

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
April 16, 2019 Presidents Hall - Franklin Hall
2:30 PM – 4:30 PM

Members Present: Heather Akou, Hussein Banai, Carey Beam, Alan Bender, Simon Brassell, Paul Brunner, Daniel Bullock, Todd Burkhardt, Selene Carter, Joanna Chromik, Judah Cohen, Rachel Cohen, Joseph D’Ambrosi, Frank Diaz, Lori Dekydtspotter, Erika Dowell, J Duncan, Jane Dutton, Ann Elsner, Philip Ford, Linda Gales, Lynn Gilman, Dennis Groth, Kenneth Guerra, Maggie Hopkins, Colin Johnson, Padraic Kenney, Peter Kloosterman, Robert Kravchuk, Ivan Keilkamp, Moira Marsh, Meg Meiman, Thomas Nelson Laird, Eliza Pavalko, Eric Rasmusen, Angie Raymond, Lauren Robel, Leslie Rutkowski, Susan Seizer, Jim Sherman, Marietta Simpson, Paul Sokol, Solomon Bruce, Geoffrey Sprinkle, Alex Tanford, Aaron Travers, Jonathan Trinidad, Richard Van Kooten, John Walbridge, Nick Williams, Alex Wisniewski

Members Absent: Kyle Adams, AJ Asomani-Adem, Fritz Breithaupt, Barbara Cherry, Kenneth Dauschmidt, Alyce Fly, Linda Gales, Krista Glazewski, Carol Hostetter, Patrick Shih, Katie Siek, Marietta Simpson, Jacob Warner, William Winecoff

Guests: Jamie Prnkert, Kim Geesla

AGENDA

1. Approval of the Minutes of [April 2, 2019](#)
2. [Memorial Resolution for Maleakal S. Mathew](#)
3. [Memorial Resolution for S. Kay Burrus](#)
4. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)
Moira Marsh, Faculty President
5. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)
Lauren Robel, Provost
6. Question/comment Period
Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to Provost Robel or President Marsh by emailing bfcoff@indiana.edu
7. Proposed amendments to BL-ACA-H9 Indiana University Bloomington General Education (10 minutes)
Jack Bielasiak, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
Simon Brassell, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
[Second Reading – Action Item]

[Current Policy](#)

[B54-2019 Updated proposed amendments to BL-ACA-H9 Indiana University Bloomington General Education](#)

[B55-2019 Updated proposed amendments to BL-ACA-H9 Indiana University Bloomington General Education \(tracked changes\)](#)

8. Questions/comments on the proposed amendments to BL-ACA-H9 Indiana University Bloomington General Education (20 minutes)
9. Proposed amendments to the Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council(5 minutes)
Erika Dowell, Parliamentarian and Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee
[Second Reading – Action Item]

[Current Bylaws](#)

[B56-2019 Updated proposed amendments to the Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council \(tracked changes\)](#)

10. Questions/comments on the proposed amendments to the Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council (10 minutes)
11. Update from the University Faculty Council Policy Review Committee (10 minutes)
Alex Tanford, Past-president and Chair of the UFC Policy Review Committee
[Discussion Item]
12. Questions/comments on the update from the University Faculty Council Policy Review Committee (10 minutes)
13. Motion to rescind BL-ACA-I9 IU Bloomington Procedures For Regulation of Financial Conflicts of Interest (5 minutes)
Alex Tanford, Past-president and Chair of the UFC Policy Review Committee
[Action Item]

[Current policy](#)

14. Questions/comments on the motion to rescind BL-ACA-I9 IU Bloomington Procedures For Regulation of Financial Conflicts of Interest(10 minutes)

TRANSCRIPT:

ROBEL: Welcome, everybody. Here we are at the end of the semester with another beautiful day.

AGENDA ITEM ONE: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF APRIL 2, 2019

ROBEL: And I'll begin as I always do, by asking for a motion for approval of the minutes.

Thank you, Pete. A second?

Thank you. Any comments. And otherwise, all in favor, thank you.

All right, and I'll turn now to our vice provost for two memorial resolutions, Eliza?

AGENDA ITEM TWO: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR MALEAKAL MATHEW

PAVALKO: Great, thank you very much. Our first is for Maleakal S Matthew.

Maleakal S. Mathew, M.D. was certainly one of the most serviceable of the Indian jewels; in his case, one generously shared by the India of his birth with the U.S and other countries. He was the senior psychiatrist with Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) of the IU Health Center from 1982 to 2004. During his tenure with CAPS, Dr. Mathew served thousands of IU students, treating their depressions, mood and thought disorders, anxieties and other difficulties that can make this human life so challenging. He did it with subtle skill, professionalism and compassion. Students and their families were grateful. They expressed their gratitude in a number of ways – simple thank-yous, letters detailing their improved quality of life after treatment as well as heartfelt personal acknowledgements in their dissertations. Dr. Mathew's varied background enabled him to have a rich understanding of many world cultures – an understanding that greatly facilitated his therapeutic conversations with IU students.

Dr. Mathew's medical degree was from Miraj Medical Center in Bombay (1948, Licentiate of College of Physicians and Surgeons, Bombay). Born in 1926 into a landed, intellectual family in Kerala, south India (near the setting of Arundhati Roy's novel, *The God of Small Things*), he clearly had an informed and deeply thoughtful perspective on India. A natural raconteur, he loved telling the tales of the India of his boyhood, particularly those involving witty lower-level Indian civil servants subtly, conversationally besting British colonial officers. He also relished telling family stories, especially about his mother, a woman possessed of great strength of character. His father died when he was an adolescent, leaving him with the considerable responsibility of assisting with the rearing of his four younger brothers. After graduating from the Bombay Medical School he worked as a physician in the Middle East for several years, first for the Bahrain Petroleum Company (1950-53) and then for 12 years as a medical officer for the government of Qatar in Doha (1955-1967). Always thirsty for more knowledge, he was a graduate student at the R.G. Kar Medical College from 1953-1955 between these two positions in the Middle East. He passed the notoriously challenging M.B.B.S. medical exam in India in 1959.

IUB students from the Middle East greatly appreciated working with a physician whose understanding of their culture was deep and first hand. It can be challenging to sort out cultural factors affecting our students – especially international students – from the possible symptoms of emotional disturbance, so Dr. Mathew's background was invaluable in helping him do this. Middle Eastern and Asian students, especially, referred others to him – “there is a great doctor at CAPS who understands us.” He certainly had a devoted following and enjoyed a strong reputation among U.S.-born students as well.

Returning to the trajectory of his career, he departed Doha in the mid-1960s and came to the U.S. with his wife and son. He continued his medical education by enrolling in an adult psychiatry residency at the Missouri Institute of Psychiatry, University of Missouri, St. Louis, from 1967 through 1972, doing a post-doctoral fellowship at their Institute for study and treatment of mental retardation during the latter two years. Rounding out his comprehensive psychiatric training, he was a fellow/faculty at a youth center affiliated with Washington University. His family was steeped in medicine. A younger brother practiced surgery in Canada, his wife was an Ob-Gyn doctor, and his son a nephrologist, now practicing in Eureka, California.

Dr. Mathew was much loved by CAPS staff and IUB students. The clinical staff valued his knowledge, which he was generous in sharing in clinical teams and consultations. His work ethic was exceptionally

strong, eliciting fond jokes from the staff about, “Dr. Mathew, can you squeeze in one more patient?” This question occurred often enough that his retirement gift included a crystal vase, with the question etched on it. He often worked late and was heard to complain about those who arrived at work early, snagging all of the nearby parking spaces, so needed by the late-comers, he noted, who had to walk too far to be ‘almost on time.’ He would never allow a student in need to be turned away, frequently shortening his lunch hour to accommodate them.

