

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
October 1, 2019
Presidents Hall – Franklin Hall
2:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M.

Members Present: Heather Akou, Karen Allen, Iman Alramadan, Alan Bender, Jonathan Brauer, Daniel Bullock, Barbara Cherry, Joanna Chromik, Paul Coats, Judah Cohen, Rachel Cohen, David Daleke, Kenneth Dau-Schmidt, K. Allen Davis, Lori Dekydtspotter, Constantine Deliyannis, Erika Dowell, Denvil Duncan, J Duncan, Jane Dutton, Ann Elsner, Lynn Gilman, Anthony Giordano, Stacy Giroux, Dennis Groth, Lucia Guerra-Reyes, Nandini Gupta, Diane Henshel, Brandon Howell, Colin Johnson, Kari Johnson, Peter Kloosterman, Shanker Krishnan, Bradley Levinson, Moira Marsh, Jane McLeod, Isabel Mishkin, Meg Meiman, Heather Milam, Sam Obeng, Daniel O'Donnell, Courtney Olcott, Eliza Pavalko, Linda Pisano, Catherine Reck, Lauren Richerme, Lauren Robel, Leslie Rutkowski, Thomas Schoenenmann, Jim Sherman, Patrick Shih, Micol Seigal, Marietta Simpson, Paul Sokol, Geoffrey Sprinkle, Matt Stein, Lisa Thomassen, Aaron Travers, Jonathan Trinidad, John Walkbridge, Christie Walton, Jeffrey Zaleski

Members Absent: Lucas Adams, Roxie Barnes, Denvil Duncan, Frank Diaz, Philip Ford, Lessie Frazier, Linda Gales, Colin Johnson, Jane McLeod,

Guests: Selene Carter (alternate), Cheryl Hughes, Dan Myers (alternate), Nancy Nelson, Christan Royer, John Whelan

Agenda:

1. **Approval of Minutes of September 17, 2019**
2. **Memorial Resolution for John D. Donnell**
3. **Executive Committee Business** (10 minutes)
Diane Henshel, Faculty President
4. **Presiding Officer's Report** (10 minutes)
Lauren Robel, Provost
5. **Question/comment Period**
Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to Provost Robel or President Henshel by emailing bfcoff@indiana.edu.
6. **Proposal to amend the electoral sub-units in the College of Arts and Sciences** (5 minutes)
John Walbridge, Chair of the Nomination Committee

Heather Akou, Chair of the College Policy Committee
[First Reading - Discussion Item]

B5-2020 Proposal to amend the electoral sub-units in the College of Arts and Sciences

7. **Questions/Comments on the proposal to amend the electoral sub-units in the College of Arts and Sciences** (5 minutes)
8. **Resolution regarding a test optional approach to undergraduate admissions** (10 minutes)
J Duncan, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
Meg Meiman, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
David Johnson, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management
Sacha Thieme, Assistant Vice Provost & Executive Director of Admissions
[Action Item]

B6-2020 Resolution regarding a test optional approach to undergraduate admissions

9. **Questions/Comments on the resolution regarding a test optional approach to undergraduate admissions** (20 minutes)
10. **Update from the Benefits Committee** (15 minutes)
Cheryl Hughes, Co-chair of the Benefits Committee
Nancy Nelson, Co-chair of the Benefits Committee
John Whelan, Vice President for Human Resources
Christan Royer, Director of Benefits, Human Resources
[Discussion Item]
11. **Questions/Comments on the update from the Benefits Committee** (35 minutes)

Transcript:

HENSHEL: Hi. Welcome to the October 1st meeting of the Bloomington Faculty Council.

I am going to try not to talk very much. So as soon as Lauren gets back, which will be sometime during the middle of the last discussion, I'm going to turn the mic over to her for any mediation of any discussions.

AGENDA ITEM ONE: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 17, 2019

HENSHEL: So our first point is to approve the minutes of the last meeting on September 17th 2019.

Do I hear—thank you.

Do I hear second?

All right.

Any discussion?

All right.

Go to approve, raise your hand.

Against?

Any abstain.

All right then.

AGENDA ITEM TWO: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR JOHN D. DONNELL

HENSHEL: Next I give it over to [inaudible] for the memorial resolution for John Dow. Thank you.

PAVALKO: John D. Donnell, Professor Emeritus of Business Law, died May 14, 2017 in St. George, Utah, at the age of 96. During his 23 years on the Indiana University faculty, he played key leadership roles in the Department of Business Law. After his retirement, John's love of the outdoors and interest in travel led him to many adventures in the United States and around the world.

John was born in Waterloo, Iowa, on Dec. 2, 1920. He graduated from East High School in Waterloo, having served as president of the student body and editor of the school newspaper. A dedicated participant in the Boy Scouts of America, John earned the rank of Eagle Scout and traveled to the Netherlands to attend the 1937 International Boy Scout Jamboree. In 1942, he married Florence May, who had been his high school classmate and, better yet, his debate partner! They were married for 58 years, until Florence's death in 2000.

After graduating Phi Beta Kappa from Princeton University in 1943, John served as a Purple Heart-winning officer in the Field Artillery during World War II. After the war, he chose to attend law school—certainly a move to be applauded!--at the University of Iowa. His academic achievements there earned him not only the Juris Doctor degree but also membership in the venerable Order of the Coif. Returning to Waterloo, John served in various roles, including in-house counsel, corporate secretary, vice-president of administration, and director, for the Rath Packing Company. He was also active in community service and continued a longstanding interest in the Boy Scouts by serving in leadership roles for the organization.

Despite John's professional success at Rath, the prospect of an academic career was tempting. John became a student again, this time at the Harvard Business School, where he completed a doctorate in 1962. He then joined the faculty of the IU School of Business, now known as the Kelley School of Business.

John quickly became an instrumental member of the Department of Business Law (now known as the Department of Business Law and Ethics). He taught a broad range of courses and led the department as its chair for a significant number of years. John displayed skillful leadership of the department during a critical time of expansion and helped significantly to establish a reputation for excellence on the part of the department—a reputation that continues to this day. The department also benefits considerably from the generous financial support John provided to it during his years in retirement.

While at IU, John became a well-known co-author of two widely used textbooks, wrote numerous articles for law journals and business journals, served as editor-in-chief of the American Business Law Journal, and founded the Journal of Legal Studies Education. Long an active member of the American Business Law Association (now known as the Academy of Legal Studies in Business), John served in various officer roles for the association and a term as its president. His leadership of the association helped to make it the leading professional organization for faculty members who teach business law and ethics.

After his retirement in 1985, John provided many hours of volunteer work as a student advocate at IU. His volunteer activities continued after a move to Utah during the 1990s. There, he served on the boards of the Virgin River Land Preservation Association and Habitat for Humanity for Southwestern Utah. His great love for nature and the outdoors led John to be active for many years in The Nature Conservancy, initially in Indiana and then in Utah.

John's fascination with world travel prompted him to visit all the continents except Antarctica. Sports and other pursuits interested him as well—and he was very good at them. Even after his 85th birthday, he was still skiing. He continued biking and hiking well into his 90s.

As mentioned earlier, John and Florence were married for 58 years until her death in 2000. In 2009, John married Trudy Corwin. She survives him, as do his children Alan, Lin, Brian, and Duane. John's daughter, Cathlin, preceded him in death in 2004.

I request that this resolution be included in the minutes and permanent archive of the Bloomington Faculty Council.

Arlen Langvardt
Professor of Business Law
Graf Family Professor
Kelley School of Business
Indiana University Bloomington

HENSHEL: Thank You. Can we stand please for a moment of respect?

Okay thank you.

AGENDA ITEMS THREE AND FOUR: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS AND PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

HENSHEL: At the moment, I would prefer not to talk too much so I'm not going to give you anything from the executive committee.

At the moment Lauren is not here so we're saving 20 minutes and we'll see where that takes us at the end.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

HENSHEL: All right. Questions and comment period. Does anybody have any questions for the floor?

HERRERA: Yeah. About the UFC. So we have the meeting on November 12th and I wonder the representative followed the Bloomington campus. If we have any NTT representation from the campus or any representation for another campuses NTTs.

PEAR: At the moment we do not have any non-tenure track representatives from the Bloomington campus and there are none on UFC that I am aware of from other campuses.

HENSHEL: All right so let me clarify. There was a purposeful discussion about this in the Executive Committee and actually among the UFC chair presidents as well. Since we are addressing the membership of non-tenure track on the UFC this year and especially trying to do it as early as possible, we decided that it would probably be better if we don't have any NTT for that vote because that would call into question whether or not the NTT person was allowed to vote or not. Because at this point at UFC does not allow voting NTT on the UFC.

So we decided to put it off for a year. We talked with the person on the Executive Committee that was the most likely or two people on the Executive Committee that were the most likely to be the representatives.

In my understanding is they understand why.

HERRERA: Yes a follow-up. So are we having five representatives from our campus or eight representatives? Who are the representative for the meeting?

PEAR: Those should be on the UFC website if they aren't they will be in the next couple of days.

HENSHEL: So let's see if I remember everybody. It's myself, Moira, John, by default—because we're the presidents. Thank you. Judah Cohen, Paul Cook. There's Erika...

HERRERA: I saw the website but they're just five. Yeah fine.

HENSHEL: Okay. Yeah.

PEAR: We're still in the process of updating that website.

HENSHEL: But at any rate the point is that we decided not to put an NTT on UFC this year for the purposes of ensuring that the vote would go through for NTT membership and UFC in the future.

Okay. Since that is a priority for all of us.

Sorry. Other questions or comments about that?

All right.

AGENDA ITEM SIX: PROPOSAL TO AMMEND THE ELECTORAL SUB-UNITS IN THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

HENSHEL: For the next agenda item, a proposal to amend the electoral units of the college. I leave it to John Walbridge, who is the chair of the nominations committee.

WALBRIDGE: Okay. I'm primarily leaving it to Heather [inaudible] who actually knows the issue better than I do. Since she's been dealing with it from the point of view of the college policy committee.

