dean of the University of California, Irvine School of Law. And Idie Kesner, our long-term dean at the Kelley School of Business has announced her retirement and she will return back to her faculty role in the Kelley School of Business.

Both of them deserve extreme well recognition. They're two of the most senior leaders on campus. I think Idie finished 10 years as dean and Austen finished eight and a half years in the dean role. So, I'm disappointed to see two senior leaders decide to move on, but they're all doing it for the right reasons, and I'm very happy for them and I know the campus will miss their leadership in due course of time. We will continue to move forward with interim appointments in both of those positions. I have already started working with the dean and the faculty at the Law School about finding an interim and I will begin those conversations at the Kelley School of Business as well. So, in the coming maybe a week or two hopefully have interim leadership announced at both of those schools.

As you all know, our graduate student workers have used their First Amendment right to vote to strike. But as I emphasized during our last session together and in my email that went out to all faculty, we have a responsibility to all students; undergraduates and graduates. Our deans are working on contingency plans to make sure that the academic mission continues to make progress with minimal disruption. And the other thing I had shared about that was intent to form a graduate education working group that would advise me and potentially BFC on best practices for ensuring that our graduate professional education remains cutting edge. I have sought out nominations and recommendations from the deans. I will be sharing it with the BFC presidents for their input and we will get that group together to begin working as soon as possible.

I also have some exciting news to share. Our O'Neill School tied for the number 1 spot and its master's program in Public Affairs released by the US News and World Report as one of the

best graduate schools. This is the sixth straight year that O'Neill School has been either first or second in the US News rankings and I want to congratulate the leadership, the faculty, the staff, and really everybody for achieving this milestone precedent written. And I was at O'Neill last week and had a brief but fun celebration with everybody there and it was great to see the energy and enthusiasm that's there in that school.

Marietta stole my thunder a little bit, but I really, really want to congratulate Rebecca for getting that tremendous recognition. If you don't know already, she's the 2022 Guggenheim Fellow winner and is in just incredible company as that one. It's always gratifying to see the recognitions flow for faculty we know are as talented as they are. And Rebecca, it's an incredible honor to be with you here and I know everybody here shares that. So congratulations to Rebecca. The other part that I'd really want to highlight echoing Marietta's comments, is not only that she is doing such tremendous work, but she's spending all this energy and time doing all the leadership work for BFC. I know she directs the Center for 18th Century Studies. The director for the liberal arts and management program. And you get all the minutes and the details that she sits there and types away. I'm curious to see how you'll type comments about yourself in this week's meeting [LAUGHTER]. Make sure they're good. [LAUGHTER] This is our last meeting and I know it has been a challenging year. I know it'll continue to be challenging for us recovering from COVID. I hope it's not a rearview mirror, but there is still a long road ahead.

I know there is a lot of anxiety with a lot of changes myself included, but the entire cabinet is brand new. I think I spent half my day yesterday and most of my morning today in interviews for other cabinet rank positions. So that train hasn't stopped yet. And it's the same thing at Bloomington with the two deans announcing their departure or retirement, I think we have four dean searches in progress; three that I have to launch and two that really started during the pandemic. So, for all practical purposes are new. So, seven out of our 12 deans will be brand new. So, I recognize the anxiety and I know this is especially hard at IU which is unusually stable in the leadership rank historically. We've had very stable rank of president and cabinet members for the longest time which is not the norm nationally. So, it would be a change anywhere but it is an even bigger change here and I recognize that. I feel the anxiety, but please know that I will continue to do my best to work on your behalf for the betterment of the campus and the university. And as I said in my very first meeting and I will reiterate here, I rarely have decisions that are good or bad because that would make my job really easy. Every decision I have to make is a trade-off between usually two good choices and that requires us to make strategic decisions. There will be decisions you like and decisions you won't like. To the extent possible, I will make sure it's transparent why the decisions are made. But please know if a decision does not go like you would like it to go, it's not personal, it's just based on the facts that I have to make decisions on. Thank you once again for welcoming me so enthusiastically here and humoring me particularly in my first meeting when I hadn't quite read the pulse of how this particular meeting works, I hope it's better since then.

[LAUGHTER]

And if I don't see you all as a group, I hope you have a successful end of the semester and a wonderful, productive, but also a restful summer ahead. As I close, just a quick warning. Bad

weather projected tomorrow, so I hope you all stay dry and safe. The last I checked, we are in the path of some fairly potentially severe storms. Thank you. That ends my report. I think we have our Q&A period and if you have questions, I'm happy to answer those. Carolyn.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: My button is not working. Did I push?

[BACKGROUND]

Yes, I can't see it from this vantage point. On route here this afternoon I was given a little sheet. And on the sheet, it says graduate workers are going on strike for union recognition. And I'm quoting from it now, the IU administration has tried to pit undergraduate well-being against graduate workers receiving a living wage. I'm not going to ask you to offer a counterargument, but I would like for you to comment on the implications of the strike for undergraduate education in particular fees, if you would.

SHRIVASTAV: I'm just saying the reality. This is not an attempt to pit anybody against one or the other. The reality is there's undergraduate students who rely on all faculty and AIs and essays for their education. Disrupting this is going to impact them. There are three or four areas where the impact is the greatest. It is students who are relying on completing their degree in time, for transcripts, some jobs, for example, will require transcripts. Admissions to grad schools. We've had at least a handful of emails this morning about students worried about delay in their grades impacting their ability to get admission to nursing schools or things like that. You may or may not know, but the successful completion of a semester is required to process financial aid for the next semester. And in some cases, not all, depending on various situations and financial profile and what their GPAs are that may be impacted for students. We have 37,000 sum of students, 6,000 of them are low-income. Pell-eligible students, those are the students that I worry about the most, but there will be others who have challenges completing their education and finishing it in time. We're also receiving messages and emails from anxious parents. And those messages range everywhere from what will happen to my kid or my child? What can you do to help to angry ones about I pay for the whole semester and if my child doesn't get two weeks of instruction or three weeks of instruction, will you be refunding my money? So that ranges the entire breadth. And that's just reality. I mean, you are welcome to come and read through some of those emails and make your own judgment based on that. Yes, pick it up. Thank you. Can everybody hear me? Thank you for posing that question.

LUKETA: My name is Valentina Luketa, I'm the president of the graduate and professional student government. I'm also one of the leaders of the graduate coalition asking for the union. Thank you for outlining the effects that the strike supposedly will have on the undergrad education. I would like to outline the effects that separating graduate students from the undergrads in our common cause for advancing education in this university will have. When we look around and when I look to my comrades' undergrads who very much are in support of us and have said so by sending an email, I think of why I came to graduate school.

Excuse me.

[OVERLAPPING]

I will finish.