During his tenure with CAPS he was asked by the Medical School to teach a course for medical students on the Bloomington campus. He always took great care to formulate their quiz questions so the medical students learned from taking the test. Other interactions with IU medical students involved 1) some psychiatric consultations for Riley Children’s Hospital, where he worked with medical students and psychiatry residents and 2) being asked to treat IUB medical students who might be experiencing depression or other problems.

He was an avid reader, particularly interested in the history of medicine and philosophy. He enjoyed sharing articles and books he thought would be of interest to others. He was an equally avid, and talented, tennis and squash player, always on the lookout for partners interested in a pickup game on a random Tuesday evening. If that was not possible he would settle for bridge, another favorite activity.

His was a long and illustrious life, of varied professional and personal experiences. He truly gave more than he took. When former staff and students return for a visit to CAPS, invariably their first question is “How is Dr. Mathew?” We are slowly learning to say – sometimes with a little difficulty -- after 92 years on this tumultuous earth, he is at peace.

We request that this memorial tribute to Maleakal Mathew be presented to members of the Bloomington Faculty Council, that it be preserved in its minutes and archive, and that after its presentation copies be sent to members of his family.

Nancy Stockton
Counseling and Psychological Services
Health Center
Indiana University Bloomington

AGENDA ITEM THREE: MEMOIRAL RESOLUTIONS FOR S. KAY BURRUS

PAVALKO: Our second resolution is for S Kay Burroughs. Dr. Sandra Kay Burroughs served IU and the School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, now School of Public Health, with distinction for over 39 years. She was an integral part of the exercise physiology faculty. Her career culminated with a 14-year appointment as Associate Dean for Academic Program Administration.

Dr. Sandra Kay Burrus passed away under the loving care of IU Health Bloomington Hospice House on June 16, 2018. Kay was born to Lanham J. and Faye (Hellrung) Burrus in Litchfield, Illinois, on Dec. 19, 1937. Kay served Indiana University and the School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, now School of Public Health, with distinction for over 39 years. She was an integral part of the exercise physiology faculty and taught an array of courses. Her career culminated with a 14-year appointment as Associate Dean for Academic Program Administration.

Prior to coming to Indiana University, Kay completed B.S. and M.S. degrees at Southern Illinois University in 1959 and 1962, respectively. She taught at Sterling High School in Sterling, Illinois, from

1959 to 1961 and served as an associate instructor in the Department of Physical Education for Women at Southern Illinois University from 1961 to 1962. In 1962, Kay came to Indiana University as an instructor and coach in the Department of Physical Education for Women, and later in the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics. In addition to teaching courses, she was a highly successful coach of the women's field hockey team from 1962 to 1976 and the women's basketball team from 1963 to 1967. During the summer months, from 1966 to 1979, she traveled to the Nevada Desert Research Institute to work as a visiting and consulting scientist with Dr. D. B. Dill (at the time, the world's renowned expert in exercise physiology) in the Laboratory of Environmental and Pathophysiology. In 1974, Kay Burrus received her Ph.D. in exercise physiology from the University of Michigan and she was an important part of the department's exercise physiology faculty at Indiana University.

During her tenure in the Department of Physical Education, later renamed the Department of Kinesiology, Dr. Burrus made significant contributions to its teaching, service, and research missions and was instrumental in a period of rapid transformation in the department. Dr. Burrus regularly taught a variety of classes, including Introduction to Exercise Science, Physiology of Exercise, Corporate Fitness and Wellness, and History of Physical Education. She was active in a number of higher education professional organizations, most notably the Midwest Association for College and University Physical Education, where she held several elected positions culminating in the presidency from 1987 to 1990. Dr. Burrus's research focused on stress, health, and included such topics as the physical-fitness levels of women and the physical and cardiorespiratory characteristics of women intercollegiate basketball players. Additionally, she chaired and served on numerous doctoral dissertation committees in the Department of Kinesiology.

In 1987, Dr. Burrus accepted an appointment as the Associate Dean for academic program administration in the school, which she held until her retirement. During her more than fourteen years of service in this capacity, Dr. Burrus represented the school on numerous university and school committees. Her sensitivity and friendly accessibility to students, her uncanny attention to detail, and her quiet and thoughtful wisdom on matters of importance to the school made her a most valuable and respected administrator.

Kay is survived by her long-time, cherished friend Gayle Hart. Dr. Burrus dedicated her professional life to the betterment of the Department of Kinesiology and the School of Public Health. For those who worked with Kay, her quiet leadership will be missed; but, the hope is that her positive attitude will remain woven in the fabric of the department.

This resolution will be presented in and become a part of the minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council, and listing the names of family members and friends to whom copies of the resolution will be sent after its presentation in the Council.

David M. Koceja
Professor
Department of Kinesiology, School of Public Health
Indiana University Bloomington

ROBEL: Please join me in honoring these colleagues. Thank you. Turn now to our president for Executive Committee business.

MARSH: I have a lot of things to report from the EC. But I want to begin with a fun thing, at least for me.

Could I ask Chad and Phillip to come up here, if you're here, still in the room? Thank you, guys. I don't know if many of you have had interactions with one or other of these gentlemen and/or with Elizabeth. (Elizabeth's already up here, so I don't have to ask her to come.)

But we've heard nothing but good things from committee chairs and faculty and other individuals about the great work that Elizabeth and Chad and Phillip have been doing behind the scenes to make the BFC run well and run smoothly. Particularly we heard from the co-chairs of the BAC, which congratulating Chad on successfully managing their schedule, which is nothing short of a miracle, I think.

And so the presidential troika decided that we should recognize their work and make a little gesture of appreciation. And so we have a little gift for each one of them. Here, Elizabeth.

You may ask them afterwards if they want to share what they were given, but I can tell you that it does have a lot to do with caffeine.

HENSHEL: We would like to thank Moira for her leadership this past year and for the leadership that she's going to continue next year as part of the oncoming as she called it. And so, first we've got a proclamation that we would like everybody we hope passed.

We move the following resolution be adopted by the faculty council.

Whereas Moira Marsh has performed exemplary service for Indiana University for many years as librarian and colleague, whereas she has served this year as president of the faculty. With distinction in humility whereas, she has led at the BFC with patience, humor and the assistance of a highly trained jackalope.

Whereas, her dedication to the basic principles of shared governance, academic freedom and respect for everyone in the university community is an example to us all. Be it resolved that the Bloomington faculty council by acclamation officially appoints Moira Marsh as chief Bloomington faculty squirrel wrangler.

And expresses its appreciation for Moira's service as president and for her sense of humor, both of which contributed to making IU not only a distinguished university, but also a humane one.

ROBEL: May I have all in favor.

MARSH: Join about us fair play, as they say. Could I ask Diane to come up? Yes please. So, I do appreciate this as a folklorist, that it is important to have, ritual occasions to mark significant events, paradigm shifts, that kind of thing.

Even if they are ironic ones, which they often are this day and age. So it has become a tradition since the days of Sugimoto, to confer upon the incoming president-elect a few symbols of the office. One of my friends pointed out that maybe the thing that we should do is, what I'm going to be doing here, is in fact passing the torch.

There you are.

For the Americans in the room, I should have you know that where I came from that is a torch.

But more important, I need to convey the tiara of power.

Finally, this year, some of you were here last time last year when Alex did the same thing to me. And being a lawyer, he added his own quarter sell to the tiara of power, which is the all-important Asterisk of Reality.

Okay, I do have more actual business. Quite a bit actually, my iPad has, here we go, so, just as a reminder, the BFC election is open through this, and through this Thursday. So you too can contribute to the next holder of the tiara or power.

If you've already voted, go ahead and vote again.

Or rather, please encourage your constituents to go online and vote for the candidate of their choice. It takes just a few moments to do. And even if there's no one running, there's no open election for your unit this year, there are several where that's the case, you may still go on and cast a vote for president-elect so we can choose the next victim.

Secondly, the volunteer form is still open. It's on the BFC website right at the front. So NOMCOM will be meeting soon to begin the process of making appointments to committees for next year. And also to form a slate of candidates for parliamentarian and secretary, board of review, and the mediation committee for next year.