AKOU: Okay. So I'm currently chairing the college policy committee and this issue came up in spring 2018 because although I was not yet serving as a representative, I was here in the capacity of being a liaison for the college policy committee.

So remember there was a discussion about how the college was broken into sub-units, but that the college did not have the authority to decide what the sub-units were. That they were seemingly somewhat random and difficult to understand exactly how those units were formed. Even when you're elected, you're not always sure what's your constituency, people are not sure who their representative is, they're opaque.

I honestly wasn't sure yet whether the CPC was supposed to propose some new sub-units. So we put together a proposal anyway and I forwarded to the Executive Committee, which discussed it, sent it onto Nom Com I believe and they tweaked what we had sent them. So there is a section of the Constitution that says that the College of Arts and Sciences shall be divided into sub-election units. The important thing here is that regardless of what those sub-election units are, everyone who's in the College of Arts and Sciences is allowed to vote for all the sub-election units. So you're not restricted to voting only for your own sub-unit, but for all of the sub-units that are in the college and that remains the same regardless of how they're divided up.

So here's an example of what a current sub-unit looks like. So here's sub-unit B. These are roughly some arts and humanities disciplines. It's not that there's no rhyme or reason at all to any of these, but again, it's a collection of departments with relatively small faculty.

The idea was to try to get a ratio of 1 to 50. These units have shifted around over the years, depending on how faculty counts and lineup the different sub-units.

But what the CPC proposed is that we realign the college sub-units for the BFC to be analogous to the CPC sub-units. So what the CPC has for representatives is there are two representatives for each of the core divisions.

Natural mathematical sciences, arts, and humanities, and social and historical sciences. Then there are three at-large representatives, which don't have to be from the three internal schools but generally that's the idea: is that those at-large will be mostly, if not all, from the internal schools.

So what Nom Com decided for the BFC is that we should also have units that are the core divisions of the college with four representatives each just like the CPC.

But then the internal schools should each get one HLS, Eskenazi school and the media school. Then there would be two at-large seats leftover, which could be filled by anyone in the entire college.

That has been a practice for quite some time, so I think that's fine to continue.

I'd say since this is very much in line with what the CPC proposed, we're fine with it.

We didn't break it down into one seat for each of the internal schools, but I think that's really a fine arrangement. So I think this is really fine from our perspective and I hope that this will really allow greater ease of understanding constituencies and who the representative is.

HENSHEL: John, do you have anything to say also?

WALBRIDGE: Nothing very important, but the first time I was on the faculty council, representing one of the college seats, I had no idea what departments I was representing.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE ELECTORAL SUB-UNITS IN THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

HENSHEL: Okay. Comments or questions? Alan?

BENDER: Yes, I'm trying to think through how the at-large work. So I'm just wondering about sort of double counting in some ways. The idea is that each of these sub-units, every 50 faculty members within a sub-unit would get one vote. Is that right? Or we're using the one to 50 rule here? But then, if that's so, how did the at-large figure into that because they're already taken into account by being a member of one of the sub-units.

AKOU: Well, the at-large seats already currently exist.

BENDER: That got passed down in the last constitutional revision.

AKOU: Not the college sub-units.

BENDER: Yes, it did. The one [inaudible]

AKOU: Well, okay. So if it doesn't exist this year, it has in the very recent past.

HENSHEL: Alan, the at-large was specifically requested by Patrick. In order for there to be one for Hamilton Lugar, one for SOAD, one for Media School, and the rest to be divided evenly, that left two for at-large. That's how the numbers got worked out. It's the exact same number of they were before. It's just divided differently.

BENDER: Do you have a sense of how many faculty members are in each of these sub-units?

HENSHEL: I don't.

AKOU: It is roughly 50 to one still, and I can say too that the three core divisions in terms of tenure track faculty are roughly equal in size. So it's really quite an equitable distribution.

HENSHEL: Yes, Barb.

CHERRY: Just following up on a couple of questions. I heard somebody ask the same questions, but I have a couple more.

First of all, when I was looking at the current sub-units that we have and then the Pros proposed one. Wasn't altogether clear to me where the mapping went. The categories that you have I could see the potential for some dispute over a few of the departments. Do they show up in the social-historical? Do they show up in the humanities? There were maybe some departments where it's not clear to me anyway, exactly where they line up.

So if you describe them in this way, what happens also over time, or when some new departments are formed and things like that. Is it clear where they fall?

So, for example, the only mapping that's totally clear is the ones that are the individual ones that you preserve, but it's not clear to me exactly, particularly in some of the departments. So the later ones like F and G are clear, but some of the other ones are not clear to me where all the departments currently fall, how they would line up in this one.

Then second of all, given that, again, the question about what's the proportion of faculty if you're going to have four each? Again, it gets to the issue of what is the ratio essentially of who's being represented for what because is it really the case that these four main categories are close enough to being equal that four reps each make sense. So it just seems to me that there's information lacking in order to make a more reasoned assessment about how good this is or not.

That's at least how I see it.

Thank you.

AKOU: Sure, certainly there are some cases where there's a bit of overlap. For example, before my own department merged into the Eskenazi School, we were in a social and historical and that made sense for some faculty in the unit and it did not make sense for others and we are very much in an art focused school now.

I don't see where the current divisions are really any better than what we're proposing. There's always going to be some gray areas regardless of how you split things up and I think the advantage here is that at least everyone knows what core division or internal school they belong to and, while, that's not a perfect system, it is understandable and pretty transparent.

CHERRY: Well, my response to that is I'm not saying that the current division of where they stand is necessarily the best one but there sure is clarity. You know which department you were in, so you know which sub-unit you're in.

What you're proposing here, you're already admitting that there's certain departments that might not necessarily clearly fit in one of the four or the other. So who's going to make the determination which one they fit into and what gaming could be involved in figuring out which category they fall into?

I'm worried about that.

AKOU: All departments already belong to a current division. They are already specified.

CHERRY: Could you be able to provide a one-to-one mapping of the existing sub-units and tell us for every department that's in an existing sub-unit now exactly which of those four does it go into and that would help inform us so we know what we're looking at.

DOWELL: Yes I think—

CHERRY: Because I can't tell—

DOWELL: I think we can do—

CHERRY: Continuously where they all line up.

DOWELL: I think we can do this. I think this is just a factor of the college. They know what unit they're in. We can provide that to the rest of the council.

I don't think really there is any gray area here because everyone inside the college knows which core division they belong to or which school they belong to.

We can provide that for the whole council.

CHERRY: I just think that's additional information to help us assess.

That's what I'm trying to say, to put clarity—

DOWELL: I don't think there's really any gray area that exists. It's just that it's not expressed herein the slide or in the proposal. We can do that—we could also provide the counts of faculty here in each of those core divisions and in the schools so that you can get a sense of how to—

CHERRY: If you go back enough in history and some people are longer timers than me here, but even before a Media School when there was a telecom department. Before I came here, apparently there was a split within the telecom department itself where you had social scientists and then you had some that viewed themselves as more humanities oriented and actually led to as I understand the creation of communication and culture, but while the telecom department was constituted the way it was before it was split.

It wouldn't have fit neatly into one of these four. That's what I'm trying to point out is that we need to take care. I'm not opposed to reassessment. I'm just saying let's make sure we've thought out how it would work and we make sure we don't have some ambiguities or things but I'm just saying I know from history that there have been some departments that didn't neatly fall into one of these four and that's my concern.

HENSHEL: Noted. Dennis?

GROTH: I'm just going to acknowledge I'm not a voting expert, but because my question has to do or at least poses the possibility that the representative from one of the divisions or from one of the schools might actually have zero support from anybody in their division or school because of the voting policy—is that correct?

AKOU: Could you explain what you mean by that?

GROTH: Because people are able to vote for anybody within the college, it's possible that say all the faculty in Arts and Humanities have zero votes for anybody of any of their slate in the pool and put all of their votes on Natural and Mathematical Sciences.

I'm only raising the question of how representative it may not be in practice.

HENSHEL: Okay—

WALBRIDGE: It's same now—

GROTH: It might not be representative today.

WALBRIDGE: I'm in HLS and I could vote for any of the college seats and they can vote or they could vote for me until I submit my present eminence but it's probably a more serious question to ask, is how many people actually do vote.

AKOU: Another thing I want to add to that too is, you're talking about let's say could arts and humanities being over-represented in this scheme? Well, not really because the maximum that they could have is four. So even though people anywhere in the college can vote for any sub unit, they can only have just so many representatives and they have a certain number of representatives and no more.

That's going to help to ensure spread across the college.

Also, I'll point out too that there are currently seats that are unfilled. So if people are worrying about being under or over-represented then we just need to get more people to actually run and fill those seats.

GROTH: I couldn't agree with you more on that. There are not enough people voting. There are not enough people running. There's not enough people that are engaged in the faculty council.

Overall, I'm just pointing out that the voting would allow, while we talk about it's true, that it's the same situation today, I'm just pointing out that actually you're from that area but you may not actually represent that area because your faculty colleagues haven't supported you. Just a comment.

AKOU: You're talking about, for example, my department is no longer in the core division. So let's say, I used to be an MID. Let's say, I was on the BFC from MID but I'm a rogue member of the department. I'm just voting in ways that maybe even against the interests of my department—like there's nothing to stop that from happening currently nor will there be really under the new division of subunits.

THOMASSEN: So just to clarify, if I may—What we're talking about is really just aggregating up with these subunits that exist already. So it would be like A, B, and C now become Arts and Humanities.

So we're already taking the groups the subunits that we have, we're aggregating up and now with this new division, it still maintains equality amongst say, each of these core divisions have the same numbers. Is that correct?

Maybe people would be comfortable seeing how our A, B, Cs and Ds and Es and Fs and Gs and so forth translate into these Arts and Humanities, Natural Mathematical Sciences, Social, Historical even though I think we all pretty much have a sense of how this is going to break down because we already have our subunits but unless they're different in some way and it's not just binning these together.