[BACKGROUND]

Why I came to graduate school. I came to graduate school because I want to pursue knowledge. I want to pursue new horizons of thoughts. And there's nothing more beautiful than when I see my undergrads realize the same. There's nothing more beautiful, when I'm approached by undergrad student, asking me, "Hey, what do you think about me go into grad school?" and me saying, "What a great idea, let me tell you how passionate I am about higher eds." That's what we're fighting for tomorrow. We're fighting for the opportunity to be the teachers we came here to be. To be the researchers we came here to be. This week has been sawn with threats, with fear, with alienation from each other, from separation. Tomorrow you'll see hope, joy, and love. Love for the fellow undergrads, love for our faculty, our members, and love for this institution.

So, I had to ask provost, will you join me in spreading love and hope tomorrow or will we continue on the path to fear? Because as scientists, as researchers, as thinkers, and as intellectuals, we're here to enlighten, we're here to be an example. What kind of example are we setting for our fellow undergrads here, when we are so in fear? When we're implying that standing up for yourself, for asking for better higher ed, for being the future of academia because that's what I am, ladies and gentlemen. We all are the future of this academia and we are speaking very clearly and loudly that together with our undergrads, we will set the precedent on this campus to say no fear, but hope, no intimidation, but the frontiers of knowledge. So, provost, will you join us tomorrow in actually spreading some hope and creating new horizons for our undergrads rather than continuing to spread fear?

SHRIVASTAV: That's a beautiful speech. Congratulations.

LUKETA: I learned it in grad school.

[OVERLAPPING]

SHRIVASTAV: It does not address the issue. I have said over and over again, I am very interested, and I am resolved TO or I have a conviction as does President Whitten about solving issues for graduate students. We do not or I do not believe that requires the recognition of a union that has been addressed by the former two provosts and I do not intend to revisit that issue.

My statement has been pretty clear. Other questions? Seeing none.

We have one more.

ROBINSON: I do have a question. By the way, I am sitting for [inaudible] he's a proxy on the BFC. My name is Ben Robinson from the Germanic Studies Department. The question was posed last week at the faculty council meeting about you having served, I believe, as a chair of Communication Sciences at Michigan State, which was a unionized institution. The graduate students were unionized there and there are, if I'm not mistaken, 10 collective bargaining units on that campus. And among other things, the US News and World Report rates student satisfaction on the Michigan State University campus has higher than it is on our campus. So my question is, could you explain a little bit, you mentioned last week you had no problem with unionization there, why would it be a decision that you wouldn't revisit here? It seems to improve morale of graduate students. It seems to improve the morale of undergraduates, at least in the case of MSU, it seems to be a change that's a foot across the country with the National Labor Relations Board decision of 2016 and other universities such as MIT, Harvard, Brandeis and Tufts as well as other public universities unionizing. Why wouldn't you just be open to what is going on in the country, to the demonstrated success of unionization and say, in fact, the previous two provosts were under informed and you're revisiting their decision, you're bringing the campus forward and you're making a decision that serves the interests of all of us?

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you.

Thank you for bringing that up. I think you hit the nail on the head. There is a national movement for labor unions to expand beyond their traditional area of influence and higher end is part of that. I will not question Provost Robel or Applegate's decision; they were obviously formed after careful study and after a lot of analysis and they have been put forward with in a very eloquent way better than I would ever be able to explain.

So, if those of you who have not read those letters, I would encourage you to read the logic for it. Here's my personal thinking about it, since you asked Benjamin. For the last two decades, universities around the country have been attacked or challenged or questioned by a lot of outside interests from governors, legislative bodies, to independent think tanks, and groups and labor unions have also been the same way. Here and elsewhere in the country we have a long, and I mean, hundreds of years long history of shared governance and I think that shared governance is the reason why universities in the United States are arguably the best in the entire world.

I believe that we need to keep the university decision-making independent of all outside influences. I know labor unions and some of the issues that people are bringing up, you're sympathetic to the cause, I get it. But this is also a long-term goal. I mean, yes, MIT finally agreed to form a labor union because the courts basically required them to but that was three years ago or four years ago.

In the bigger history of things, we don't know what the net impact of that will be. I think we are better solving those problems using the mechanisms we have. And we have done that. I mean, even in the last six or seven weeks that I've been here, even before I started President Whitten, one of the priorities she said, was these issues about graduate students. We have worked hard to resolve those. We have tried and done some impactful things already. Doesn't mean that's the end of the road, we need to do more, but this is the start.

I think our current mechanism, including this body, gives us every way possible to resolve that. And I do not feel getting an outside entity to come in and handle the bread-and-butter issues at this point is a good idea. I'm being advised that that is time for Q&A and we need to move on to the next item.

So, I will begin with item number 8, which is the proposed amendment.

[OVERLAPPING]

NORTHCUTT-BOHMERT: Point of order. Can we take an extra minute and 34 seconds? Can we have a minute and 34 seconds to respond? He took more than a minute and 34. But he took more like three minutes to respond to the question, but a minute and 34 over the ten-minute mark.

COHEN: Is not a debate. It doesn't matter how long his time to answer was. We have a set time to get through a period and we have a full agenda to get through.

NORTHCUTT-BOHMERT: So my concern is that in the spirit of faculty governance and not just shared governance, that faculty members also have a shared amount of time on the floor and both last week I was cut off. And this week I'm just asking that we have an extra minute and a half or response.

SANDERS: But it's not a debate. We're not debating right now. It's a Q&A. In the spirit of faculty governance, I think we should do a better job making sure that faculty have the time that's allotted to them. And then if the provost spends extra time that we consider giving the faculty extra time. You have the same time. It wasn't [inaudible] until you've decided. It was ten minutes.

SIMPSON: We have to move on.

NORTHCUTT-BOHMERT: Rachel, when I was at ten minutes, my mic was caught. He talked to 11 minutes and 40 seconds without his mic being caught. I didn't speak for 11 minutes for every other. I started and stopped the clock. Sorry. Rachel. If I also, can speak.

SIMPSON: No, no. We have to move on. The executive committee has created a one-hour special meeting precisely for the issues that I think people want to address.

[OVERLAPPING]

NORTHCUTT-BOHMERT: I totally appreciate that. I sent an email to the executive committee Saturday morning at 06:30 AM asking to have items added to the agenda that it wasn't responded to until just before the meeting today. Some of us it's not convenient to add an additional meeting onto the end of our day to talk about issues that should be addressed during the regularly scheduled time.

So, while I appreciate the special meeting at the end of today's meeting, I have prior engagements that I've had to cancel to attend. My comments last week, we're asking for a

resolution to be introduced that we're not entertained at the meeting. And then we're not responded to me via email. If this is a body of faculty governance, how does faculty have a voice? That's the larger issue I'm reading.