Those are all elected positions. Committee chairs, please remind your committee members to fill out the form. Even if it is your fervent hope to remain on that committee for the rest of your life, we need to know that. And the way to get that information to NOMCOM is to fill out the form.

So please remind everyone to do that. And I have six other things just to mention briefly. First of all, I'd like to ask Ann Elsner to make a brief report from the technology policy committee.

ELSNER: Hi, we met throughout the year, and our chair Samir Patel could not be here.

So I'm going to read the statement that he sent:

The BFC-TPC would like to make the BFC aware of an app to increase student engagement. Specifically, that means to follow what they're supposed to be doing in their courses, and to be reminded. So the app is called Boost and it was piloted last year based on instructor opt in.

Boost aggregates information from Canvas to deliver timely, personalized automated notifications and interventions based on a student's learning activities, ie their assignments. Boost reminds students when they haven't submitted anything for an eminent deadline and delivers periodic positive encouragement messages. Notifies students of instructor's announcements and course calendar events. And provides easy access to the Canvas to-do list.

Pilot results show that it was successful in nudging students and resulted in increased assignment submission rates. So one of the things when we discussed this was that many students have like dozens of assignments, and they're not logging into their computers, they're only using their phones. So the way we use Canvas is the announcements go out via email, and I don't know if everyone does that.

But being an optometry school, we have pretty good student engagement because the students are together most days all day, so they can remind each other. But this is not the case across the campus. So there's questions and URLs that you can look at, and Ben Motz, M-O-T-Z. So bmatzindiana.edu and this will include some URLs that you can get from him, and FAQs, etc, to know more about this.

And if you try to look this up online, the word Boost in software is also open source for C and C++ as well as OpenQT, etc. So for those of you who are software geeks, please don't confuse that Boost with this Boost.

MARSH: Thank you, Ann., So this is the last meeting of the year, and we hope to get some important things accomplished as soon as I shut up.

I just wanted to report out from the executive committee that there is five things that I know of already that are underway this semester already that will be continuing next year. So I want to mention just those just so we're not just all going to go to sleep over the next three months.

The facilities task force has been at work, charged with figuring out meeting with the office of what we used to call the architect's office. And I forget for the moment what we call it these days. But the people responsible for renovations and new buildings and disruption all over campus, are working with that office to figure out a way to ensure that there is faculty input on planning for facilities projects.

So to minimize disruption to the academic mission. So they have been at work already and we expect a report from them shortly. Second, we have just appointed a three-person steering committee for the Gen Ed in the third century Task Force. The draft charge of the task force is to report on the future of general education on our campus and make recommendations for changes and it's requirement on structure.

So we appointed a three person steering committee since we have anticipated the actual task force will be huge. That group will have its first meeting in a week or two. And that work will continue through the end of next year. Thirdly, the educational policies committee, the hardest working committee on campus this year as far as I can tell, had a meeting with Dave Johnson, the registrar.

To begin work on proposing an amendment to our admissions policy so that our admissions will be test optional in the future. So that meeting will happened very soon, this Friday. And so that will be coming to the floor very early in the fall for action.

And then finally, we have appointed a tenure and promotion criteria task force. And I'd like to ask Eliza to describe that briefly.

PAVALKO: Sure, happy to. So this came out of the president's state of the university address a couple of years ago. One of the things that he asked for was a review of pathways for teaching excellence.

Including a review of tenure criteria, or promotion and tenure criteria regarding teaching. We've done a number of things. We've had each school or college, their policy committees look at their criteria to see if they think they need revision. But one of the things that they reported back to us and we realized is that really the review should probably happen at the campus level.

We convened a small group of prior members of promotion and tenure committees to get some advice in terms of kind of what that might look like. And their advice was that that indeed the campus, well it's actually the policies and procedures of principles and policies of tenure and promotion could use some revision.

So we then talked with Diane and Moira and have now talked to the executive committee, and put together a small task force this summer that will draft some initial changes to that. The plan is for those to then go to the faculty affairs committee in the fall for full vetting and revision as they see fit.

But to kind of jump start that process with a smaller task force in summer.

MARSH: Okay, that's it from me.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

ROBEL: Thank you, I have just a few quick things. The first is to add my own thanks to all of the thanks that have been expressed so far from Moira's work this year, it's critical for shared governments to work well.

To have a faculty president who is willing to give me her cell phone, and to take my calls when I call, just so that we can make sure that nothing comes up that surprises anybody on either side. And she has been a wonderful partner this year and a wonderful leader.

So my deepest thanks to you, Moira, for all that you've done this year. And I'm happy to delete the cellphone if you want me to, but I really appreciate the opportunity to consult you and to lean on your judgment. So I want to thank the candidates who are standing this year for faculty council president.

Colin and Heather and John, it's important that we as a faculty think hard about the ways in which this body works with those of us who are charged with the day to day operations of the campus and the university. And it's really important that we all step forward for these kinds of leadership roles.

And so I appreciate all three of you doing that at this time. I want to congratulate the Eskenazi School of Art, Architecture and Design. That was one of the happiest of those kinds of celebrations I've ever been to. The Eskenazis were extraordinarily grateful for the ability to provide that kind of support for the school, for the faculty, and the students and their facilities.

Lois Eskenazi is herself a gifted painter, self-taught. And it's always moving when we have the opportunity to have someone step forward and say, I believe in the mission of this place. I believe in supporting it, and I want to help. And so my profound gratitude to the Eskenazis who have done that repeatedly for Indiana University, and also more generally for our state.

Those of you who spend time in Indianapolis know that they provided the largest private gift for a public hospital in the country. And it has made an enormous difference in that hospital's ability to

provide patient care. Finally, there's only one center on the campus that reports to me, and that's the Center for Rural Engagement.

And it reports to me because of the way in which it was founded. I was able to work carefully with our Lily endowment to get a gift to start it up. And it came out of two broad intuitions. The first was we do astonishing things on this campus.

And we live surrounded by people who could use what we do. And it's difficult for them to find us. And sometimes it's helpful for us to have a way to facilitate our interactions with those communities. And the second is it would be wonderful if the citizens of this state understood in a tangible and real way the kinds of things that this university does.

So at the end of the first year, the Center for Rural Engagement has involved over 1,000 students, over 1,450 community members, 150 faculty members, 20 funded research projects. Every school on the campus plus the college, both faculty and students, sponsored 30 health projects, 15 arts projects, 54 resilience projects, and 27 communities.

And been instrumental in receiving helping faculty on campus receive support from both Mellon and Luz. And just last week it won a national award for its work. So I would say it's doing pretty well in its first year. It's made a huge difference in our state's Commission on Higher Education's understanding of the kind of work that we do, the breadth, the depth and the scope of that work.

And those of you who were at the State of the Campus address back in March heard me read an email we received from a teacher in Salem in Indiana about a concert in which our wonderful Jacob School of Music went to Salem, Indiana and worked with band students.

And performed a concert with them that was widely attended. That kind of broad scale, holistic engagement that lasts over a very long period of time, I think does more to help our state understand the quality of the things we do and the breadth of the things we do.

And to understand the research that we do and the impact that it has. So I wanted to end on a high note this year in my reports, and I think this is a pretty high note.

AGENDA ITEM SIX: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

ROBEL: With that, I will, I'm not sure we have any questions that were submitted ahead of time, but I'll open it up to the council.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: PROPOSED ADMENDMENTS TO BL-ACA-H9 INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON GENERAL EDUCATION

ROBEL: Okay, seeing none, let me turn to Simon. Thank you so much for the proposed amendment to the Gen Ed requirements.

BRASELL: Thank you. This is a follow up from the previous BFC meeting where the first phase of these revisions were proposed. And on April the 2nd there was the further background presented in terms of the history behind the changes that are now being proposed.