MARSH: Right, we are proposing to go from 10 units to I think five...six. Part of the issue we've had lately, not just last year but even in previous years, we've sliced and diced the college so thinly and we were slicing and dicing and relatively low turnout in all the elections, we are

winding up with situations where there are a number of these existing units that don't have representatives because nobody voted or we couldn't find anyone who agreed to run.

Splitting into the schools within the school which already exists and already have their own seats, and the three core schools—that is the way that the college policy committee organizes itself. You have representatives from each of three course on the policy committee. I tend to think that the college knows best how it should organize itself and how it knows itself best.

Our mandate here is the Nominations Committee is supposed to come to an agreement with the college policy committee on how the sub-units are to be arranged and that's what they have done. So this is coming to us just for ratification.

I, honestly, think that this is likely, if anything is going to improve the outcome on elections going forward is going to be something like this.

HENSHEL: Anybody else? Linda.

PISANO: I just have a clarification with the core divisions. How often does each of the four divisions need to be assessed in terms of the number of faculty being represented? I don't know how often the faculty in those core divisions fluctuates.

For example, if Arts and Humanities somehow got a lot of hires, then is it possible that the number of representatives needs to change? I'm simply wondering how often this is visited in terms of the number in the core divisions.

WALBRIDGE: Would basically I think be a matter of settling-up between the policy committee and the nominations committee.

At this point, Heather, help me.

PEAR: Actually according to the bylaws, the election supervisor worked with the vice provost for faculty and academic affairs on the voting lists. So we certify the number of representatives to the BFC every year.

HENSHEL: Yes, Israel.

HERRERA: Just clarification. I heard that, when you say everyone, could both for everyone that is then your track tenure because we have the lectures, our own also election. Right?

HENSHEL: Yeah. Thanks for the clarification.

HERRERA: Okay and also for the communication and I think that should be important to highlight. So for a representative from the college, the communication should be with the constituents in the same appointment.

So they won't send messages to the lecturers because we have our own lectures and everything. Is that correct?

So they are not representing—when they are representing Arts and Humanities, it means that they are sending messages reporting about what happens here in BMC just for their constituents not to lectures in arts and humanities.

AKOU: It's true. Technically the current sub units for the college or if we reconfigure them, these are subunits for tenure-track faculty because NTT faculty are elected in a separate process.

HENSHEL: Any other questions at this time? We're going to readdress this next time.

Oh, Alan?

BENDER: Getting back to the at-large, I like this proposal. I'm just wondering whether it fits with the current bylaws, what the rules are about all these.

So in the past, we all know the number of campus wide at-large seats got reduced from 10 to five, but at the same time in the Constitution, there was a provision for there being one at-large member from the college and that got rid of.

But the bylaws deal instead with this one to 50 business like for every unit of sub-unit for every faculty 50 faculty members, you get a representative. So I guess what I'd like to ask is the way this works for figuring out the total number of seats in the college that you just add up all the faculty members in the college and divide that by 50, then that gives you about 17, so we need to have 17 total seats in the college and this is a proposal for how to split up those 17, is that the way it works?

I'm just wondering how we get the numbers.

HENSHEL: Alan, yes. But we will have numbers next time. So why don't we wait for the numbers for each of the units and how they add up to the subdivisions for next time.

BENDER: Yeah, that sounds great. Thank you.

HENSHEL: I would like to move on at this point.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT: RESOLUTION REGARDING A TEST OPTIONAL APPROACH TO UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

HENSHEL: We have an issue coming to us from the EPC again. So this is the resolution for the test optional approach to undergraduate admissions.

Turning this back over to Jay Duncan and Meg Meiman for this discussion.

J. DUNCAN: So I want to start out by providing just a little bit of context of what we're doing here. We discussed this last time and so everybody remembers. We're not in a position where currently Bloomington can vote about policy here, we're still waiting for the UFC to act. So they're going to do that soon as one of the issues on their docket for this semester.

But in the meantime, what we have for you today is a resolution. What we would like to do is send a signal that we as a faculty have discussed this and that we feel it should move forward for discussion at the UFC level.

So that's really what this resolution is about, and Meg's going to read it for you.

MEIMAN: Whereas IU Bloomington strives to provide greater and more immediate access to students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds, retain the IU Bloomington's position as a leader and academic excellence and research and enable the campus to mitigate enrollment risks connected to upcoming demographic shifts.

Whereas for many students, the combination of a high school GPA and a standardized test score can be predictive of college success, numerous reports suggests that for some students specifically from low and moderate income families and students who are first-generation, a standardized test score may not fully represent their academic strengths, and whereas studies show that the adoption of a well-executed test optional admission policy can lead to an increase in overall applications as well as an increase in the representation of underrepresented minority students in the applicant pool and the freshman class.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Bloomington Faculty Council endorses the adoption of the test optional approach to undergraduate admissions proposed by the educational policies committee, and encourages the university faculty council to amend policy ACA-54, establishing campus undergraduate admission policies accordingly.

HENSHEL: Questions or comments? Barb?

AGENDA ITEM NINE: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE RESOLUTION REGARDING A TEST OPTIONAL APPROACH TO UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

CHERRY: Overall, I like this whole resolution approach. I just want to ask for clarification. When you make reference to endorse the adaptation of the test absolute approach proposed by the Educational Policies Committee, my recollection from the last BFC meeting was that there was a PowerPoint presentation from this committee, and things in there included like recommending that the IU create a separate path for admissions and so on and so forth.

It doesn't set forth a specific test optional approach, it recommends that there be one. I'm a little concerned about the language in here because the way this language reads, it looks like it's actually incorporating by reference a very specific recommendation for a test optional approach that came from that committee, which I don't believe happened.

We're really more supporting the idea that this committee came out with recognition that there'll be a test actual approach. So I'm just a little concerned with the language, that's all I'm saying about cleaning that up. So that's just the point I'm going to make.

DOWELL: Barb, would it fix it to just replace proposed with discussed?

J. DUNCAN: That would certainly be fine with us.

CHERRY: I would say of a test optional approach as recommended because they didn't specify specific one yet. We're trying to put out there the whole notion that we want to support adoption of a test optional approach regimen as recommended by the Education Policies Committee.

I think that would be cleaner and more accurate as to what we're actually doing. That's just my suggestion.

J. DUNCAN: I find that a very good suggestion. I will defer to Barb's judgment given her expertise here. I think that absolutely clarifies things out—

CHERRY: Just cleaning that up. That's all—

J. DUNCAN: Thank you.

DAU-SCHMIDT: The resolution twice in its rationale refers to students of lower socioeconomic background, and then when it gets to the motivation, it refers to minority students. I don't necessarily think that's wrong or that it's incorrect since the lower socioeconomic will be disproportionately minority students, but I just wondered why that change?

I would think we would just say that lower socioeconomic students sometimes are inadequately represented by a standardized test scores. They are better represented by this therefore, this will increase—it's not just lower socioeconomic minority students are going to benefit from this, it's lower socioeconomic students in general, and I just wondered if the last motivation shouldn't be made consistent with the prior two statements.

D. JOHNSON: I'm happy to speak to that and Sasha can as well. The first part is about low and moderate income students whether they are underrepresented minorities, urban or suburban, or rural students and first-generation, and so that is the intent.

That first part as you mentioned, maybe it's not explicit here but I think we talk about the research. Studies show increase in overall applications as well as increase in the representation of underrepresented minorities. So it's citing research and that's why it's mentioned there.

There could be other studies that would just be focused on low and moderate income students, but we called out the research from the large 28 institutions over nearly a million students' records.

That's the study we've decided.

DAU-SCHMIDT: On the page that you're on—I would think you would say increase in the representation of underrepresented students of lower socioeconomic standing and first-generation families or something like that.

D. JOHNSON: That seems very reasonable to me and if the committee wants to amend, that's fine.

HENSHEL: Geoff is next.

SPRINKLE: So I support the resolution. I just had a quick question with regard to is it optional? So certainly, it's optional with regard to taking the test. Let's say you take the test, is it also optional with regard to reporting your score?

J. DUNCAN: Yeah. If a student chooses the test optional path, they're not submitting test scores whether they took them or not.

HENSHEL: Other questions or comment?

BULLOCK: But students—just checking to confirm that there's no policy at the university level and therefore, the ability to make that determination is delegated to the college or the department itself?

HENSHEL: David?

DALEKE: Yes, that's correct. So the university graduate school does not require the graduate record examination for admission. That decision is up to each individual program.

BULLOCK: Not the college?

DALEKE: Not the college, although the programmer school, a school could adopt a policy that affects all programs. I could imagine it's possible.

HENSHEL: So David, correct me if I'm wrong. That means that this would also be the case now for the directed MIT programs?

D. JOHNSON: That would be up to each individual school.

HENSHEL: Ken.

DAU-SCHMIDT: I guess I will move that we amend the resolution in a way I outlined. They can give the exact language, but basically it would say, on the page that we're looking at right now, increase in the representation of underrepresented students from first-generation and lower socioeconomic status in the applicant pool in the freshman class.

HENSHEL: Okay. First, let's get a second, and then let's have discussion.

The second.

Marietta, you've got a comment?

SIMPSON: I do have a comment. I'm all for this resolution, but when we initially had the discussion, this policy was introduced with the expectation of increasing the pool of overall applicants, of not only underrepresented and minority students, but it also included the TOEFL exam with the expectation of increasing possibilities of international students.

In the language of this, unless I missed something, I don't see that, so is it specifically not in here for a reason?

D. JOHNSON: Yeah. The TOEFL is still required and is not part of this. International students would be test optional merited for SAT and ACT just like domestic students, but we still require the TOEFL for international students.

DOWELL: Let's see. I don't support Ken's amendment. I feel it's intentional that we called out in two different paragraphs. One, referring to specifically low moderate income students in first-generation, and that we're specifically talking about research about underrepresented minority students in the second paragraph, and I suggest that we do not amend.