SIMPSON: I understand that. And I'm sorry that it's caused this unrest. You're right. That you didn't get an initial response to email. And I'm sorry that the response didn't come in the time that you needed it to come. So, we apologize for that.

But we did try to accommodate the messages that we heard from faculty by having an hour-long meeting after this, so that everyone had an opportunity to express themselves. We have to move on because other faculty members have been working on some of these issues for years. So, we have to be able to accommodate what they'd been working on.

I'm sorry.

Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BL-ACA-D9 BYLAWS OF THE BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY REGARDING STANDING COMMITTEES

SIMPSON: We are on proposed amendment to be LACMA D9 bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of Indiana University regarding standing committees. This is a second reading and an action item. I will call on Rachel. Go ahead and do present and walk us through these amendments.

[NOISE].

COHEN: All right. So, this is a second reading of the bylaws amendments and the creation of a new policy that we talked about last week. Again, just a quick refresher of why we're doing this. We are looking to improve committee guidance and transparency and committee development, as well as create charges for all of the student committees instead of just some of the students' committees.

Just a reminder, the bylaws amendments, the things we changed, we created an organization of the standing committees. So, we basically listed what the primary function of the standing committees are. Again, that doesn't mean that they don't have another function that's just the primary function [NOISE].

And then the other part of the bylaws change was that we removed CREM from the Executive Committee as it often doesn't have anything to do from year-to-year. And added Research Affairs and Student Affairs, as they often have many things to do from year-to-year. Along with that, we created a new committee policy. That is because policies versus by-laws are a bit easier to change, they're more flexible. They are typically longer, have more detail. And overall bylaws should be more stable than we have had over the past few years. And so, this is an attempt to try to stabilize our bylaws. For the new committee policy documents, the

responsibilities of the standing committees. It lists all the charges for them, and it documents all of our current and longstanding process for nominations in committee selection process.

Anything in the by-laws that we moved came with us to this new committee policy, so nothing was lost. Again, nothing was lost. And anything that we added was already being done. So we didn't create any new process. That is very fast run-through of what the new policy is in the bylaws change. This will take two motions because we need to change the bylaws and also create policy. But we can talk about all of them together if there is any discussion.

AGENDA ITEM NINE: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BL-ACA-D9 BYLAWS OF THE BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY REGARDING STANDING COMMITTEES

SHRIVASTAV: Okay. The proposal is open for discussion. Right? Any questions? Seeing none? I would call for a motion to vote. I'll be doing both together.

I would do the bylaws first. Okay, let's do the first motion or somebody needs to propose a motion.

COHEN: No. We just need a vote.

SHRIVASTAV: Oh, I it came from the community. So we just need a vote. This is to change the bylaws. All in favor, please raise your hands.

Any opposed? Motion passes.

The second one. The policy. Okay. The second one is also coming from the committee does not need a second. This is a motion to form a committee on policy. Policy on committees. Policy on committees. Thank you.

All in favor of that change, please raise your hands.

All opposed? Okay, motion passes. Thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM TEN: RECOMMENDATION TO REDEFINE STATEWIDE TRANSFER GENERAL EDUCATION CORE REQUIREMENTS AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON

SHRIVASTAV: The next item is recommendation to redefine statewide transfer general education core requirements at IU Bloomington. This is Kurt Zorn and David Johnson's formula. I believe this is the second reading. And this will have a vote at the end, so take it away, Kurt and David.

ZORN: Well, I thought I was going to show you the slides but something happened. So what do I do? I'll try it again. This basically just a quick, real quick afresh. The Higher Education Commission has basically decided it wants to promote what's called the Indiana College Core,

which is a transferable general education curriculum among institutions. And were expecting a large increase in the number of new students coming to Indiana with an Indiana College Core. And the consequences of just reminders for IUP students is our current campus ICC requirements are more stringent than those that had the other institution. Because we require mathematical modeling in world languages and cultures. And for transfer students who come in with the ICC milestone. Again, this is a very important point. The students who earned the ICC milestone elsewhere and then come to IUP are exempted from the IUIE ICC requirements. Our current ICC requirements include the AUB Gen Ed requirements, the students who come in with this ICC milestone that they've received elsewhere are able to be exempted from all of our gen ED common ground requirements. So our change that we're proposing is basically to do this. Now this may look like what the heck is it? Well, we have this neat little formula that Michael put together, which basically says the current includes world language and cultures and mathematical modeling. We're proposing to do is to pull those out, so all students are gonna have to take that. And just put in a quantitative reasoning, which could be a number of different levels of mathematics. So hopefully that refreshes your memory without confusing you. And that's, I'm open for questions. And I'll let Mike answer all the detailed ones [LAUGHTER].

AGENDA ITEM ELEVEN: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE RECOMMENDATION TO REDEFINE STGEC REQUIREMENTS AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON

SHRIVASTAV: Proposal is open for discussion. [NOISE] I don't see any. Oh, there is one. Yes. Go ahead.

THOMASSEN: Hi. I was a member of EPC and I heard the presentation about this, and I've heard it again here. And I think it's really quite a thoughtful thing to do in a nice solution to some challenges that will preserve the equity between our in-state students, our out-of-state students. And so I really appreciate your time working on this and coming up with this. Thank you.

SHRIVASTAV: Any other questions? Seeing none, I guess we need a motion to approve these changes. Yes, we have one. Is that a question, Colin, or just motion that would need a second?

JOHNSON: Second. I'll second it.

SHRIVASTAV: All in favor, please raise your hands. And all the opposed. Motion passes. Congratulations. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM TWELVE: PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION FOR TEST-OPTIONAL APPLICATIONS FOR SPECIFIC APPLICANT POPULATIONS

SHRIVASTAV: The next item is a proposed extension of the special exception for test optional applications for specific applicant populations. This is also a second reading and an action item to vote. This one is brought to us by Kelly Askew and David [inaudible], co-chairs of the Educational Policy Committee and David Johnson, Vice Provost for Enrollment

Management and Sasha Thieme, our Assistant Vice Provost and Executive Director of Admissions. So David.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Provost Shrivastav. And thank you, President Simpson for your leadership this past year and your ongoing support in enrollment management and we have appreciated your leadership, but this past year, I would be remiss in a public forum if I didn't comment in terms of Eliza's memorial resolutions, Dennis Peters.

My husband is a chemist and received part of his education from Professor Peters. And I really appreciate so much his contributions to his work and life and profession. So, I want to just acknowledge here this test optional admissions was passed by this body in January of 2020. And I want to say thank you and we appreciate your gratitude for that. The UFC also approved it and then also acknowledged by the Board of Trustees as a policy of change. And in the interest of time, I won't go through all these marks. But what I will point out is, what do we get out of this test optional policy?