And in the last two weeks there have been a couple of changes to the proposal that stem from discussions at the April 2nd meeting. And I've endeavored to summarize those on the first slide. The key consideration is a change in language from should to must in terms of the reporting on the shared goals.

The idea that those reports should identify how programs both support and assess the learning goals. And the more significant change is an addition to the description of the fate of those reports, which is the idea of creating a dedicated subcommittee of the General Education Committee to help both the EPC and the DAAC committees foster best practices in terms of meeting those learning outcomes.

And I'd especially like to thank the contributions from the DAAC Committee in helping us derive a language that follows on the recommendations from the April 2nd meeting. So, to summarize then, the main changes that have enacted in the policy compared to its previous version is the idea of specifying diversity in the United States as a required rather than a recommended shared goal.

To identify that the general education committee plays a role in approving courses for the common ground, and receives the reports on how individual degree programs support and assess the shared goals. And there's also the suggestion for changing the name of one those shared goals from information fluency to information literacy.

So there's additional language that has been added in, which is to describe in a little more detail the basis for what the common ground and the shared goals are. With the main idea that the common ground is a student responsibility through their course selection to meet. And that the shared goals represent a faculty responsibility by integrating these components into both curricular and co-curricular aspects of all degree programs.

And then, as I mentioned, the other major change is this specification of the role of the General Education Committee, both in approving courses and then in receiving reports. The other changes involve a little bit of wordsmithing and some reordering of items. And my thought is that it's easiest to then go and specifically bring up the policy which was included in the agenda for the meeting.

The policy statement, there are minor wording changes to that. The common ground, specifically, now has this additional language to identify what it composes and, in particular, the role of the general education committee in approving the courses that represent these three areas. And there are effectively no substantive changes to any parts of the common ground.

Where the changes and recommended revisions to ACA-H9 have been included is in the separation of shared goals into the diversity in the US as a required shared goal, and the other three as being recommended. Associated with that, there's then the requirement that all schools and the college must report back to the General Education Committee on how their undergraduate degree programs support and assess the learning goals for the diversity in the US requirement, and also whether and how they address each of the other three recommended shared goals.

The one major edition compared to the language that was presented on April the 2nd is this additional sentence that requires dedicated subcommittee of the General Education Committee should be appointed to review the DUS learning outcomes. And this essentially represents the same way in which there are specific committees within the general education, or subcommittees within the General Education Committee, to assess the course requirements, or the courses that meet the requirements for the common ground, as this shared goal is now also being proposed to become a requirement.

The language here is to specifically identify a mechanism and an approach for reviewing those reports and feeding that information back to the two most pertinent committees, standing committees of the BFC. And then within the overall revisions to the what the shared goals constitute, there is effectively a reordering of them to identify diversity in the US as a required component followed by the three recommended components, with the change in the language from information fluency to information literacy, and the enriching educational experience has been slightly extended with a couple of additions.

And those were included in the version that was discussed on April the 2nd. So effectively, that's what constitutes the recommendations for the various revisions to this policy, which comes with recommendations from the Educational Policies Committee.

ROBEL: Thank you so much. All right, there have been a lot of changes that we've responded to last week, and, of course, the policy response to a few years of discussion.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON PROPOSED ADMENMENTS TO BL-ACA-H9 INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON GENERAL EDUACTION

ROBEL: So are there additional comments or discussion before we vote, Alan?

BENDER: Yeah, could you put up the section about the shared goals? I mean, what the language will say. So is this—

BRASELL: It's in three separate slides.

BENDER: Okay, yeah, maybe you can move back a slide then.

Okay, let's see. Yes, I'm trying to find this here.

So the last the previous version that we talked about a couple weeks ago with the BFC, it specified who the reports are going to go to. And that got deleted.

I know there's this extra sentence at the end that's been added, but I think, so I think it'd be helpful to, let's see, where it says all schools in the college must report, that's where previously said something about to the GE.

I think it'd be useful to go to reinsert that.

ROBEL: Doesn't it still?

It says that on the slide.

BENDER: Why doesn't mine show it? The version that I have that I got from the BFC, from the agenda, didn't include that, so I'm confused. And the previous version did have it.

And so see here? I mean this is what I've got, must report how each of their—

UNKNOWN: Okay, the first sentence doesn't even look the same.

BENDER: Yeah, so this is different. Yeah, okay. Yeah, well, so I can't really make a comment.

ROBEL: So, are there other comments?

MARSH: Just information, I should have done this last time I talked about it, I apologize. Just by way of explanation of why we're doing this, because it seems like we have messing about with this particular thing for quite a long time now, at least three years.

The fact is that some years ago is that this body or a body very much like this one, passed an amendment to a document and the document was not the policy. The document was just a circular, B16-2011 which is the document that we approved that fleshes out all of the requirements for general education that are in the policy and that document actually lives on the undergraduate education website as amended by the BFC.

But that document is not a policy, so what this body did in April of 2017. Because they amended the circular to say that the BFC have to say that the faculty of each undergraduate unit, they used to say that the faculty *should* adopt the grave requirement that addresses issues of diversity, and they change that language from should to *must*.

The problem was that the governing document, the governing policy, the one we're looking at today says, you can't do that. It says that the US shared goal is *not* required. And so it seemed to us that in order to move forward, the intention of the BFC three years ago was in fact, to make this change, to boost the US requirement from a should to a *must*.

We have not at this time, but this does not make the DUS a common ground. This means that there's a lot more flexibility as to how this requirement can be met and it still keeps the control of how to implement this requirement within the hands of the faculty with each units which seems appropriate, but I just want to explain as to why we are actually bothering with this now.

We are in a sense fixing a parliamentary booboo that we made a few years ago.

ROBEL: Okay, are there comments, Judah?

J. COHEN: Thank you. Just two very, what I hope to be quick, questions.

The first one is largely a clarification to ask if the changes that are currently being made through to ACH-9, it seems to me or at least based on my experience that this DUS requirements seems to be first time that the Gen Ed committee has given to some level of jurisdiction over something that goes beyond the curriculum to the co-curriculum.

And I just want to clarify if that is in fact, the case. The second question that I would ask, if this were passed to do what the roll-out might look like in terms of a timeline?

Thanks.

BRASELL: I think the idea of incorporating co-curricular components is the recognition that in the report for the diversity in the US task force.

One of the considerations is building in some of these components for example into the first year experience. And so the idea also embodied in the reports coming back to both the DAAC committee and EPC with the language associated with best practices is to try and effectively develop the approaches that can be adopted within degree programs that include some of those co-curricular activities.

And so one anticipates that there is indeed a development phase associated with how individual degree programs will meet this requirement. And part of the next step, if this is approved is for it to then go forward to the schools and the college and then to individual degree programs to work on how these components can be incorporated.

So in a sense, this is not something that will in any way, shape or form take place overnight, then we'll need to be a development period and the expectation is that some of the reports that will come back to the general education committee will be steps towards addressing this new requirement for the DUS shared goal.

I don't know if Dennis wants to add to that.

GROTH: Yeah, I would say, I don't disagree with anything Simon said. So Simon, thank you. Just to remind people that most every school has something in place already that they have mapped to the learning objectives that were defined by the subcommittee last year, so we're not starting from a complete deficit.

I think there are parts, even parts within schools that have something in place that are not fully fleshed out and I would leave that to the faculty within the schools and to whatever governance process they have to figure out how to best accomplish this. I don't think that this says this provides the flexibility, rather for people to look outside of the classroom for how diversity and inclusion might be incorporated as learning.

They're in student centered class rooms typically less than twenty hours out of a week. That leaves a lot of time out of that 20 hours during the week for not only opportunities, but also where we know learning is happening and to the extent that the faculty can be engaged in that particular process in a thoughtful way.

[I think that everyone will benefit and mostly our students. So I expect we'll see something in place really quickly from some programs and we'll have some reports. As soon as we'll get a report, I'll ask for a report. What will they look like? I don't know. We'll find out, that committee will review it and provide feedback and we'll learn through that particular process.