HENSHEL: Other comments?

HERRERA: Yes, I would like to ask in about the reason why we shouldn't have underrepresented minority students? Maybe you mentioned before.

DAU-SCHIMDT: Why am I making the motion? Just for logical consistency, and also, I actually think it gives you broader political support.

I do think minority students would benefit from this, and I don't think there's anything wrong with that, but I think that the action of the program and the rationale behind it.

I did ask the question, is it going to benefit kids from lower socioeconomic status in general? I believe the answer was yes, so I don't understand why we wouldn't broaden this last sentence.

HENSHEL: Erika, you're doing a respond?

DOWELL: You have an introductory paragraph, you have a paragraph that talks about the potential impact on students from low and moderate income families and students from first-generation, then you have a paragraph that talks about the impact on students from underrepresented minority.

Then we have a paragraph that says we resolve to take this approach, and I don't think that there's any internal inconsistency. It's simply introduction, reason 1, reason 2, and then the recommendation.

J. DUNCAN: With the language, we're referring to our specific studies about specific groups of students, and that's why it was presented in exactly this format. Whether it has benefits outside of those groups, that's a different discussion, and personally, I believe that this could benefit any type of student, but this language is specific for that reason.

HENSHEL: All right. My understanding is before we vote on the resolution, we still have to settle on the language of the resolution. There are two recommendations that, I guess, we probably want to vote on.

The first one that I understand is that the D turns to man A in the bottom part of the resolution. So far, that hasn't been controversial, so let's get that out of the way.

Can you move to the part where we're talking about?

What we're talking about is in the second line, "Therefore be it resolved that the Bloomington Faculty Council endorses the adoption of a test, optional approach to undergraduate admissions and is proposed staying the same."

MARSH: Point of order?

HENSHEL: Yeah.

MARSH: I think we could say that Barb made that motion, moved that amendment, but it hasn't been seconded. So if it needs a second, I second it.

HENSHEL: Okay. For this piece?

MARSH: Yeah.

HENSHEL: Thank you.

CHERRY: I had suggested the A instead of the "and recommended" as opposed to propose because the initial proposal is specific one, but it's a recommendation, just what I thought we were endorsing.

So it's just those two-word changes.

J. DUNCAN: We support both of those changes.

HENSHEL: That's fine. I still would like to vote and get it settled. Okay, the vote right now is for changing the "the" in the second line to an "a" and proposed to "recommended" in the fourth line.

Ready? All in favor, raise your hand.

All opposed, and any abstained.

Okay, that first one's done.

Now, the second one is a recommendation. Can you move back to where Ken made the recommendation to change this line and or the words on this page at any rate?

So Ken should recommend it, and we're voting on representation of underrepresented minority students to, correct me if I'm wrong, Ken, underrepresented minority students, lower socioeconomic students, and first-generation students min the applicant pool.

DAU-SCHMIDT: I don't want to strike minority because I don't want minorities included in this. All I'm saying is that this will benefit a broader set of underrepresented students, and I don't know why the last sentence wouldn't reflect that, and I don't really care—I mean, we can leave it the way it is, but I suppose the easy way is just it'll increase the representation of underrepresented students.

I would have said, if you want to talk about socioeconomic, increase the representation of under-represented students from lower socioeconomic standing or first generation families or something like that.

HENSHEL: Okay. Jay?

J. DUNCAN: While I appreciate Ken's point and I personally feel that there may be broader benefits here, this is citing specific language from a specific study and odds, such it may not be desirable to make it overbroad past there.

So at the moment, I don't support that amendment.

HENSHEL: Okay. My understanding, what we're voting on from Ken's nomination, is an increase in the representation of just minority students. You want to just do it that way?

I'm trying to figure out where you want to go with this Ken.

DAU-SCHIMDT: In the representation of underrepresented students in the applicant tool.

HENSHEL: Barb.

CHERRY: Verification. Jay, in your opinion, as long as that sentence says "studies," to add the language such has been proposed, does that render the paragraph inaccurate?

I'm just asking. It sounds like, what you were saying, that you had certain studies in mind, and that's why it's written this way. So if that's the case, then we shouldn't add language that makes it inaccurate.

That's my concern. This is specifically referring to study, so it seems we better react in what we claim it's doing.

HENSHEL: I'm just waiting for conferring to stop.

MEIMAN: Thank you for your patience.

I think that in this particular instance, I think given the reasons that both David and Sasha have cited and what we have discussed at least with the EPC, I feel firmly at least that we retain minority students because that refers to the previous studies within this resolution, it is most consistent, I think, throughout the course of this resolution.

As we've discussed before, I think that the impact of this particular resolution and hopefully policy when it's passed, I think, will have a wider impact. But I think for the moment, it's important to focus on this for the purpose of being both consistent and then to follow up with a lot of the studies that both David and Sasha have endeavored and drawn on.

CHERRY: So given that, what I would like to know is why isn't the second paragraph which does refer to the low and moderate incomes needs of the gross? Why isn't that sufficient to address your concern? Why do we need to amend a paragraph to add something that might be inconsistent with its premise based on studies?

We've got to be accurate in what we say.

DAU-SCHIMDT: I think it makes it more accurate. Myself, as I read it, I mean, maybe I should read it through again but if we're talking about.

CHERRY: They are claiming because it's profits on studies that in fact to add the link you're proposing is not accurate. So that's the concern that I have.

HENSHEL: Okay, so let's just vote. So the proposal right now, can we move back to the place that we're talking about changing?

There. It's just to strike minority students in the second to last line here.

Yeah. Okay. So that's all we're voting on, is whether or not we're going to strike minority from the second to last line.

So it will read, where a study showed that the adoption, so remember it's studies, show that the adoption of a well-executed test optional admissions policy can lead to an increase in overall applications as well as an increase in the representation of underrepresented students in the applicant pool and the freshman class.

That's what we're voting on whether or not to change the language to the strike minority.

Okay. All in favor of the resolute.

Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

DELIYANNIS: If the Committee says that this would not be a true statement, I don't see that voting on it can make it true.

MARSH: Point of order. We have called to question, we have to vote.

HENSHEL: All right. So I'm going back to the vote. All in favor of the change by striking minority?

All opposed?

Sorry, all abstained?

That did not pass.

All right. So we are now at the resolution, do we want to pass this resolution?

Any last discussions before we vote on the resolution?

J. COHEN: Two quick friendly questions. The first one. Jay and Meg, when you first introduced this, you mentioned that a standardized test could also be an undue financial burden upon those in lower income and under-represented groups, and we want to know if that's something that would be worth including in the second paragraph of the resolution.

The second question is more of, how do I say it, a stylistic one which is to say that whereas usually leads to in legalistic language in fact, and here, we should probably either do whereas-although in an elegant approach, which is to say that the fact itself really is more numerous reports, or to strike the phrase beginning with for many students and ending with predictive of college success.

MEIMAN: Thank you for your friendly suggestions and for using the word friendly. That was a lovely preface. Made my blood pressure drop a little bit.

Yes, I think that I appreciate the stylistic changes.

Regarding your first suggested change, when you were talking about in the second paragraph which is displayed here about the reference to high GPO, that the burden of these tests actually suggests that for some students, standardized test score may not fully, I think, represent their strengths.

Were you saying here that it might be good to reprise the language about the financial burden?

J. COHEN: Yes. In other words, for example again, inelegantly, it may not fully represent their academic strengths and represent an undue financial burden.

MEIMAN: That's fine with us. Yes. Thank you.

HENSHEL: I'm not seeing any more comments at the moment. Am I crazy?

Okay, so is that for a vote Judah?

J. COHEN: I do propose those changes.

HENSHEL: Okay. Can we do those one at a time please?

Okay. So let's do the first one.

The first one that you recommended is in the second to last line here right before the end. It may not fully represent their academic strengths and present an undue financial burden...

Is there a second for that?

Okay. Any comments about that before we vote? Yes, Lisa.

THOMASSEN: Sorry to keep us going on this one, I apologize. But I think it's important to note that it's not just that it's a financial burden. So I think adding that obfuscates what's really going on here.

I mean, there's available to support people who are lower income to take the test. It's actually the opportunity to retake the test, and retake the test, and be tutor to the test, and so forth. That really is the thing that's keeping people out. I think if we just focus on like it's a financial burden to take the test, we're really minimizing what's going on here, and why we really want to move to a test optional and more holistic portfolio review.

HENSHEL: Okay. Any other comments?

K. JOHNSON: Could we just say something about removing barriers to entry? Because it summarizes I think Lisa's point as well.

J. DUNCAN: That would certainly be fine with me because that is the broader issue is barriers to entry. Even for the students who may qualify for waivers, if they're never informed that they're qualified for waivers, then that's not very helpful to them. It's still a barrier.

J. COHEN: I'm happy to withdraw previous recommendation and to take on the current one.

DOWELL: Where would that be located in the current proposal?

J. COHEN: The way it looks here, a standardized test score may not fully represent academic strengths and present barriers for entry. If that's weighted way to look at it.

HENSHEL: Okay. Is that acceptable?

J. DUNCAN: Quick question, should we say, “and may present barriers of entry just to be accurate?”

J. COHEN: Yeah, sounds great.

HENSHEL: All right. So I'm going to go back before we have this particular vote. What we're voting on my understanding is standardized test score may not fully represent their academic strengths and may present barriers to entry.

Yes, okay. A second for that just to check it, got it.

Any additional comments on this particular vote?

CHERRY: Just the thing you have a plural, score should be a barrier to entry, not barriers. I'm just saying get the plural when what's referring to is sample singular.

HENSHEL: We have to make number consistent.

CHERRY: That's what I'm saying.

DOWELL: This is why wordsmithing in the big group is hard because I don't think a test score presents a barrier to entry. It's the whole system of testing that sets the barrier to entry a score.

I mean, a score does present a barrier to entry, but that's a different barrier.

CHERRY: Well, it actually refers to the combination. I correct myself since the students, the combination of a high school GPA student may present a barrier to entry. So that's still is a combination still singular though.