The demographics, a majority of the following populations chose to not have their test scores considered. A 46% of the enrolled beginners in a pandemic certainly chose to not have a test scores presented in as a student's choice. But we had tremendous increase in areas that we want to see increases. And that is women, 21st century Pell, first-generation students with unmet financial need, international students, and historically marginalized students, underrepresented, minority students. And so we're very pleased that we've had these outcomes. And here is the persistence data that we wanted to share with you today. And we appreciate the support of Kelly and David from the EPC. And we have talked with the EPC in regard to these data and these outcomes.

And so as you can see here, we typically have been around 97% persistence from the fall to spring. Pandemic year of '20, we were at 95. And then we're coming back up with this '21 class, this past fall's class to now spring semester. And so it's showing some good recovery and we're pleased with that. Now to focus on the test optional aspect of this, you can see their retention rates of students based on their different color-coded test scores. And I just want to point out that the grand total or the average for the class is that 95.9 or 96%. And you can see that those students in the gray, the test optional students were close to the average, but also above some test score centers and below some test score centers. And I really want to point out what maybe isn't on the screen here is the 1170, so 1300 banned at 95% retention rate, 95.1 compared to the 95.3. That is where you would find the average SAT at 1298 for our class this last year. And so we're really pleased with the outcomes of our test optional students and certainly the rebound of students. And I also want to say in gratitude, thanks to Sasha Thieme and her team for all the tremendous work and admissions and other folks and colleagues. At the end of this academic year, Mark McConaughy our now retired registrar to thank him for the work that he has done. And I'll turn it over to Sasha to talk a little bit more and make our request very succinctly here to you about this policy.

THIEME: Thank you, David. And echoing all the thanks and appreciation for the faith of our faculty and the confidence of our faculty for us as institution to be able to offer this opportunity to our perspective incoming students. So the question was that we're bringing today as an

extension of the exception which would allow all populations to apply to IU test optional for the next academic application process. So the question that we wanted to address was, how did these specific populations perform and how did they persist into the second semester? And really the news is there is no news. So our athletes homeschool and non GPA students, as you can see, they're listed, they had very similar persistence into the second semester. We also then looked at first semester median GPA at IU. We saw a little boost in 2020 as we were all negotiating the pandemic but we see that the GPA for the first semester overall is higher than previous cohorts as well. When we look at test optional students, again, similar to second semester persistence, they are performing very well, which all the research that we'd had done prior, the 18 months of research and longer that we did before the vote in January 2020 suggested that test optional students may in fact have lower second term, second year persistence rates and slightly lower GPAs, but by the time we got to graduation rates that would all level out. So we expected some of this to happen when you think about those students who are most impacted by standardized test scores. This is not necessarily a surprise, so we're just thrilled with how well that they did, attributed to the great support they receive from faculty and advisors across the campus. And then also when we looked at these three populations that we're discussing today, also strong performance across the board. These are highly talented students, amazingly gifted students who have come to IU and done very well and will continue to do well we believe in the rest of their career thanks to your good teaching. And so really today is that we ask EPC and by extension, the VFC for an extension of the special exception through the spring 2023 and fall 2023 admission cycles that would allow these three populations, homeschool students, students attending high schools who do not assign traditional [inaudible] or numerical grades and recruited athletes to apply test optional. Through our review, we have learned when students could not get access to test. We learned that in fact, we are able to make sound decisions for these students as well as the others. And as we can see from the results, they're doing very well. We learned a lot from the pandemic and we're excited and thankful to be here today.

AGENDA ITEM THIRTEEN: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF SPECIAL EXCEPTION FOR TEST-OPTIONAL APPLICATIONS FOR SPECIFIC APPLICANT POPULATIONS

SHRIVASTAV: I just quickly note that the EPC unanimously endorsed the requested extension of the special exception. This is now open for discussion. Yes, Rebecca.

SPANG: Can I ask a couple of questions of clarification because you are going a little bit quickly through the slides. If you back up the GPAs that we were seeing there, they're last spring or they're last fall?

THIEME: This is just this recent fall for the fall 2021 cohort.

SPANG: Okay. And then I had another question. There is obviously this group of students who apply with test scores that are very low. And they seem to translate into low GPAs and somewhat low retention rates. What else do we know about them? Why are they applying with low test scores? applying test optional? And how does the population that applies with low test scores compare in terms of demographics to the rest of the cohort? [NOISE]

THIEME: Absolutely. So, I would say they are resulting in lower. These are still really successful students who are doing very well here at IU. Specifically what we knew about the research when you look at the interplay between a lot of demographic factors and standardized testing, it's the low-income women, first-generation, under-represented minority students who are more likely to report stronger preference for test optional. However, due to the support for those same populations, whether or not you apply test optional can depend on the counseling you receive on the benefit of that opportunity. So our goal in admissions has been for many years not to hold students accountable for the resources or the tacit knowledge they may or may not have had approaching this process. So for many years, we have celebrated the strong academic performance over a test score. And so we have admitted students per academic policy, per curriculum policy that we've received. We have been able to admit these students and they've been in our cohorts for many years and now you're seeing that they are successful. But we can't hold them accountable if they don't know the rules to play the game, and that did not seem appropriate, so we're treating them all similarly.

JOHNSON: And Rebecca, I might just add that we are a large public institution, 9,482 freshmen in our class, and we're set to repeat that number probably again next fall. And Indiana is in our name and we work to serve the state of Indiana and to serve the population of the state, along with students from across the globe and the country. And so it's the spectrum of students that we have here. We are a selective, we can argue that, but we are selective institution. We are not a highly selective institution with the class of 2,000 freshmen and very low admit rates. And so we are in this lane of being a public institution, working on the selectivity. We will have the strata of students and students will, as Sasha said, continue to present test scores and they might be lower. But this is all about the opportunity too for students, of course, to be in your classroom and to have their lives changed by you and other faculty. So this is about that opportunity at a large public institution. It's a soundbite on that, I think.

SHRIVASTAV: Yeah. Go ahead.

THOMASSEN: Hi, and maybe I'm mis-remembering or I might be totally wrong. Was there some sort of thing like NCAA or Big 10 that athletes required test scores?

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you. And Kurt, feel free to jump in.

ZORN: For years the NCAA did require test scores be submitted for recruited athletes. During the pandemic, they too, like many institutions, 2.2 million students couldn't get a test score. And so they had to make some changes. They have for the 2022-2023 year, continued that test optional policies approach. The earliest vote I saw was maybe January of 2023. And Division 1 and Division 2 academic committees have recommended their councils continue this. So we feel we need to be prepared that it could in fact change, and so this exemption would be compliant, consistent with that.