ROBEL: Any other comments? Yep, here

RASMUSEN: As Dennis said, maybe this won't make a difference. But I have four objections and one of them is, it isn't completely clear what we're approving. And from what I've seen, the memo—we got some learning goals last fall, I think last spring there were sent. That looks like a social justice, neo-Marxist indoctrination course, which I, of course, would oppose.

I prefer having a course indoctrinating Christianity or at least 1950s liberalism, but we don't know that that's that. Probably it won't make any difference and what the schools are doing now may satisfy the requirement. That leads to a third problem which is new reporting, new bureaucracy. And a fourth problem, which is new of this version which is the subcommittee; that it looks like for advocating a part of Gen Ed to some subcommittee of a committee and we don't know who's the people will be on there deciding this.

As was just mentioned, maybe a new thing to have EPC looking at co-curricular requirements in the first place. So to deal a little bit with this, I would like to propose to amend the proposal to delete everything that's on this slide now from all schools and the college onwards.

That would leave making it a requirement, but it would get rid of the administrative part of this and get rid of the administrative part of this and get rid of the subcommittee.

ROBEL: That would require a second.

ELSNER: Do you mean in the time or from the slide downward?

RASMUSEN: Okay, so all words, all schools in the college must report to the GEC and then the next slide may be we put up—the dedicated subcommittee.

Excuse me?

Sorry...

BRASELL: SO what would be left by that would be just this first part of the introduction to the shared goals—

RASMUSEN: That's right.

BRASELL: From three slides...So we just leave that?

RASMUSEN: Yes, yes. So part of the shared goal the diversity the United States part, this required part...

ROBEL: I hear no second. So the motion fails.

RAYMOND: I think I'd like to suggest we continue to have a conversation because I also support the idea that there's no standard here.

So what we're going to see is some schools been reporting what they already have in place, which we've just heard that there's a lot of schools that do. But no standard about how to be measured, and no clear guidance as to what will occur if someone has a problem with it.

And it conflicts with our accreditations, though some of that needs to be in my opinion flushed out. So I think everyone in the room is very happy with the idea of this being a required goal, but it's a hard target to hit if we don't have the target.

And that's what I worry about.

ROBEL: Are you seconding that motion?

RAYMOND: I'd like to hear discussion, because I know Kelly School a bit more.

ROBEL: The only way to discuss Eric's motion is to second it.

RAYMOND: Then I second the motion.

ROBEL: All right, is there further discussion?

Hearing none, can we vote on the motion please?

All in favor of the motion?

All opposed.

All right, the motion fails. Moving on to further discussion of the proposal from the committee. Any further discussion? Alan?

BENDER: Yes, what is showing here is a little bit different than what got sent out, but if this is the language that's great.

But one thing I would suggest, let's see we're not on the same slide, can you go one slide further? So one question is how often these reports are supposed to be submitted. I think it might be good to insert there must report annually to the GEC. And something else I'm wondering about it whether the report should also go directly to the BFC, so report annually to the GEC and BFC, I'm wondering Simon if your thoughts about that.

BRASELL: Well I—

BENDER: Is that a motion I would, if we're going to do emotions, I guess I would say start with annually. I mean just to give some, to specify how often these reports are supposed to be submitted.

All right, is there a second?

Is there discussion of the annual reporting?

KLOOSTERMAN: The committee think about how often? I mean it's once a year, once every other year.

BRASELL: The expectation is that this would be annual, but it was not specified as part of the policy. Because a part of it will depend upon the timing for the general education committee meeting and working in, with their schedule as well since that meets only in the springtime.

ROBEL: Okay. Colin?

JOHNSON: And it does occur to me. Dennis, I'm wondering if you could say a few words about how assessment is done and on what sort of terms where general education is concerned, generally. Because it does seem to me that there are mechanisms in place to do that.

I mean I think there is room for a discussion going forward about how we're using the data we're collecting. The regularity with which we're collecting it, but I'm wondering if you could say a little bit about, because this is a subsidiary point within the broader articulation of general education.

GROTH: Yeah. When general education was set up, all of the general education, each time a class is offered, it's to be assessed. And how the assessment protocol was defined was entirely left to faculty to determine what they were going to assess within the context of the learning goals. So for this, my view is we will be looking at an annual report that would identify how of the learning outcomes that were identified by the diversity in the US group that put them up,

How the schools are meeting them and with the evidence that supports their assertion that they're actually accomplishing it. In a way you would hope that over time, schools would be able to learn from that process to establish goals. Which were broader than just how are they doing on the individual learning goals and develop a more holistic view of diversity within the context of their degree discipline.

I hope that answers what you're looking for.

ROBEL: All right, further discussion, Alex, on the motion?

TANFORD: I was a little unclear Dennis by your answer. In the current general education program generally, is there a requirement for periodic reports? And if so, is that because it seems to be this one should be the same as whatever it else, whatever that it should go in with the regular course.

GROTH: So there's a mandatory report that I provide to the BFC about kind of the state of general education that happens every year. And it also includes assessment information, but that's a very high level report. For the individual courses, they're to be assessed. And the outcomes of that assessment, in whatever capacity the faculty are doing them, are to be reported every time the course is offered.

Because it's a shared goal, and you would see that it might be done across a curriculum, I think we have to look at it in a slightly broader context. And I think we would be looking for the schools to develop the right kind of way to report this.

I don't think that some schools actually do this with a course. So for the BA students in the college. So the easy thing they might do and say is we're just going to do the regular general education assessment for these courses, then we're going to provide an aggregate report to the campus.

I won't say that's good or bad, I think that's up the subcommittee to make a review of that and determine whether they're sufficiently satisfied that people are taking seriously the need to educate in this key area. And I think until you see it, I can't predict what that outcome will be, other than we will be better than we are today.

ROBEL: Okay, there's a motion on the floor to amend the language of ACA H9 to require the report to the GEC to be annual.

All in favor?

Opposed?

There appear to be people who also care not.

So in fact, I don't know if that's a—what did you get?

Passes?

Okay, so as pass then within the annual report, are we ready to vote on the proposal?

ADAMS: Sorry, I have one further question. This is not a motion, this is just a question, and I apologize, because it seems like a fussy point at first. But the first sentence under Shared Goals in the document that we were given, I think it's on the first slide of the Shared Goals slide.

Says they may be embedded within curricula and/or as co-curricular activities. Later on in the paragraph it says that all schools must report how each of their programs assess the learning goals within their curriculum and co-curricular activities not and or. And that we've had a lot of concern at Jacobs about the fact that we cannot incorporate the DUS requirement into our curriculum just for reasons of credit hours.

And of course we want it to be in compliance. So is this in fact an end or an end or.

BRASELL: I would say having and/or in both places would be a friendly amendment.

ADAMS: Okay, in that case I apologize for saying this was not an amendment or a motion.

I moved to amend whichever sentence that is in the paragraph on shared goals. I believe it's the third sentence to say assess the DUS learning goals within their curricular and/or co-curricular activities.

ROBEL: Is there a second? Thank you. Well, there's got to be a second half discussion. Okay, great, all right.

GROTH: So just a logical thing. The first and/or provides programs the flexibility to determine where it occurs. The second one, if you leave it and/or would provide flexibility for programs to report, where they decide they want to report. And leaving it and, if you only have it in the co-curriculum you would say, your report would be very short on the curricular side.

So I'm just saying that by logic you leaving it and says they have to say where it's happening.

ROBEL: Is that a satisfactory answer?

ADAMS: Are you asking me?

ROBEL: As the proponent of the motion, I am. It's not we can go ahead and...

ADAMS: If you're given the flexibility to include either in the curriculum or in a co-curricular activity, then it would make sense to me that we're only going to report whether it's been added to the curriculum or as a co-curricular activity.