It's saying the combination creates a barrier, not the test score itself.

I misread it myself.

HENSHEL: I'm going to propose something else. I'm going to propose we come back to this one more time and I'm really sorry guys. But it is already 3:30 and we really need an hour for the next discussion.

We have done in John and Christan here and I think there's just a little bit of wordsmithing.

J. DUNCAN: We do have some—I think we need—

HENSHEL: Yeah, David, we're not going to do it otherwise.

MARSH: Point of order again. So this is on the agenda as an action item. If we're going to postpone it, I think we have to make our motion to postpone to another meeting.

HENSHEL: Yes.

MARSH: With regard to that suggestion, I just want to point out this is not a policy, this is only a resolution which is telling the UFC do this and the UFC can argue about that. Really get into the wordsmithing and then the final really start, but we don't necessarily have to get it absolutely perfect just for the resolution, but it is important.

There is a time factor to this.

If we want this to take effect soon, and I'm getting the sense that no one is against the general thrust of doing this, the UFC needs to act this semester and there's only one meeting for UFC this semester.

So if we postpone it, we run the risk of missing the boat entirely.

HENSHEL: So I would like to propose a vote on the following. I propose that we vote on the gist of the resolution with wordsmithing to be done by, don't look at me like that, like EPC by EPC just taking into account the concerns of the faculty council.

DOWELL: I suggest we just vote on it as presented and then we know what we're voting on. We know it's not perfect, but it's not a policy. It's just a sense of the council.

MEIMAN: I agree.

HERRERA: So since this is going to mean UFC that we'll need for the November 12th meeting, is the proposal for the item on the agenda? So I propose to vote today because we have just one meeting UFC this semester.

HENSHEL: Okay. So at this point, we've had one slight change. I will point out that, Judah, you are on the UFC, you can make changes there. So therefore, could I recommend that we go ahead and vote now so we can go and turn to retirement, which I think is an important point for discussion today?

All right. So we are accepting it as is with the modifications that have already been voted on only, and we are leaving it to UFC.

If you've got recommendations for UFC changes, please just write to us and we'll take it to the UFC for you.

Okay. So vote on how it is now with the slight changes from before already voted on. Got it?
All in favor?

All opposed? One opposed.

Abstain? None.

Thank you very much and thank you for your patience, Sasha and David too.

AGENDA ITEM TEN: UPDATE FROM THE BENEFITS COMMITTEE

HENSHEL: All right. I now would like to welcome to the floor as it were, the benefits committee, Cheryl and Christan, and John.

WHELAN: Great. Good afternoon everybody. I'm John Wheeler and I'm here with Kristen Royer. I'm the Vice President for Human Resources and Kristen is the Director of Benefits for the university and we are here to answer any questions, to share information, to provide whatever we can to you about the retirement plan changes that were announced on Thursday.

I have seen since Thursday a variety of emails that have circulated and while by and large, the reaction has been very positive. We have over 30,000 participants in our plans.

So I was certainly not expecting us to not have any concerns. As I said last year about this exact time last year, we fully know that any changes, even if they are for the better, holistically changes change and particularly change related to people's retirement plans is emotional.

I said that last year and I still believe that and we don't take that lightly. That being said, we made changes and we went through a process to make the most positive impact we can for our participants, which are our faculty staff and retirees.

So we have put together a presentation to address what I think the questions are based on the circulation of email, but let me just say we're not bound by this at all. If you find that we should go in a different direction, we're here for you. So I don't have any particular agenda that I want.

So let me just invite anybody to stop us at any time and ask any question you have and we're certainly happy to change direction.

So this is what I think some of the themes I have heard about through some of the e-mail exchanges from people who are concerned about this change, I should say. There's been a lot of other discussions about things that people feel very positive, but these were the concerns that were raised.

One is about the authority to make this decision. Another is about the decision process itself. Then another is why this decision, the actual determination.

AGENDA ITEM ELEVEN: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE UPDATE FROM THE BENEFITS COMMITTEE

WHELAN: So maybe I'll pause to see if that is an appropriate line of discussion you'd like me to take. As I said, I'm happy to go in any other direction you would like, but I want to make sure that I'm addressing your concerns and I don't want to go down a rabbit hole.

Okay, no objection. I'll proceed.

HENSHEL: No, there's—.

WHELAN: I'm sorry. Yes?

KRISHNAN: Just a clarification before we get started. What...know that decision that's been made

Can you hear me?

WHELAN: Yes, now I can.

KRISHNAN: All right. I just want to understand the context for the decision what got this started and what is the reason for, I'm not asking what the decision itself but more of the entry point for what got this started.

WHELAN: That's a great question. If it's okay with you, I actually think going through some of these slides might get to that question, but I can answer directly but I think I will get to that if that's okay. Then maybe if I don't get to that, please remind me and I can answer it more specifically, but I think this will get to that.

Is that okay?

Yes.

GUERRA-REYES: Maybe you are going to get to this, but I also would like to know if the Benefits of Department is going to do more outreach because that one email was terse and a lot of people don't really know what's going to happen now.

So that would be very helpful.

WHELAN: Okay, great. I'll make a note to touch on that. The short answer is yes, but we can talk about that that we do plan a lot of communication for that.

MARSH: One other question I know that has come up is that, is the decision that's been announced already is that a done deal or not?

WHELAN: Yes, this is a final decision. This is a contract that we have signed on behalf of the University. So this is a final decision.

So there needs to be a little bit of context on this. In the area of retirement benefits, there are specific legal requirements at the federal level, ERISA, the Employee Retirement Income Securities Act, which were not bound by, but that's based on common law from the states over the years which we are bound by.

So essentially, the same terms of residue apply to us in one form or another. It creates a very specific set of fiduciary responsibilities that does not exist in other benefits decision.

Let me start by saying, this is a unique set of responsibilities that apply to decisions related to retirement. The Board of Trustees of the university have a fiduciary responsibility by law, to ensure that our retirement plan and the investment options are providing the greatest benefit possible to our participants. The university's benefit, savings for the university etc, are irrelevant. It's exclusively a legal responsibility to protect participants in retirement plans.

Our Board of Trustees has that responsibility. That responsibility is a legal personal responsibility. Meaning, neglecting this could mean personal liability for individuals. Our Board of Trustees has delegated that, as is common in many universities, to my position.

By extension, has allowed me to create a fiduciary committee of people who also bear that responsibility. Everybody on that committee has a personal legal fiduciary responsibility on behalf of the individual.

So that is how we got to the point of this committee making this decision.

You may ask, some people have, "Who is this Retirement Plan Investment Committee?" I am the ex officio chair by virtue of my position. You can see we have several faculty members on this committee, Srini Koma is in the back.

Thank you for joining us, Srini.

Jane Williams is the faculty member IUPUI. Don Energi who is on sabbatical right now. I believe even out of the country. Then our CFO, John Sejdinaj our treasure, Don Lukas, a representative from General Council, and we invited Jim Sherman who's not a member of this fiduciary committee. We invited him to be a part of all of the deliberations in this process, and in doing so, he has been included in all the meetings, but only an advisory role. He is not a voting member. But Jim has been involved all the way along, and has been able to inform on behalf of faculty and retirees, since Jim is a retiree.

So this is the committee that was set up.

Every person on this committee bears personal responsibility, legally and ethically to make decisions in the best interest of faculty, and staff, and retirees.

So, what are those responsibilities require us to do?

We have a responsibility under the law to evaluate and select service providers. Our responsibility to evaluate, select, and monitor the different investment options that exist for participants to select and to place their money, and as I said, every member on this committee has actually signed in writing that they accept the personal legal fiduciary responsibility here, and can be held personally liable.

You may have seen over the last couple of years, this law has really gotten a lot of visibility. A number of prominent universities have in fact been sued in class action lawsuits, for specifically not taking action to review the investment lineup, and to look at considering changes in the vendor in order to save fees, and also to provide a better experience with more services.

Not taking the action we took to review this, would in fact be probably negligent under our responsibilities under law. So we now have a sense over the last couple of years very specifically, what these actions need to be to comply with this better than we have ever known before, based on the way courts have been interpreting these lawsuits.

They've really put a spotlight on what we are expected to look at, and I'll get to some of that in a second.

So we have a duty of prudence. We have to act with the care, skill, prudence and diligence, we have to provide a diverse array of options for people to invest their money, we have an important duty of loyalty, and I can't state this enough.

I stated this a year ago.

I think I said to you, if there's one thing you take away from my presentation, is that we have one obligation and one obligation only, and that is to make sure we're looking out for the interests of our faculty, staff, and our retirees. So we operate under the exclusive purpose of providing the best overall experience for those individuals.

Then obviously, this comes out of the Internal Revenue Code, and so the plan assets must be held for the exclusive benefit of participants as I mentioned.

Not doing so could actually affect the tax advantage status of our retirement plan altogether. So consequences are significant not just for us as committee members, but for the institution and our plans themselves.

I will pause there before I move on, to see if there any questions about that. Yes?

DAU-SCHIMDT: Just that presentation there points out to me where the problem is. Because you gave legal requirements as to how the decision is made, but you forgot entirely about faculty governance. I actually think a better analogy than Orissa programs without collective bargaining would be Orissa programs with collective bargaining, and if there was collective bargaining, there would have, been an obligation to bargain over this.

I think with faculty governance, it's not collective bargaining, but there is an obligation, it's in our constitution that we be consulted about it.

Actually, it's also in our laws, our BFC Policy and Consultation, that the body for consultation on the things that affect the faculty as a whole is this body, not faculty members and committees. All right?

Especially, Associate Deans that aren't elected, on committees.

I guess this was a done deal. I can tell you that there are a lot of people upset about this, and they wish they had been consulted more. I think just a little advice going forward, that the level of consultation with the faculty has to be commensurate with the seriousness of the change, and this is a change that affects every faculty member.