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you. Thank you, Kurt.

FREEMAN: Can you hear me? Testing. Hello. So, I wanted to speak on this one, to issue my support, I'm an absolute love for this. I think we had a meeting earlier to where you came and you talked about the demographics of students as they breakdown racially on this campus. And I think this is one of those many tactics that I would say not even just renewing it for next year, but maybe a long-standing thing to look at because if I wasn't maybe that lower cohort of test scores to where I was unconditionally accepted to IU. Look at me now. But [LAUGHTER] that is one of those things to acknowledge in the greater conversation of how we truly make an impact on diverse students and students from underrepresented backgrounds here. And I think this is a step along many other strides that we must need to take, but I would issue or really urge everyone to also vote in favor of this as well because I think this is a beautiful thing to carry on to the next year.

JOHNSON: Say thank you for your comments. And what year are you now?

FREEMAN: I'm playing with the button. I'm a senior now. [LAUGHTER]

JOHNSON: And will you be graduating this May?

FREEMAN: I will be graduating in December.

JOHNSON: But you plan to graduate from Indiana University?

FREEMAN: Absolutely.

SHRIVASTAV: Congratulations and thank you for choosing IU, and thanks for your successful experience at IU. [APPLAUSE] I won't ask you your GPA or anything in a public setting [LAUGHTER]. But you're graduating so that's what matters. [inaudible] we can't do that. [LAUGHTER]

Question? Any other questions on this one? Sorry, Steve.

SANDERS: David, or Sasha, thank you for this. When we move to test optional, we clearly had instrumental goals. The most important one being to increase the diversity of the class in all ways. How will we know and how will we measure that that has been accomplished? I'm not a social scientist, so I don't know how the regression analysis or whatever it is works, but will we be able to say with confidence after a certain period of time that had we not done this our cohorts of under-represented students would have been less that we can safely attribute an increase in our cohorts of diverse students to the adoption of the test optional policy. Are we going to be able to say that at some point or at least evaluate that and how is that done?

JOHNSON: Steve, you are teeing up perfectly a presentation for the fall where we will be focusing on fall to fall retention of students. And we're excited about that. The trajectory of my experience at IU has been that we have increased the number of under-represented students year over year over the last decade. So, we're pleased with that work and we feel like this will help us in that regard. Sasha can share some percentages and numbers here in just a second, but I will also say that we will be very focused on the retention of students who are test optional, the

graduation of students. So, this is an overtime study. And as Sasha pointed to that, while they might have GPA slightly lower at the beginning, they tend to graduate near their peers in time, so we're excited about where this will take us.

THIEME: Okay. Well, I had just mentioned today we did see an increase in the number and percentage of students who were Pell-eligible in the fall cohort already. We saw as David mentioned an increasing the students who have identified it as a population that has been historically underrepresented in higher education already in the cohort. And we also look at what it meant to focus on academics in our scholarship awarding process, we had numbers like a 125% increase in underrepresented minority students who received merit-based scholarships, 241% increase in Pell-eligible students who qualified for academic merit scholarships. This policy that you supported in January of 2020, which is a policy not a temporary thing, was pandemic response has afforded us the opportunity to go beyond that and celebrate student academic success in so many areas. So, we look forward to sharing that data with you. Thank you.

JOHNSON: In conclusion, I think I would be remiss if I didn't say we were poised to be the first big 10 institutions. Well, we were the first big 10, that voted for this, and we were hoping for that traction and that was in January of 2020. And those were housey on days [LAUGHTER] and then the pandemic happened, and everybody became test-optional, test flexible [LAUGHTER] and so we didn't quite get the boost out of that that we were looking for. And we were thinking 21% of the class would be 15 or 20 is what research had showed and we presented to you, but then 46% of the class,

SHRIVASTAV: Yes. Jim, you're next.

SHERMAN: Just a quick comment, Steve. Correlation is not causation, so it's going to be very difficult unless you stop the program, then you would have relevant data which we don't want to do. So if the numbers look good, it's okay [LAUGHTER]

SHRIVASTAV: In the interest of time, one more question. I think John, you had something. We have to move on for a vote after that.

WALBRIDGE: Given that you've found that you don't need test scores to make good admission decisions. Is there a justification for considering test scores at all?

JOHNSON: I think yes, the hills of the UC and California State system and other institutions, that's something to certainly discover and to do more research on. But we've never been, and we've presented to you this two years ago, we'd never been anti-test, we value additional information yet also we're very supportive of the students' academic experience over their four years. That's what we're really focused on with the focus on the high school performance. So, John, it's a great question and I think something that further research an institutional policy would change. So that would be moving from test-optional to not considering tests. That's a different policy consideration.

Thank you. Go ahead, Sasha.

THIEME: I was just going to add, so I appreciate the question. David said there's more to be learned just as we are learning so much more about neurodiversity of students, one could and how the differences and how they consume and absorb information it would make sense that there were also be differences in how they demonstrate their knowledge. So maybe not sweeping something away but looking at how we can look at all the factors that David mentioned, so I think more research is warranted.

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you. Great discussion. I'm not hearing anything that really questions the proposal itself. So, I would in the interest of time like to see if there's a motion to vote on this, it comes from a committee. Thank you. So we do not need a motion on that vote, we can open it up for a vote. All in favor of the extension of the special exception for test-optional applications for specific application populations please raise your hands. Looks like a unanimous yes. Unopposed, no, the motion passes. Thank you. The next item is a proposal to add sustainability literacy as a shared goal in the IUB general education. This is the second reading so once again, we will have a vote on this one. And I invite Kelly Eskew and David Rutkowski along with Sarah Mincey and Brian Winterman to present this from the committee.

ESKEW: Thank you. I sit here in a couple of different capacities. First, I'm co-chair of the educational policies committee with my colleague David Rutkowski. I'm also a member of the sustainability as a shared goal task force. This was chaired by Sarah Mincey, who is the director of the integrated program on the environment. She is the managing director of the IU Environmental Resilience Institute, which is part of the IU Grand Challenge. Brian Winterman, who is the Information Literacy and Assessment Librarian, was not able to be with us today. I presented in December at our BFC meeting and I talked about what this institution and its constituents and what this body, the BFC, has said about its concern for in its commitment to sustainability, including climate change, and our stated commitment to sustainability education.

So, I'd like to very briefly remind us of this. The IU Bicentennial Strategic Plan says sustainability is one of our core values. And it says sustainability is one of our strategic priorities. Shortly before I presented in December, the president said that IU is actively engaged in the conversation about finding solutions for climate change. And this body passed a resolution two years ago in April 2020. And it said we will work to actively support current and future academic programs in and related to sustainability. And the IU student government has formerly called for sustainability education, and they stated this. They also said within that resolution, we are graduating into a world that is undergoing rapid ecological degradation, the climate crisis is already impacting our lives and will continue to do so.