I would just rather see it be consistent that were either required to embedded within curricula and co-curriculum, I mean cards on the table. My I would love to see it required in the curriculum, I think that has a little bit more oomph to it than giving us the flexibility.

But since we're beginning the flexibility in one case, I would rather see it in both cases.

ROBEL: The emphasis on oomph of the Jacob school means a lot to me, but we should perhaps if there's not anything else on this proposed amendment go ahead and vote. John is this on the "and-or" questions?

TRINIDAD: It is, it is. It might make you both happy if we just strike the "with curricular and co-curricular activities" from that current slide, then it's required one way or the other but if then not pigeonholed how you report it.

ADAMS: That sounds like a good solution. I'll agree with that.

ROBEL: All right, so I think the proponent of the amendment is suggesting that we simply say supports and assess the DUS learning goals. Period and then up to the end. Is that okay?

All right, do we need a vote on that to? All right, is there a second?

John I believe probably you.

All right, discussion?

All in favor?

Excellent. Opposed?

All right, and then are we ready to vote?

Okay, all in favor.

Oh, Paul.

BRUNNER: I'm sorry, I haven't said anything all year but there's a I think there's a discrepancy between what's on the screen in front of us and what was distributed in the agenda today, the words on the top.

The end of the top lines has 2DGEC wasn't in the agenda copy that we received, and I'm just asking what the intention of the committee was there.

BRASSELL: Apologies, the version that is on the slide was what is intended.

I regret that because of all of the different track changes that has taken place with this document that there is a couple of minor discrepancies between the version that was circulated and the version that was agreed and approved.

ROBEL: Does that...okay.

Now are we ready to vote?

All in favor.

All opposed.

Three. The committee recommendation passes.

Thank you very much Simon for all of your work, and thanks to your committee. Great, all right. And thank you to all of you for your discussion over the last three years about this.

I think we've got something to work with at this point or we can work with it.

AGENDA ITEM NINE: PROPOSED AMMENDMENTS TO THE BYLAWS OF THE BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL

ROBEL: All right, proposed amendments to the by-laws of the Bloomington Faculty Council just by by-laws. Erica?

DOWELL: Thank you. You'll recall we talked over the changes to the bylaws last time.

We have the slides that represent what we suggested last time and I want to just report of couple of things that came up. And resulted in some further revision that has satisfied everybody on the executive committee and everybody on the costumer rules committee so far and we'll see if you are happy with it also.

And also respond a couple of questions that we had last time. I know that. Someone brought up the selection of alternates and we checked the language. We recommended that the selection of alternates should be made from your election unit, your own election unit. But it's not required that it has to be from your own election unit.

So I think people can feel free if they can get somebody from another unit, and it'll be okay. And then we talked more about how to deal with tied nominations. And I wanted to skip forward a couple slides here, giving you a couple examples of ties, right? So ties in the nomination process can look something like this where we have, let's see, seven, six candidates.

And one has two nominations and the rest all have one, right? So it's a very, kind of low and sort of a flat situation here. But we can also have ties where it's actually for an election, where we have maybe two candidates and they each get five actual votes from people in their election unit.

And we decided that it might make sense to deal with the kind of nominations ties in a different way. And actually it would be okay for examples of elections sort of ties to be decided by lot because that seems more fair to the actual voters. And here's what we've suggested for handling ties for nominations.

And essentially, what we are saying is that those persons receiving the most nominating votes in each unit, shall be placed on the final ballot with the total number of candidates up to at least twice the number of seats to be filled. Now that, and then saying if the nominating votes are tied between two or more candidates, all such tied candidates will be placed on the final ballot.

So that is maybe not the most felicitous phrasing. We can work on that. But essentially, we're saying that if we're filling one seat, normally we would only have two candidates for that. But if we ended up with, oops, I hit the wrong one. But if we ended up with a nomination that looks like this slide for that one seat, we would potentially put all these people on the ballot if they agreed to run.

And so we still might end up with only two candidates for that one seat or we might end up with four potentially six. But typically, a lot of people who are nominated are unable to actually run or don't want to run. And so that sort of takes out the discretion on the side of the nominating committee.

But leaves the discretion essentially to the voters to choose between the full array of people who have been nominated. I can answer questions about that. And we talked also about whether we actually need to give the nominating committee the ability to add six additional candidates to the pool of at large candidates.

And we decided that that's fine with us and that does give a nominations committee some discretion in that particular area. Although we did not say that they had to come up with six, they could come up with two or decide how many they wanted to add. And then this is something at the end of section 4, 6, which is just cleaning up some language that Alan Bender noted was pretty sloppy at the end of that section about how nominees are listed.

And that's something that we just added today and will be in your circular. But it essentially just cleans up language saying that the final ballot should list the nominees from each election unit. As well as the at large nominees alphabetically, period and gets rid of some old language about tenured, untenured at large, things like that.

The vote for this will require two thirds to pass, and I think, I'm ready for questions.

AGENDA ITEM TEN: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON PROPOSED AMMENDMENTS TO THE BYLAWS OF THE BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL

ROBEL: Are there questions?

Alex?

TANFORD: On the screen you have up right now...

DOWELL: Yes.

TANFORD: It says, in the red area, total number of candidates up to at least twice the number of seats.

Those seem contradictory to me. Up to twice means no more than twice, at least twice means more than twice. Can we—?

DOWELL: We can strike “up to.” Yes. That’s why I said it’s, it’s the most felicitous language.

TANFORD: So which way do you intend it to?

DOWELL: We intend it to be—

TANFORD: To cap it at twice?

DOWELL: We don’t want to cap it at all. We want to leave it open. It needs to be at least twice the number of seats to be filled and could grow from there.

TANFORD: Okay, then probably need the strike “up to.”

DOWELL: That would be fine, I think.

ROBEL: Diane?

HENSHEL: So the problem with the striking the up to is that we don’t always have enough nominations and enough people willing to accept being on the election ballot.

DOWELL: That was a pre-standing problem and I take no responsibility for solving that problem.

ROBEL: All right, Alan?

BENDER: I have suggested language. So I understand what the issue is and I think what the intention is, so if you said on the final ballot right before the red starts. Normally with the tall number candidates up to twice the number of seats, so you delete the twice so it’s up to you delete the at least twice.

So it’s up to... Sorry, you retain candidates up to twice the number of seats and that should be seats not just seat to be filled. But then, the next sentence could start with however, and then it will read on. So it will make clear what the intention is but then point out that.

So the intention is that you’ll have up to twice the number of candidates as there are seats to be filled. However, if there’s a tie, here’s what you do, so that’s just a suggested change.

ROBEL: John?

WALBRIDGE: Okay, as a W who's been at the end of the line since kindergarten, I would propose changing alphabetically to in random order.

And I would make that a motion.

ROBEL: Is there a second?

Okay, discussion?

Hearing none—all in favor of the motion?

All right. Opposed?

All right, we're all for randomness, and now we—have we resolved the issue that several people have raised around this other language?

DOWELL: Well, I think the simplest resolution was simply to delete the up to. And then we had the minimum number of candidates that we sought to a place on the ballot. That's to leave us a problem with perhaps lack of participation but I don't know that's a problem we need to solve right here.

I think I did it and announce just the different way to do it but I think that the simplest one is to delete up to.

ROBEL: Okay, you want to do that in the form of motion somebody so we can just get it done.

Alex?

TANFORD: I move that we delete the words up to.

ROBEL: All right, and the second?

Thank you, J.

All in favor?

All right, opposed?

Terrific. All right, any of the discussion? Alan?

BENDER: So I'm okay with this business of having the nomination committees sought up to six additional nominations. But I think it might get a little bit weird because suppose there are four candidates that had been nominated by the faculty.

In what situations does NomCom decide, what are they going to do, zero or six of their own nominations, are they going to say, well, these four look great. We don't have to add any more of our own nominations or these four suck, so we better add another six.

I'm just wondering how that's going to play out.