For some of these, I mean, this is their life savings, and it's millions of dollars where it's invested. This was a huge decision, and you needed to have more than just a fig leaf of coming in here in September and saying, we're going to look at it, we're going to take some bids, we might do something. It might be any of a range of things, and then disappearing and coming back and saying, this is a done deal.

It really was inadequate under our consultation policies.

WHELAN: I appreciate those comments, and that's a conversation obviously that I would love to have more of a discussion about.

As you said, this decision has been made.

I will just maybe make the point that the decisions you mentioned, millions of dollars are at stake, and in fact, millions of dollars of savings will be created as a result of this decision. I'm not trying to be defensive about your point about process, but I do want to make the point that the entire way through, our focus has been specifically on the data, the evidence, and hundreds of hours of review to make the decisions based on specific data that would be in the best interests of all participants.

But your questions are fair point, and I would love to know more about that and understand perhaps from a legal perspective, does my fiduciary responsibility transcend to this committee? Does everybody here have that legal fiduciary?

That would be the question that would be certainly I'd want to explore for future reviews.

DAU-SCHIMIDT: I don't want to overstate this. I think you clearly take your responsibility seriously. I think the committee took their responsibility seriously.

You might have made the right decision, but what people are upset with is that this is a very important decision that affects everybody, and the consultation was just bare minimal. I was

here for the September meeting, I personally feel sandbagged on this. I know members of my faculty that I represent feel sandbag on it.

A much better process would then, once you went out and solicit it and got a proposal, then you would go back to the faculty, including my constituents, so that they can give the feedback on what they want. Because it's true that there were faculty involved and there were statements about, well, how do you feel about fidelity? How do you feel about TIA? But in the context of no proposal, what do you say to that?

I can tell you, and for the future, and I'll leave this out here, don't make any more permanent changes without coming back to us and asking us, and I'll let that stand. That's in our BFC policy of consultation.

So Know that you've been forewarned now.

WHELAN: I will say, if I could just add a point, we have met since last September and beyond that every single month with this body's Benefits Committee, to the extent that we did not ever hear that we were not available, and we're not consulting enough.

So I would say that we have never had an intention of sandbagging. I would just maybe push back on that.

It may feel that way, we have never denied an opportunity to have a conversation with anybody, we've made ourselves as available as possible, we've met monthly with this Councils Benefit Committee for 12 months in a row.

So we have made ourselves available. I think the question about coming back to present the proposal is maybe different question about whose decision is it, and who has all the information to make an informed decision?

So that would be something to consider if it would be presenting it saying give us input, but we're not delegating fiduciary responsibility.

Jim, had a question after you.

SHERMAN: Yeah. John, in terms of consultation, how much is the information upon which a decision was made could actually have been shared with others outside the committee? How much was proprietary?

WHELAN: Okay. I have a slide, and we jump ahead a little bit. But I think that's an important question.

Sorry if it goes past it... I apologize.

Yes. So here some of the factual challenges.

I mean, we were using of course our size as an institution, we are approaching six billion dollars in assets so we had tremendous amount of leverage. There are only a handful of vendors that were in the scope to even bid on our business.

We put very strict parameters because we wanted to make sure we didn't put our assets at risk, so there were only a handful of firms that even had the capacity to bid on this and we received bids. But when they put themselves out they have a demand on us and confidentiality and their willingness to bargain is based on that.

So one practical question would be, they put proprietary information out there that they knew we would be holding confidentially.

We ensured that.

So to come out and present it more publicly they may not have given us the same opportunities because if they weren't selected they don't want other universities to see what they offered us because they may not have offered that to others.

So it may have affected our bargaining position possibly, and that's just a practical question. We agreed to confidentiality to our committee. I guess in hindsight we could have said, "We will not keep it confidential and we will share it with our various faculty councils."

But I wonder if it would have changed the situation.

DAU-SCHIMDT: Yes. I think we're confusing, who has the authority to make the decision and what decision is made with consultation. Because I can guarantee, you don't have to breach any confidentiality to tell the faculty, "We're thinking about doing away with TIAA CREF altogether. What do you think about that?"

I can guarantee you would've gotten consultation then, you would've gotten feedback, and you missed out on that opportunity because that wasn't done.

WHELAN: One of the challenges in a decision like this is ensuring that we made the decision and notified all the other vendors who bid on the same day that we communicate to our employees.

Because it's an important process to make sure that the word did not start leaking out about which way we were going, at the risk of perhaps them pulling back, changing their bids.

So again, we're speculating a little bit but we went at this in good faith. We went at this in the way that we felt we had the best obligation to do so.

I would say here's the other practical piece of this, is that, this was an incredibly deliberate process based on very specific information.

We tracked investment funds for quarter after quarter.

We met with the vendors in person.

We reviewed thousands of pages of detailed information that they submitted, and the decision was based on the totality of that.

So to try to summarize that I believe in one or two meetings would not accurately reflect, and we would not be capable of capturing all the varying factors that would go into that to make that decision.

So again, I apologize if the perception that we had been trying to hide anything or sandbag anything I can assure you to a person that was not the case.

In fact, early on I had even asked when we started this process, "Is it okay just to put a vote out there for this and see where people want to be?"

The clear answer, and I knew this would probably be the answer but I just wanted to check is, "That would be a failure of our personal fiduciary responsibility because, perhaps a personal preference that is not in the best interest of our 30,000 participants, and leaving money on the table. Having an investment line up that is not the most robust for our participants would in fact be negligent on our part."

So I understand, we wanted as many voices as we could. I guess in hindsight we could have thought of other ways to do it, but I feel like there were limitations that we had to try to get input, short of sharing the proprietary confidential information we received.

I hear you. I apologize, and I'm not sounding defensive. I'm simply trying to explain how we made our decisions along the way.

ROBEL: So I see, Erika, then Moira, then John.

DOWELL: Okay. Thanks.

I would like to hear from a member of the benefits committee because realistically, consulting with the Bloomington Faculty Council cannot always happen in the meetings of the whole, but it's sometimes restricted to particular committees that can hold the information in confidence.

Could someone from the committee say a few words?

SOLOMON: Yeah. I'm Bruce Solomon and I chaired the Benefits Committee last year. To your point, Ken, I remember John coming in September and explicitly saying that we might do away with TIAA altogether? I think that was mentioned.

Christan, the Director of Benefits, I think attended every Benefits Committee meeting we had, last year. I'm virtually certain that she reported to us the progress of this process in general terms without revealing any confidential details.

But, I just want to say, it was very clear to me and to everybody on my committee I'm sure, that they had a very strong intention of trying to communicate and consult, throughout this process. Perhaps, I as Chair of the Benefits Committee misread the importance of mentioning it more frequently or bringing it more frequently to Faculty Council meetings.

When John spoke last fall and he asked for questions, there weren't many questions. There was very little feeling of controversy about this and again to a person on our committee, we felt confident throughout the year that, what was being planned and that this process was going to result in a really good outcome for the faculty and staff.

Which I think that it has. So I don't know if Erika if that response—

ROBEL: Yeah. Moira?

MARSH: Two things. One is that, I also went back to the transcripts of the meeting mid-September when the last time John came and told us what the plan was before it was kicked off. I did ask explicitly in the discussion section of that meeting, "What's going to be the next steps after the RFP?"

He answered explicitly that the decision would be made by the retirement investment committee, and then that information would then be communicated after that decision was made.

So it seems to me that if we as a body or even as individuals objected to that, that was the consultation process, it was laid out then and there. If we objected to that consultation process and maybe we might have, but nobody did at the time, and it doesn't seem appropriate to object now although we might want to think going forward about how we might want to make this a little bit more transparent than it was.

I learned something very interesting that in your first line today about the role of trustees in this.

Second point is that, yes this affects all faculty, therefore it affects this council, it affects the UFC for various standing committees. But it's not just faculty, it's all employees are affected by this.

We certainly can't speak for all employees.

If the trustees have delegated authority to John Whelan's office and threw him to this committee, they outrank us. So if we wanted to talk about other ways going forward, and I have to admit to it since I was president at the time and I did not realize this little bit in our bylaws that Ken as pointed out that says that this body is the appropriate body.

So maybe I missed the boat on that and should have spoken up more at the time. But it does seem to me that there are quite a few constraints on what role this body could have had in terms of actually making decisions let alone discussing things in public.

It seems to me that the consultation process was done as they said they would do it, and it seems to me that it was appropriate.

ROBEL: Thank you. John.

WALBRIDGE: Yeah. I would find it very helpful if Mr. Whelan could move forward and go over the details of the proposal which I, glanced at, but I'm sure I'm not alone on the faculty council and not having a total understanding of it.

You presumably have been burst in it, every waking moment for the last 12 months.

WHELAN: I'll be happy to if that's okay.

ROBEL: Absolutely. Maybe it would be good just so we all have a baseline of knowledge all the way. I know you asked for questions to just get through the slides so that we understand the baseline and then we can have more questions.

WHELAN: Okay. Great. This may get to some of your questions.

So what we know is that the expectation in this area under these fiduciary responsibilities are to focus on really three areas and we have done that.

Looking for lower fees, and I'll talk in a second about what that means because there are two kinds of fees.

Improved services, that means more advising services, better advising services, more availability.

Then ultimately, higher-performing investments.

So maybe I'll walk through this briefly because I think it will outline in some ways the specifics of this.

I apologize I'm going to step back a little bit to talk about how some of these plants work in our setup and I apologize if some of you already know this, but many people don't.

So I think it's helpful context.

Historically, we have had two vendors, Fidelity and TIAA. What most people don't realize is that each of those providers provides two separate services. They haven't been looked at that way for most years up until about a few years ago.

One of those is that they provided their own investment funds.

Then individually, they provided what we call record keeper services. This is the overhead management of communicating to you, giving you access to get to your information on their web page, providing advisory services to you. Those have always been so blended, people haven't realized that those are one and the same.

Best practices have been to separate those two for a couple of reasons. One is there are fees in both of those areas and they get blended together and in some ways almost blurred, which has been a problem—people say there needs to be more transparency.