I know that IU student president Ky Freeman and Leo Banks who is sitting here as a proxy for the vice-president, are prepared to discuss the student position today, I hope we'll be able to hear their comments. The IU Graduate and Professional Student Government passed a similar, almost identical resolution the same semester. And Kaitlin Doucette from IU Graduate and Professional Students is also here today and hopes to offer a few brief comments. In December after I presented and we had had a discussion, I said that I would send out to you the full proposal. This is all of the information about the formation of the task force, what was considered, the research that was conducted, etc. Also, I had some typos and what was

circulated in December, and I was embarrassed. That went out in January with a preamble that summarized my comments, and it included all this background information and the task force asked you as BFC members to take this to your units and request of them that they report their concerns about sustainability as a shared goal to me, to Sarah and to Brian. And that was done and I thank you.

There were concerns. And I want to be very upfront about what we heard. So we heard from the colleges associate deans with objections from Kelley's Academic Council and for the Jacobs School Council. We had some other e-mails but most of those we could easily respond to questions, but let me talk about what these concerns were and I think I'm accurately summarizing them and if I'm not, I'm sure someone will correct me in a minute.

Number 1, that the sustainability is a shared goal will require creation of new courses that students will have to take. The schools will have to create new courses. This isn't true. It's just not true. I don't know any other more clever way to say that. We heard that you need to delay this for a year or longer, some indefinite period, so we can evaluate the entire Gen Edge shared goal program. My understanding is that is happening, but I'm not sure because that's not the charge of the task force on sustainability as a shared goal. It's not the charge of the educational policies committee, as we say in the law sometimes true and unrelated.

So that may be something that needs to happen, but that's not what is before this body today, is that question of whether we need to review the entire program. And finally, we heard this should not be a required shared goal. This should be a recommended shared goal. Again, the task force agrees that requiring an additional course is a burden on the schools and it is also a burden on the students and we don't recommend that.

We also feel that if you only recommend the shared goal, it would be insufficient for us to be consistently and effectively addressing a topic of such significance. The task force feels that sustainability needs to be part of an ongoing conversation within and among departments and schools rather than a one-time curricular invasion or reform. As one colleague on the EPC said, we are either saying sustainability yes, climate, yes, or were saying maybe climate. I would ask is having a recommended shared goal consistent with what the BFC and the school has already said what IU has said, its commitment is and what the students have asked of us.

Will schools that object to the shared goal move forward if the goal is merely recommended? So what is required? It's not that bad. Schools are required to evaluate and report on their current sustainability teaching and co-curricular activities. We evaluate and report on what we're doing all the time. It's part of our job. An implementation task force or committee, I don't know what the proper term would be, will offer feedback and guidance. And that committee will stay in place as long as it is asked to do so. And it will collaborate with the schools with ideas for how they might add different readings, listenings, watching to their courses, add new datasets. It does not require a massive curricular overhaul. The implementation task force will report back to the schools and to the BFC on its findings and when it's prepared to do so, it will disband and schools will report to the General Education Committee. This is the language, that is required. And right in the middle it says, all schools and the college must report to the General Education Committee annually to show how each of their undergraduate degree

programs supports and assesses the DUS, diversity in the United States and sustainability literacy goals. So must report on how they're supporting and assessing. That's the required language. These are the changes to the policy.

I think that what we've said as a school, as an institution, what our leaders have said, what the BFC has said, what the students and graduate students have said is inspiring, chosen inspiring commitment to something that matters.

But I want to close with this. Recently there was a survey of 10, 0 young people ages 16-25 in ten countries, including the United States, that's a huge survey. Seventy-five percent of the respondents said the future is frightening. I said this in December. We talk about our mental health crisis among our students. It's not just COVID, it's not just social justice issues. It's climate anxiety, students are worried. It's anxiety about environmental degradation. We have to give our students the tools to confront the world's biggest problems. And climate and biodiversity loss and environmental degradation are those problems. Thank you for listening.

SHRIVASTAV: The proposal is open for discussion. [NOISE] Yes, Ky.

FREEMAN: So thank you so much for that presentation. So this is an issue that we've really looked at. This year in our constituency with talking about it with the Undergraduate Student Government, just the greater community as a whole. And what we've seen is that sustainability has been an issue that college campuses around the world have been plagued with and trying to figure out what is the implications of this and what that will do in the grand scheme of things here. But what we're looking at as we look at this as students is that the job of our institution that we go to or to come to some post-secondary institution is to equip us with the tools to critically analyze the world that we live in. Now, the concerns come with is that there might not be a world very soon to actually critically analyze in the event that these types of things are not merely being as a requirement here. And what we've really tried to do this year in the conversation of sustainability is to really understand and really make sure that we express the intersectionality of this issue when you're talking about activism on environmental injustice and how the coupling of that works with so many other aspects of racial injustice. So as we really talk about this and think about this and look at this and understanding that there is no additional requirements that end up happening there, and it works with things that are already existing, you can't just make things an option in this space because our environment that we're actually living in. I don't know if we can put this off any much longer. And I think our students have really demonstrated that not only undergraduate level but also on the graduate level as well. So I'll turn it over to Leo for a few moments to speak as our sustainability director for the IU student government.

BANKS for DEDERICHS: Thank you. Yes, I'm sitting here as proxy, but I actually think that's a really good point on the intersectionality of the issue. It cuts across so many things. And that's why it's so easy I think to integrate into all the programs. I can put the concern about creating new courses. I have two thoughts on. I don't think that'll be impossible, obviously, undergraduate students, there's a lot I think I don't know about how courses are created, but I do get to experience all of them. I don't think that's impossible. I've seen so many courses where

you can take something. And look, I mean, literally, it's just how does this thing we're talking about affect the environment? Because literally everything we do uses some resource.

Somehow, in some way, everyone's going to graduate and get a job where resources are consumed and used. Are they using them sustainably? It's that simple. I don't think that's a concern. If you do have a program that you need to create a new course for it to get sustainability into it maybe that's a whole other issue in and of itself. I like to talk about mainstreaming. It's how we got to the issue that we have with our climate today. You can't just shove sustainability down everything centrally. You have to mainstream it into everything. Because otherwise, it's a never-ending battle where you'll keep fighting it over and over and over because you keep making the same mistakes because it was never mainstreamed.