DOWELL: I think that we don't know how it's going to play out. This has traditionally been a part of the nominations committee's responsibilities, right? This is an existing part of the by-laws, so it's not really a change, and it's a place for them to seek to place candidates that they think might help the overall representativeness of the council presumably.

DOWELL: I mean, so what is different though is now there's a flexible number. That's what's a little bit weird it's not saying six. The way it used to be it's up to six. So it puts a nomination committee in the situation of trying to decide, okay, well, how many do we do?

Zero, or six or what? I'm just pointing out it's a little bit weird. But if the nomination committee is okay with that, I'm fine.

ROBEL: Okay, thank you. Eric?

RASMUSEN: Just to explain another thing is there may not be as many seats as before and the seats may be variable, so we didn't want to say equal to the number of seats or something like this, this gives flexibility.

ROBEL: All right, any other discussion?

Are we ready to vote?

Okay, all in favor?

Okay, opposed?

Good, terrific. We're on a roll here at the end of the year.

AGENDA ITEM ELEVEN: UPDATE FROM THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE

ROBEL: All right, finally, well no, an update from the university faculty council policy review committee, Alex?

TANFORD: First, I apologize for not having the fancy PowerPoints slides with the IU logo and things like that but I don't get around with these until yesterday. I think I've mentioned before that there's a university faculty council policy review committee that's tasked with updating the university policies that affect the entire all seven campuses.

To conform them of the conventions of other parts of the university that do policies, and there is a university policy that are policies we're supposed to review every five years. We have policies that have not been reviewed in 50 years. So it's the UFC only meets once a semester.

It's meeting is next week, we don't meet again, so I'm going to have to put on my, Seer hat, and predict how the UFC will react to the policies that we are bringing to it next week. So just to give you sort of a heads up on what is going to happen.

Policies to be rescinded. There's a UFC policy ACH 34 on political activities of academic personnel that dates from 1963. Allowing us to go out and protest against the Vietnam War. We're not changing it but the university enacted a broad political activity policy that applies to everyone not just faculty.

And they just took the language Macy 34 and incorporated it wholesale into the policy called GRO2. And my wish for all of you over the summer is never you start to know all the university policies by their numbers. So we're going to resend that and go with the university policy, same as ACA35 on outside activities and extra compensation for dating from 1966.

This policy has been superseded again, by university policy that came through this body last year on conflicts of interest in commitment. The pivotal thing in there that affects us is our ability to do outside activity, consulting, writing books, things like that that bring in extra compensation as long as we only do it an average of one day per week.

That language has been continued in the university policy. Again, there's no change in our ability to do outside activities next to compensation. ACA72 cheating and plagiarism dating from 1961 had two very simple paragraphs on student academic dishonesty. That has long ago been superseded by the code of student rights, responsibilities and conduct which has a much more comprehensive definition of what student academic dishonesty is.

There's a second part of it that's a little more controversial and our old policy ACA72 placed an obligation upon the faculty to police the rules of academic dishonesty. That is to investigate student academic dishonesty in our courses and in our programs. And impose appropriate our discretion Mac and make freedom.

Appropriate sanctions for students caught academic this in doing cheating plagiarism and things like that. The controversial part is language that said the faculty must report all instances of academic dishonesty to the relevant student affairs officer, dean of students or whatever they are. There is little push back on that to whether that's too strict and whether or not we the fact should have more flexibility to decide that in some instances.

And we thinking particularly of first-generation students and students that may not have the sophistication coming into the university to truly understand what plagiarism is. To give the faculty more discretion to decide whether or not it's the kind of thing that needs to be reported. So that's going to be discussed at the UFC.

Policies, again, that we need to review because we haven't looked at them in a long time, One is the accommodation for religious observances for students, making no change, that'll be some language updates. It retains the core concept that it is the student's obligation to request the accommodation, and the faculty is under no obligation if they don't know about it.

Honorary degrees, now we get into the couple of things that are going to have amended, be amended one is, the honorary degree policy currently says that honorary degrees are awarded at convocations. That's going to be changed to graduation or other ceremonies in anticipation of handling these things out like candy during the bicentennial.

The second one is the policy says with respect to the role of the President of the university. Merely that the President transmits the dossiers to the Board of Trustees, that seems way out of step with the way we've actually handled honorary degrees for years. So it's going to add that give the President the authority to the extent that we need to include recommendations as to the appropriate ceremony for the award and any other associated considerations.

Third is we're adding a requirement that the committee, the honorary degrees committee, be selected so as to assure diversity among campuses, disciplines, and perspectives. And I expect all of that will pass without any problem. Then another substantive change we're going to propose is an ACAAD, the trustees teaching award.

One is sort of a language one, if the current criterion is must go to the best teachers. Not sure how big that number is but we're changing that to outstanding so it cannot be interpreted as the single best teacher. The policy was an extension from the old teaching TER award, the old teaching excellence recognition award, which was originally drafted as a single award.

And now the trustees teaching award are handed out to 6% of the faculty. The second part, the current policy is written so it applies only in the entity category. Only two lectures and clinical faculty that excludes for example professors of practice. And so that the ideas, partly in anticipation of the university may, as it thinks through how we treat in career paths for NTTs, it could add additional categories.

It could change lecturers to say professors of practice. So that it changes the language of eligibility to all non-tenure track faculty as well as tenure track faculty. And I expect that to go through. Academic calendar, fascinating thing which has generated whole lots of interests. I once served on the campus of university calendar committee and it was the single worse committee I've ever been on because it doesn't matter but the calendar has two meanings I think to people.

One is you got to set the bookings. And back in December of 2013, the trustees by resolution asked the President in consultation with the faculty to create a common calendar for all campuses of the university. The President has done that. There is a calendar now that extends out to 2031 that sets start dates, end dates, what holidays we will celebrate.

You can't have some campuses recognizing Labor Day and others not, and some recognizing Martin Luther King Day and others not. So the basic aspects of the university calendar are now set by at the presidential level. I mean, not personally, delegates. And the existing policy did not distinguish that kind of general authority to set the framework from the requirements of different campuses and units to set their own local calendar for exams, registration dates, deadlines for turning things in, When are you going to have full breaks, things like that.

So this new policy continues that power in the campuses and units. It takes it away from the UFC. In other words, the university faculty council is going out of the calendar business. That's being delegated to the President. And it's turning it down, it's delegating it down to the calendar.

I would point out though that the current policy says that each campus must have a faculty calendar committee. I'm relatively sure that Bloomington does not and probably no other campus does. So this again changes that there must be a faculty calendar committee to the faculty council can decide whether it wants to form a calendar committee or it wants to delegate the calendar task to the administration.

I expect oddly enough, this one to be controversial. All right, now the one truly substantive thing that we are doing proposing is amending our policy on academic freedom. I was surprised to find out that our academic freedom policy did not cover research. It covered teaching and it covered librarianship that was it.

So I think it was an oversight, everybody, I mean, it just it never was, it wasn't controversial. But we want to put that in to make sure that it extends to research and that that includes publication and dissemination of the information. The other thing is that the existing policy is at best ambiguous is to whether, is to how far down the list of academic appointees it applies.

I think the most logical reason at existing policy is that it applies to essentially full time tenure and non-tenure track academic appointees. And this may or may not be controversial, I don't know, seeks to expand it to all academic appointees with teaching, research responsibilities, including visiting, adjunct, acting, and part time faculty that normally find themselves not covered and protected by many university policies.

Two other things that it is adding. One, and again, I don't think this is controversial, number three, because it already exists in the code of academic ethics. Is the right of faculty to have freedom to express their views on matters having to do with the university and its policies, that will go in the same section as public comment on issues of common interest anyway which requires that you can't speak for the university if you're talking about public matters.

And I don't know what will happen to this provision, there was concern that academic freedom could be asserted as a defense to a charge say of research misconduct, under a research misconduct policy. And this has happened that a professor accused of sexual harassment in class for example, could attempt to use academic freedom of instruction as a defense to a charge under the sexual misconduct policy.