But secondarily, they are in a position to advise you to put your money into funds that are their proprietary funds, and some funds have more fees and others.

That has become an understanding that could be an area for better performance and better savings for individuals. So the fees that we all pay, the university doesn't pay any of this. These are the fees we pay a record keeping fee to whoever is managing that.

Then the investment funds that we are putting our money and each have fees associated with them depending on which fees we pick.

Some are lower, if they're more passive, you just put it into a market index fund. Others are more managed. So we have accomplished savings in both of those areas, dramatic savings.

People say, "I hear fees, what do you mean by fees? How much money are you saving?"

In the administrative fees, which is the lower of the two, but it's still significant, we not only lower the fees, but we change the way the fees have been applied.

Historically, not just here everywhere.

This overhead administrative fee is based on how much money you have saved. Somebody who just got pulled yesterday doesn't really get any less or more benefits than someone who's been there for 40 years.

So why should the person has been for 40 years be paying more of an administrative fee?

So we change that to a flat fee for every participant, \$28 a year. The fees we've had in place, fidelities were lower than TIAAs, but both of them were significantly higher than what we have negotiated. Fidelities have averaged around \$60-\$70 a year, and that's an average. TIAAs has been about \$122 a year, but that's an average.

When you think about the fact that people who have 40-years' worth of investments, they were probably paying thousands of dollars, could potentially been paying thousands of dollars in administrative fees. Through this negotiation process, everyone will pay \$28.

For the vast majority, we have secondary funds that are \$48 a year. So that's one savings, but that's not even the biggest savings.

On the investment line up, we had 300 and some odd funds. Because they are all proprietary by the vendors we have, they could encourage people to go to the funds they wanted to even though they're not supposed to, we can't really say whether they are or not.

We took the fee from on average 57 bases points, which is 57 percent of one percent on average, down to 26 bases points, so 26 percent of one percent.

I don't want do a whole a math here, but you have people who have been here for a long time, they have a lot of money. They will be saving potentially tens of thousands of dollars a year because of this negotiated situation.

So fees collectively, we can't pinpoint exactly because it's going to depend on a lot of factors, but it is safe to say that we are saving collectively millions of dollars for faculty and staff and retirees.

We move on to improve services.

So we have a commitment from fidelity, and we have presentations with all of our vendors. They, more so than any other firm, said we will do whatever you need. We are going to increase immediately the number of people dedicated to this university, and the second you tell us that's not enough, we are committing to you right now we'll give you more people.

We're going to build an office in Bloomington for you. We already have one just outside of Indianapolis. We have one in South Bend. The other regional campuses in Northwest in near Chicago, but we said Bloomington, no office they said, "We'll build you an office."

They're going to build an office here.

We feel their advisory services, we have always received great feedback about their advisory services, people have been very happy with them. We feel that's just going to be an increase.

As far as the investments go, I'm going to jump ahead a little bit. As I said, we have 300 or so investments exclusively in two vendors. We approached this process from the beginning saying we are going to disconnect the investment line up from the record keeper.

We are going to do our research, which we spent hours and hours over the last year with expert outside financial advice to find a lineup of easy to understand high performing low fees.

We said we do not want to be bound by any record keeper. In fact, we are going to intentionally separate this lineup of funds from any of the record keeper vendors. So TIAA, Fidelity, the others, they knew that none of their funds would be in this line up because we felt that that way,

they have no skin in the game, their advisory services are in the best interest of everybody involved.

We know that we have the best of the best as far as we can estimate on what's available in the market regardless.

We also know that simplifying this lineup makes the chances of people getting better returns more likely. So we simplified our structure into four TIAAs. One is the most basic, which is just life cycle funds based on the years, which put it in there and it changes from more aggressive to more conservative the closer you get to retirement. They're very common, very low fees, and you don't have to do anything.

Passive funds, there's a little more risk, but you're matching to the market. These are very popular and you follow the market.

Some people want to be more aggressive. So we have active funds and we have really good active funds. We think that we put in there, but then we also said there are some people who feel that they can still beat the market and they want to go in and pick whatever they want. So we have a self-directed window that allows anybody to go into that and virtually all mutual funds that are in the market are available.

Some vendors don't put them on there, but virtually, everything is out there.

Let me pause, Jimmy, you had a question.

SHERMAN: Yes. It might be beneficial to tell people that among those mutual fund windows will be funds from TIAA and from fidelity. So you don't have to leave fidelity or TIAA if you don't want to. You can go to the self-directed window and choose funds from those vendors.

WHELAN: Right. While not every TIAA fund is available, there are certainly, I think it's 17 different funds that are available. So we feel that by doing this, we are ensuring that people catch the 57 bases points down to 26.

This lineup creates incredible savings in that regard, but we also feel like this is a higher performing people. Also, we think make more money on average because these are just higher performing funds.

So that is the crux of what the decision was that we made. I can go into more detail, but that's essentially the gist of what we have done.

WALBRIDGE: Thank you, that's very helpful.

WHELAN: So I can keep moving through this presentation if you'd like, but let me just say that this has been an exercise that we are certainly not in the forefront of. This has been something that universities all over this country are doing.

We reached out to many universities to understand how they did this, how's the best way to be responsive. I know the Benefits Committee of Bloomington Faculty Council individually and independently did their own due diligence cost to a variety of these universities to understand this process and make sure that what we are proposing to venture into was a legitimate process, and I don't want to speak for them and they certainly would direct to them if they want to, but from what I understand, they found that by large, people felt that this was the right decision for the universities.

I don't have anything to add on that. I talked about the new invested menus so I walked you through that.

So let me just finish by saying in addition to that, we have added additional features. We have now added the ability, which has never existed before, for people to roll over money from other employer's retirement plan into IU retirement plans to, A, simplify that you can see everything in one place, but B, take advantage of the incredible fees we have negotiated that you probably might not have in your other employers. B, we've created a Roth Option for people, which is just one more additional way to invest your money if you want to.

Then the self-directed brokerage window, which essentially provides almost an unlimited number of investment options.

So I'll pause there because I think that's the bulk of the presentation that I have on slides. I think I covered everything that was on the sides and then pause for more questions if anyone has any.

ROBEL: Other questions?

WHELAN: Yes, I'm sorry.

So if there aren't any other questions, I will follow up to the question about communication and outreach that was raised earlier.

Any other question?

Okay. So we do have a whole plan.

I realize the announcement was sudden as trying to line up and negotiated arrangement with the level and the size of what we're doing is a complicated process and keeping it confidential is part of the process of getting this deal arranged, and so idea would be nice to say it's coming, we've picked somebody, we're moving along.

The problem is, we say that the firms that were not negotiating with are going to say we know it's not us and then there's adds to other potential issues.

So it's not ideal, but we had to get to a point where we had to get the finalized agreement with fidelity and then announce it. I do acknowledge that there was an abrupt announcement and I

apologize, but if it helps, it probably doesn't, but the Board of Trustees found out at the same time everybody else in this room found out.

The Vice President, and the Chancellor, and the deans found out at the same time that everybody else in the room found out, and I don't know there was any way around that. I apologize for the abruptness of that.

That being said, between now and January one, we have many opportunities and we have a web-page that I encourage you to go to and you can see all this. I encourage you to reach out to TIAA if you're with them.

I encourage you to reach out to Fidelity to talk about what this means. Fidelity will be on campus to provide some do Webinars, to give some overarching explanations.

I would encourage you to take advantage of those because I think a lot of the questions people have will probably come from those and then if you have an individual consultation, you might now have a better sense of the questions you might want to ask them. The decisions that need to be made between now and January one.

There's no decision that has to be made if somebody just does nothing. All of the investments that everybody has regards if they're with Fidelity or TIAA, will roll over into that tier one section, which is a list of Vanguard life cycle funds. Vanguard is universally seen as the most valuable and most effective in life cycle fund out there.

That would be the default, and at any point after that, people can take their money out of that and put it into any of these funds that we have in our lineup.

But you can do that before January one if you want.

There are some funds with TIAA and there is a lot of money, billions of dollars that are sitting in these funds that are called annuity funds.

Many of you may have those.

Those are in agreement with an individual and TIAA. So they will not automatically roll over. Some of those, you have the ability if you want to roll them over into these new fun line up. Some of them actually have a limitation through your relationship with TIAA that you can move those for up to 10 years. But you never have to move any of them if you don't want to.

That's your choice and so some people will choose to keep those in TIAA because they want to be in that annuity and that's perfectly fine.

New money going forward, that's contributed from the university and that you contribute will go into this new line up, but anything you haven't those annuities you should keep there.

Some people have said, "I refuse to be anywhere else other than TIAA. I'm going to move all my money over there." For they have mutual funds and annuities, I don't know if that's the best investment option, but you certainly have the right between now and January one to call TIAA and say, "Take all my mutual fund and put them in annuities. I don't want them to leave your care."

That's certainly a possibility.

Again, new money, starting January one will go into this lineup. But if you want to move everything over so that you keep as much of it as you can in the TIAA, that's certainly your choice. But that is how this will play out and we will be communicating, offering opportunities for people to meet, to have webinars, to have one-on-one consultations and at any point, please reach out to our office and we will help in any way that we can.

ROBEL: Other questions?

Are you member of the council?

Under our rules, I'm sorry, maybe you can get somebody at the table to come and ask your question.

Are there members of the Council—Maira?

MARSH: I'm sorry, you may have said this and I may have missed it. But will there be more town halls or other events on the campuses coming forward to tell people about what's going on?

ROYER: The current plan is all the information about town halls which Fidelity calls workshops, if you will are posted on our website. There are multiple days at Bloomington. The last two weeks of October and on each of those days, we'll be giving sessions, I believe three times a day.

So we did it at various times of day is to try and accommodate as many schedules as possible. Also, in there, there are a couple of sessions that are retirees as well, so those are on our website.