So getting it into every single school and the university is how that actually would be done, at least from my perspective. So I'd share this statistic. And you can just look this up. The IU stats report and stats is a ranking system that ranks universities based on a bunch of different metrics for their sustainability. So it looks like missions and curriculum and all these other things. And just looking at the academic part for IU. So we scored 17.17 out of 18 on research. That's really really good. For our curriculum, we scored 26.99 out of 40. So that's 95% and 67% respectively.

So obviously we have some work to do there. But back to the point of it's critical that this is something that's being taught. I attend a lot of protests and events that are themed around this. And I see students who know a lot about it. I see students who know very little about it. I see students who don't care. And it is that latter part that concerns me greatly because I've met students who don't care but it's not because they're annoyed or because they don't want to know. It's not that their heads [inaudible] so they were never taught.

Because frankly, you could go to a high school in the state and never hear the word sustainability. You can also go to IU and never hear the word sustainability or IU has failed you. That's just plain and simple. So, I think that is very, very critical. To address a couple of other points really quickly about delaying this until there's some review of the whole gen ed system. I mean, as an undergrad student, I can understand that. I think we all have opinions about the gen ed system, but [LAUGHTER] I see that personally, but I don't think it's something we can delay. And I also think the data you would get out of monitoring this would be useful in that you're going to collect information. You can't actually change what you aren't measuring. There's no reason to delay doing that for another year. You might as well get the information now and then roll it into something later on. So yeah, that's rambling. Those are my thoughts. Thank you.

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you. You're set? Go ahead.

DOUCETTE: Hi, everyone. I'm Kaitlin. I'm the GPSG sustainability officer, and I will keep it brief because Leo and Ky already did such a great job summarizing how we feel as the Graduate and Professional Student Government. But I just want to remind everyone of our shared goals again, which is that we want to provide the best education possible for our students and prepare them for the real world, whatever that means to anybody. And so I would

encourage everybody to think about the fact that the undergrads are asking for this and they want it. And it is our responsibility as their teachers and leaders and mentors to listen to them when they asked, we want to learn. They want to learn more. They're asking for it. So that's my biggest statement. The other thing is I really feel like this is a unique opportunity for intersectionality to come into the conversation because all of our classes at some point or another are going to involve sustainability or climate change or anything relating to the environment, which is unavoidable. So I think it gives us a unique and creative opportunity to get together and really creatively come up with ways to discuss this in our courses. And again, as a scientist and fourth-year PhD student in the Biology department, I think the fact that our students want to learn is very encouraging to me. I rarely am asked to teach them more. So I just really appreciate them wanting this and Kelly and others on the committee for advocating for it. So, thank you very much, all you before.

SHRIVASTAV: Other questions? Yes.

WYRCZYNSKI: Hi.

[NOISE]

I'm Steve Wyrzynski. I'm at the Jacobs School and you referenced some concerns from the Jacobs Music School council. I'm just wondering, would you give, say an idea of what co-curricular activities might be? You have as part of some of the ideas going forward. I know some of the Jacobs faculty are concerned that they might not be able. This is not in their expertise or their purview to do that. Would artistic works or compositions or artistic collaborations would those be co-curricular works or would it have to be a course or a class? And in addition to that, on the other end, will there be evaluations by the test for us? Yes, this meets the standard or no this does not meet the standard of this proposed change for sustainability. Who would be doing that? Thank you.

MINCEY: So co-curricular opportunities abound at Indiana University for sustainability education. Sustain IU, Office of Sustainability offers internships for students every year. The environmental resilience institute has multiple volunteer opportunities and internship opportunities for students to take. And those students who participate in these activities are from across the disciplines. I have great statistics that I could provide to you about the variety of majors who were in these programs. So those are some examples. I don't think that that's necessarily going to cover all of the students. So I would be interested in working with and I think the other folks in the committee would be interested in working with schools who may be in the situation that you're in to think about could we develop potentially workshops for Jacobs School of Music that would be supportive, that would allow your students then to potentially have something that they might be assessed upon like performance pieces. I just evaluated a student's research proposal. He is from the Jacobs School of Music, working with the Ostrom workshop in political theory and policy analysis on sustainability and opera. There are students who are thinking about doing this work. I also had a student who was in my Sustainability Scholars Program, it's a co-curricular research experience for undergraduates who was working with the theater department and a faculty member over there about sustainability of the materials that are used in set design. So we can imagine very creative ways to address

sustainability, I think with the co-curricular programs that exist, but I think we're open to other ideas that you all might have as well. Go on Idris.

ESKEW: The only thing that I would add to that is yesterday, I took my sustainability law students over to the art museum. And the art museum did a sustainability tour for us where we went and we looked at objects and how they relate to sustainability. It was really an incredible experience for them and I didn't have to teach. [LAUGHTER] So that was an incredible experience for me this close to the end of the semester. Is that responsive or?

WYRCZNSKI: The other question is about [OVERLAPPING] Well, just who's on the end of the process deciding yeah, this is meeting the spirit of this proposal and this is falling short for the proposal?

MINCEY: the proposal we address an implementation committee should be formed through general education committee to work with the schools to develop those assessments. And so I think it would be something that would be a back-and-forth between schools or units, I suppose.

ESKEW: Yeah. We view it as collaborative.

J, you had a question?

DUNCAN: Yes. So I could share the EPC when this task force got started, I want to congratulate the task force and current EPC for bringing this to the finish line. I'm really glad to see it here. Climate change is an issue of equity, of access, of education. I can't think of anything more timely to add right now. We can't wait. This is absolutely something that needs to happen. So I went to buoy strong support for this proposal.

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you. So Kelly, I'm in the college as you know. [LAUGHTER] And so when you mentioned that you had received some concerns from people, those concerns were also shared with me and a number of other people, including members of the college policy committee. And I just wanted to ask or maybe my understanding of the concern for many units and I don't think it's just the college is not necessarily that anybody objects to the idea that sustainability is a priority. And I also don't think it's just an objection to the idea of having to do additional work to make things happen. I honestly, at least in the college, I think there's a genuine concern that this is actually necessarily superficial. That it will be done badly if something as central as a concern for integrating sustainability into the curriculum can be accounted for with a dataset, for example, which is anathema to our understanding of the significance of general education in the context of liberal arts education.

So it's encouraging to know that it wouldn't have to be a class. But at least in the context of the college, which is a very large unit that spans obviously many, many departments, many of which would actually be possibly contributing to this, but also have very strong feelings about how that should happen. That assurance actually isn't much of an assurance to a lot of people in the college because it feels like, well, let's do a webinar and everybody has to do it and check it off. And that's not our understanding of rigorous education.