And so, number four is intended to say that this policy academic freedom does not override other university policies concerning academic ethics and misconduct. It doesn't say exactly what its relationship is, I think that would have to be worked out by each individual faculty board of review. And let's see, just a one other quick thing to what you can expect us to be working on next year.

One, I discovered today that the university has no policy on diversity, we've got at least three of them on this campus. It was Kip Drew, our Chief Policy Officer, we were in discussion of something else where I made reference. And our committee made reference to the university policies on diversity and, she had to point out that we don't have one, I think that will probably be new at the top of our list.

We are also looking at rethinking the general minimum standards for faculty boards of review and the grievance process. There have been a number of changes in the law in the federal courts as to what kind of due process, and what kinds of things are required at a minimum.

So we are going to be looking at faculty boards of review, we're going to be looking at the process of search and screen for senior university administrators. And more importantly, I think the process of reviewing the university administrators and, of course, school deans. Also in the list is the Sabbatical policy which currently is restricted for faculty only to research related sabbaticals.

For librarians, it is currently extended to include pedagogical purposes, and it does not address NTTs at all. So I think that there's going to be some attention to the sabbatical policy and obviously will continue to go on with the NTT third rank and other proposals related to that.

ROBEL: We have one more action item. So unless anyone has a question, let's keep them short five minutes.

WILLIAMS: Alex, do you see the changes to the academic freedom policy including academic specialists?

TANFORD: Yes, yeah it will include, I would see it is including academic specialist if they fall within the definition of their, that it relates to their teaching or research responsibilities.

As it is, the policy is on academic freedom all say subject to fulfilling the duties for which your other university duties and responsibilities, so, but yes I agree that would, I don't know.

ROBEL: Okay, Anne?

ELSNER: This has to do with ACA-32 item number two, I brought this up with regard to previous things. We have a number of academic appointees who are not faculty.

So, in your first statement you said something about faculty, and then you were listing for academic freedom and you were listing adjuncts and other things. That you have to make up your mind if you want to include all academic appointee.

TANFORD: Yes.

ELSNER: My research associate would be someone who's grant funded, do you want post-doctoral fellows who are trainees, I mean if you do—

TANFORD: No.

ELSNER: That's one thing, but there's this whole realm of people who work on grants, they do not have a long-term contract with the university. And you'd like them to use the principles of academic freedom, but it could be used to argue about firing...

TANFORD: Yeah no, the idea is that is restricted to the academic appointees, this is a summary as defined in the university policy which does not include postdoctoral fellows and graduate students because by definition they're working *for* someone.

ROBEL: Eliza.

PAVALKO: Yeah, I think it's important that it says academic appointees would include many of those other categories. It would include Student Academic Appointees, it would include academic specialists, who currently are not defined as faculty age include temporary academic. So that distinction between faculty and academic appointees is a really important one depending on what the committee wants to cover.

TANFORD: Yeah, we've attempted to define that and I don't know what will happen on the floor of the UFC.

ROBEL: Okay, any other discussion or questions I think we could maybe direct to Alex or come back to this after the next action item, so we can just get through our agenda.

Alex, I think you're, are you the—

TANFORD: I am the next action item as well.

ROBEL: Yep.

AGENDA ITEM THIRTEEN: MOTION TO RESCIND BL-ACA-19 IU BLOOMINGTON PROCEDURES FOR REGULATION OF FINANCIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

TANFORD: Which is the motion to repeal, Bloomington policy ACA I nine, that's not 19 that is an "I," which confused me for a while because I couldn't find it. The Bloomington policy ACA I nine on Bloomington procedures for the regulation of financial conflicts of interest.

This was based on UFC policy ACA 74 which asked each campus to create its own conflict of interest committee, ACA 74 has been repealed by the UFC and replaced by UA 17, which, creates a university level conflict of interest committee, and eliminates the authorization of campuses to have their own separate conflict of interest committees.

The second part of it are existing policy, lets the units set their own disclosure procedures before how you're supposed to tell your dean. UA17 now sets uniform disclosure procedures that apply to all campuses and all units, and are just in policy which defines the responsibilities for IUB faculty which to some extent are in odds with the UA17.

UA17 again, at the university level sets the same rules for all university faculty. So our existing, and there are small things like that refer to the art policy, sends things to the office of sponsored research, which I don't believe exists anymore. So that it's my view that the policy that we have is not salvageable and terms of amendment.

If you want to do anything on this campus with no conflicts of interest that are consistent with the new university-wide UA17 policy that we'd have to start from scratch. So recommending that AC19 be repealed.

ROBEL: Are you moving that it be repealed?

TANFORD: I am moving...I think that this does not actually come from a committee, it comes from sort of an ad hoc group or does it come for the executive committee?

I think it comes from the executive committee so.

ROBEL: Okay, then it doesn't need a motion.

AGENDA ITEM FOURTEEN: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE MOTION TO RESCIND BL-ACA-19 IU BLOOMINGTON PROCEDURES FOR REGULATION OF FINANCIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

ROBEL: Discussion? Anne?

ELSNER: Thank you very much.

I spent quite a lot of time this semester having to do forms for COI. That were unfortunately inconsistent with the State of Indiana laws which are crystal clear and we should be following them.

And the procedures on the campus are not clearly spelled out. So whoever's doing this policy, needs to get with the State of Indiana conflict of interest laws. And do what they say, rather than the procedures we're doing now which make no sense at all and do not give the State of Indiana the information that they're requiring.

ROBEL: All right, any other discussion?

All in favor of this repeal?

Thank you, opposed?

The ayes have it we've got a little time if you had further questions for Alex on the UFC materials.

BENDER: Yeah. I'm probably going to ask the same question you were going to ask about the third rank.

Any word on what's happening with that, what the title is that they're recommending?

TANFORD: The third rank proposal that is going to the UFC next week is proposing, I'm not sure it is gone it is trying to remember whether it's going, it came down to two titles a teaching professor or senior lecturer with distinction.

And I don't actually remember whether that is going to be proposed as an alternative or whether they were actually going to recommend one or the other. I think it will come down to whichever one they recommend somebody will move to amend it to the other.

ROBEL: Elizabeth.

PEAR: So the report from the task force will be made available later this week, I want to say tomorrow when the UFC agenda goes out so I could be able to read their full report.

But they are recommending going with the teaching professor title. But say that they are happy with senior lecturer with distinction as a backup if there's too much disagreement on the teaching professor title. And Eliza was on the task force and can probably explain better.

ROBEL: True.

DUNCAN: For those of you who also serve on the UFC by virtue of your various positions here representing us for Bloomington, just a heads up: I will be delivering to you a petition with several hundred signatures strongly endorsing teaching professor. And why that is an appropriate and dignified title for our position whereas the other one does not suitably represent the future interest of the university and supporting its non-tenure-track faculty.

ROBEL: Any other—?

HERRERA: Last question. So regarding the entity representation in the UFCs, there any conversation because some other campuses, they have had representation for lectures clinical. I wondered about the Bloomington campus representation in the UFC for NTTs or lectures or clinicals or research scientists.

Is there any conversation about all that?

TANFORD: There's certainly conversation, there's no...getting the UFC to do anything is extremely difficult. Because it is scattered across all seven campuses and only meets twice a year. There have been a number of discussions about where to go next in the advancement of sort of the career paths of NTTs and the improvement of the status of NTTs.

And where that has to happen at the university level and where that has to be delegated in the campuses. There are a lot of such discussions going on at the executive committee level. But there's nothing concrete the rest coming out of the gap.

ROBEL: Okay, thanks. All right, great work everyone, good year, a lot accomplished.

And to celebrate on April 30th, at 2:30 when we would otherwise be meeting, we would be partying at the University Faculty Club and I look forward to seeing you all there, thank you. And we adjourn in the usual way.