If you can't attend an in-person session, there are, I believe, four virtual webinars and see you can join those and those will be live and moderated, and in addition to that there are, I believe, 100 almost approaching 1,000 individual meetings sessions and we will add more if we need to.

The one thing I would tell you is that, we're working with Fidelity to send out more information. There will be a booklet. It's similar in format to the open enrollment booklet that we send out every year in October, that will be mailed to your home address and that will have even more detailed information with sections broken out about well if you're currently with Fidelity, what do you do if you're currently with TIAA or if you have both and so it walks you through that.

In addition to that, as John mentioned, you can make some decisions about where you want to direct your retirement contributions.

Beginning in January, there will be what Fidelity calls an open choice period and we've aligned that with open enrollment. So while you're going out to make any open enrollment elections and change anything this year if you so choose to do that, you can go out and do your retirement at the same time.

It will be a different website link, but we'll be sending that out so you can do everything at once.

For those individuals who come to the Open Enrollment Session and the Benefits Fair here in Bloomington, that will be Monday, November 11th this year. We will have Fidelity setup on site so that someone could come and maybe update their benefits, get their confirmation e-mail right there and then walk over to the next table and speak with Fidelity about updating their retirement.

We will be going around to all of the regional campuses and also having large town halls at the IEPUI campus as well.

ROBEL: DIANE?

HENSHEL: We used to have a pretty long open enrollment session. We used to have about all of November, then it got reduced to two weeks and then it got reduced to 10 days.

Could we please have a month back, especially this year?

ROYER: This year, the open enrollment period is a full two-week period. It's November 11th through the 22nd I believe off the top of my head. The open enrollment period, when it was a longer period was when we did it on paper and we had to collect all the mail and do all the data entry because it's all online now and the benefit elections roll over from year to year and largely are benefits have not changed from year to year, and in fact this year very little is changing.

In order to align with payroll cycles and make sure that we can get all the updates in the system and all the file feeds to vendors for the January one elections, we've kept it to that two week period that said this year.

The Benefits Committee came to me and asked if we could at least send out the information earlier so that faculty and staff would have that and I believe the Open Enrollment Materials are going to go out. Hopefully, assuming everything is aligned correctly with the printer of the week of October seventh.

So maybe as early as next week. So you'll have the materials for longer. Thanks to the Benefits Committee for asking us to do that and we were happy to accommodate.

But the election period will still be that two-week period, just due to system limitations and collecting all the information for sending to the vendor. The open choice period with Fidelity will be longer. It won't be limited to two weeks.

I don't have the exact dates off the top of my head.

We're still figuring out some of those dates at the end when it will end, but it will largely be from November two.

We believe to December 23rd.

ROBEL: Jim.

SHERMAN: Yeah, I wanted to point out what I think could be the biggest benefit of all of this change.

That is over the last few years I've spoken to a lot of faculty and staff about their retirement plans and their thoughts about retirement, and part of it is lack of motivation. Part of it is just the sheer number of investment possibilities.

But the fact is that all of us have not paid probably sufficient attention to where our moneys are, and what those investments are. What this will be is a kick in the butt for all of us to look more carefully, and with a smaller number of investment options through Vanguard, I think we'll be able to do a better job.

So I think that might be the best investment upgrade of all because we're all now aware that we have to look at this carefully.

So I hope you'll all do that.

ROBEL: Micol?

SEIGEL: Thanks. So this is a question that I'm communicating on behalf of a retired faculty member who is also a money manager, and the essence of the question as I understand it is about where Fidelity makes its money?

But the question in particular, "Most of the schools that have left have not paid the retirees. Most of the schools that have left TIAA have not required of the schools that the investors move their money from one to the other, that retirees move their money. But in this case Fidelity is asking retirees to move their money."

Then the second thing is that the Fidelity platform is getting paid based on how many investors there are in each? How much money? It comes out to a flat fee per investor. How much lower is that fee because the retiree money got moved?

ROBEL: Well, let's get an answer to this first.

WHELAN: I can't answer and respond but I'm happy to do the research about other universities not requiring retirees to move over. I just don't know the answer to that.

My sense is that probably more than not are actually doing what we're doing but I can't say that definitively, but that would be my sense.

We made that decision because we felt that it was in the best interest of everybody involved including retirees because the fees are still being paid by everybody including retirees.

So that was part of the decision for us to make it more cost effective for everybody. We felt that participants are participants regardless of their status and so it didn't seem right to leave the benefits of savings off the table for the retirees, so we lumped it all together.

The second question, I'm not sure I understood exactly, but I think it was about Fidelity and how they make their money. Because they have no funds available in this line up, they only are making money off of us through the record-keeping fees, and they were aware of that so there's no investment option at all for Fidelity option for Fidelity fund in this new plan, and the amount of money they get paid is a fixed amount of \$28 a year for most of the funds, there are a couple that are supplemental funds that are \$48.

But in either case, so there's no opportunity for that to grow or creep we negotiated that.

So that's regardless of the amount of assets that are held by any individual person or collectively by the University. I don't know if that answered the question?

ROBEL: Can I ask? Did I understand you to say that there will be opportunities for people to ask their questions all around the campus for the next several months?

WHELAN: Absolutely yes. We will have these open sessions Fidelity will be around, individual calls with Fidelity are possible so. If you are feeling like there's no opportunities to get questions answered, let us know we'll make direct connections.

As I said Fidelity told us, "If you need more resources we will give you more resources." So there will be a flood and so you may say, "Wait a minute, I tried to get to Fidelity and they are booked up these days." Call us and we will call them and we will make more options for you.

ROBEL: Meg? Thank you.

SEIGEL: There's a second part to my question, Meg. I'm sorry, could I just finish?

It's a pay to play. Vanguard pays fidelity money to be on their platform. Does anybody know what that is?

WHELAN: I'm aware of the concept that does not apply here. There is no relationship based on our agreement with Fidelity or Vanguard. The fees tied to Vanguard are completely independent of Fidelity.

We decided on the Vanguard fund before we decided on a record keeper, and Fidelity offered us their best option. So there's no relationship there that is at least connected to Indiana University, both of those are made independently and the fees were independent when we decide what they were going to be.

ROBEL: Meg?

MEIMAN: Will we have the ability to still meet with TIAA-CREF representatives in the coming months as well just to wrap things up.

WHELAN: Yes, in fact not only in the coming months, TIAA will have a presence on this campus for probably decades still because there will be billions of dollars that will remain in TIAA through these annuity funds.

We've been in contact with TIAA. TIAA wins some of these and Fidelity wins some of these and other companies wins. This is the name of the game, this is where people are going to single record keepers. So we've had very professional conversations and cordial conversations with TIA, and we're going to partner with them and they're going to continue to have appointments like they do now on campus.

So yes, Serine.

Serine, is one of the members of the investment committee. I don't know if it's okay for him to come in.

Do you have a microphone, Serine?

HENSHEL: Could you come up to one of the mics that's at the table; I can't hear you up here.

ROBEL: A member of our benefits committee responding—

KAMMA: Yes, let me follow up on that pay to play in case not everybody understand that.

One of the key considerations in our review processes was to eliminate potential for conflicts of interest and we do that by separating out the investment choices from the management of the record keeping services.

The investment choices were made independently without the record keepers at books.

Now there might be a take back as the pay to play thing from the fund to Fidelity—that's the presumption. But we have the option of changing any of these funds in the investment line up. If the Retirement Investment committee thinks it advisable.

The fee, \$28, is not going to change if we change this fund.

So there is no conflict of interest between the record keeper and the funds we have chosen. For example, we can change the Vanguard target date fund and replace it with say TIAA target date funds, and the \$28 fee doesn't change. Is that right, Jim?

WHELAN: That's correct.

KAMMA: I'm sorry, that's all I wanted.

ROBEL: So I would like to acknowledge that any change in our retirement systems is going to be unnerving to people. I've been at Indiana University for 34 years. All of my retirement savings are in TIAA-CREF.

And so I totally get that when you get an announcement that says, we're moving to this other group, it's unsettling. But I do believe that if this decision had been made decades ago, I would be better off in retirement. Because I would not have been paying the fees that I've been paying all these years as I've been accumulating my retirement funds.

So I appreciate tremendously the care with which the committee has approached this task. I appreciated it when you came and talked to the BFC about it.

While I too are experiencing the existential concerns that come with a change in the letters that I have, the TIAA-CREF letters that have been on everything associated with my ability to sail off into the sunset at some point, I do know that this was done not to benefit the university but to benefit the faculty and staff at the University.

The University will not see a benefit from this other than the benefit of knowing that it has met its fiduciary obligations to us as employees of this University.

So I appreciate that very much, John, and all the members of the committee who were involved in this.

HENSHEL: John, I look at the stock market and what's going on these days with great trepidation. I'm a little concerned that you have a single due date for this changeover.

What happens if on January 1st there's been a crash because of some crazy thing that's happening not related to us per se but obviously, potentially greatly affecting the stock market.

Do we have a chance to change the date at which this transfer occurs if the stock market goes crazy?

WHELAN: I would say well the short answer would be I don't think we will and let me explain why.

I think it would be too hard to predict.

We would have to had no far enough in advance of what date and it's probably too hard to predict what might happen to the stock market. So to say January 10th, well then something could crash on the 9th and that being said, there will be a small blackout period for a couple of days.

It'll mostly likely be done at the very end of the year where things tend to be a little quieter as they transitioned over. It's just a few days.

We'll have more information on that, where the money transitions over basically what will happen is, all the funds in fidelity and all the funds in TIA that are being transferred will be liquidated and then transferred over effective January 1.

I understand the question but I think it's probably an impossible thing to try to manage effectively and in talking to that you raised that question once before I believe.

Because last year when we talked about this and I brought that to our experts and I don't think this has been an issue.

It's obviously anything could happen and times are tumultuous right now but I haven't heard a story where anyone's had a mass loss on a transition date like this.

ROBEL: Right. Well on that shall we adjourn in the way we always do.

Thank you so much, John.

Great. Thank you.