So I guess the question that I have for you is my understanding based on Paul Gutierrez objection was not only that the college has objections to this, but according to him, every curricular administrative unit in every school on campus has expressed concerns about this and in fact opposes it. That was his characterization in a letter that was sent to you. So I guess in terms of informing, now, mind you I have no objection to ignoring administrators [LAUGHTER] in terms voting my own position. But in order to fully process the implications of what I'm doing, I'm wondering if you could comment on the task forces consideration of that feedback and comment on the accuracy of Paul's assertion that the people would be in charge of administering this uniformly object to it.

ESKEW: Again, I think you highlighted one aspect which is we don't represent the administration on the Bloomington faculty council. I hope that we would not do it badly. It is not our intention to do it badly. And you're right, perhaps I'm being trite when I say, you just add a dataset and that takes care of it. But when people were saying, I can imagine how we work this into our curriculum. Those were some of the thoughts that came to mind, as we had a discussion within the EPC about it and then as we had a discussion within the task force about it. So I apologize if I was trite about that. I have talked to the undergraduate chair, Kelly, a number of times and he has said over and over what you've said. We have no objection to sustainability, especially business students, they're going to be doing sustainability the second they walk in the door of their first jobs. Their concern was frankly, as I understood it from the Kelly side was, what about school of nursing? What about school of education? They have requirements. Are they going to be able to meet those requirements? This goes to the whether or not it needs to be a new course.

JOHNSON: Sara (phonetic), you were looking something up. Did you want to [OVERLAPPING]

MINCEY: I just don't have the statement from Paul. So I'm sorry, I don't know. It was a letter dated March 25th, if I'm not mistaken, it was sent to the executive committee and presumably referred to either education policies or real task force. That's why I wouldn't have seen it. I'm not on that committee.

SHRIVASTAV: Can I just pick up and speak a bit? I'm thinking about going back to Kelley slides about, what does required mean. I think when we work with schools, we may identify that there are some school's faculty who don't want to take this seriously. And maybe a webinar is what makes them happy to fulfill this. But our goal here was to require everyone to seriously consider this, right among their faculty and to seriously think about how can they implement this within their students education. So I don't think it's perfect. I don't think that [LAUGHTER] every undergraduate student will actually meet all of the learning objectives that I would hope that they would meet with regard to sustainability literacy. We're requiring schools to consider how important is this to you among your faculty. And if it's important, here are some ways that we suggest you might be able to do it and we want to work with you to develop the co-curricular experiences or curriculum to do that.

ZORN: Correct. Thank you. [NOISE] My office convenes the undergraduate associate dean, so I can attest to the fact that they were unanimous in their [NOISE] concern in opposition to,

and let me be specific, the required component of the sustainability shared goal. That is the crux of the matter, the required component. All of our Gen Ed shared goals, with the exception of diversity in the US, are recommended. And I'll comment on the US, in diversity in US in a second. But that is the way the Gen Ed program was designed, that all the shared goals would be recommended. So this would be a substantial change in the Gen Ed structure. Now, you may ask, why is the diversity in US a required shared goal? I have on my right-hand side, the Gen Ed guru.

Basically, it goes back to a 1990s policy that the BFC passed that said, diversity needs to be included in the curriculum. And then when this came up and Michael can correct me if I'm wrong, but when it came up for discussion as a shared goal, it was realized that this was something that the faculty council had said should be required. Therefore, an exception was made, and it was made to be a required shared goal. The point I'm trying to make is this would be a substantial change if you now start saying, well, this is a required goal. And what the academic associate deans are concerned about is we have lots of constraints when we're trying to administer and from a practical point of view, our curricular programs. We have state limits on the number of credits that can be required, 120. We have accreditation requirements in some schools already mentioned, like nursing and education that constrains the ability, et cetera. It should be noted that the undergraduate associate dean of Kelley opposes the requirement even though, Kelley easily meets the sustainability requirement. It should be noted that the O'Neill associate dean, executive associate dean opposed the required component. Even though, of course, O'Neill can easily meet that sustainability. Then the reason they oppose it is because of the concern that this is not, as the economists who say there's no free lunch, that something is going to get pushed out of the way, possibly, in some of these programs.

So they do not want to start down the slope of all shared goals coming out now becoming required because it just is not, I hate to use the term, but it's not a sustainable model. I hope that helps.

[inaudible]

SHRIVASTAV: Student's guy, go ahead, please.

BANKS: Can you hear me? Cool. Thank you for that concern. I think from the student perspective, because I understand the hesitation there because you could then start having this ripple effect of all these things being required and crowding out of courses and credit limits, et cetera.

But couple of points. First of all, I don't see from a student perspective, a rash to throw in a ton of shared goals that suddenly are required, that overburden the curriculum. I don't know how often they're introduced, but this one seems to have taken long enough. So, I don't see that suddenly becoming an overflowing situation. Secondly, as it was previously alluded to, if there is going to be a reconsideration of the way Gen Ed and shared goals work, which I think, if that's something that's happening, that's great.

To me, this seems like more of an issue with the way that system is structured. No system is perfect. But just because it's set in an imperfect system doesn't necessarily mean that we should not go ahead and start that process. If that system is going to change, we've already started and this might be an impetus to actually think about what that change is going to look like. Rather than saying, because from my understanding, these changes in terms of Gen Ed and shared goals, you're going to take some time. Push this back here and wait for that to get assessed. That might take more than a year just from what I've seen. And I don't think it's worth delaying this to wait for another, a pre-existing system that change from someone who cares all about climate and that's why advocacy work. That's literally the problem of what climate change is. It's the world isn't set up to deal with this and people say, the system doesn't work that way, that's the problem with the system. That's not a problem with this. I think that this is the step in the right direction. Yes, it creates some inconveniences with the system and those are difficult to deal with, I don't want to detract from that, that's hard work. That's not fun. But you start down this path and you tweak the system as you go rather than punching the brakes immediately. Thank you.

SHRIVASTAV: In the interest of time, I'm going to let Kelly and if you need to respond to either Kurt's or this comment, but after that, people have to move to the vote.

MINCEY: Sure, I was just going to make the point that those are individuals that Kurt was talking about administrators that and they're important administrators. But at least in O'Neill, + I know that our undergraduate Program Director, Andrea needs supports this wholeheartedly. So, she's very close to the undergraduate education side and an administrator, so I'm sure we can find those examples of individual administrators who support this. And of course, many faculty do.

SHRIVASTAV: With that, I would like to add, this doesn't need a motion because it's from the committee. So, we do have to take a vote. So I would call all in favor please raise your hands. Maybe we take quick count. So please keep them up and steady.

All opposed, please raise your hands.

I guess there are several abstentions. Yeah.

Based on just a visual count, I would say the motion passes.

That is the end of the agenda. Please remember, we will take a ten-minute break and then regroup for a special meeting. But otherwise, the meeting stands adjourned.

[NOISE]