

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
April 28, 2015
Kelley School of Business – CG 1050
3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Marlon Bailey, Abhijit Basu, Purnima Bose, Andy Braden, Carrie Docherty, Lori Duggan, Nathan Ensmenger, David Estell, David Fisher, Alyce Fly, John Gibson, Thomas Gieryn, Margaret Gray, Daphna Rae Greiner, Dennis Groth, Brady Harman, Jeff Hass, Bradley Heim, Israel Herrera, Ed Hirt, Jonathan Karty, Bradley Levinson, Karma Lochrie, Jon Macy, Laura McCloskey, Patricia McManus, Joseph Miller, Sharlene Newman, John Paolillo, Jennifer Pearl, Jamie Prenkert, Deanna Reising, Ben Robinson, Leslie Rutkowski, Steve Sanders, Micol Seigel, Jim Sherman, Catherine Sherwood-Laughlin, Jon Simons, Rebecca Spang, Geoff Sprinkle, Cassidy Sugimoto, Herb Terry, Frances Trix, Richard Van Kooten, Nona Watt, Rega Wood

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Lessie Jo Frazier (Ilana Gershon), Laura Ginger (Beverly Stoeltje), Krista Glazewski (Mitzi Lewison), Alex Tanford (Moirra Marsh), Mikel Tiller (Jason Brown), Justin Vasel (Ben Verdi)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Joelle Bahloul, David Baxter, Michelle Chung, Gerhard Glomm, Timothy Hoch, Gretchen Horlacher, Cheng Kao, Jon Lozano, Michael McRobbie, Lauren Robel, William Swanson, James Wimbush, Sung-Un Yang

GUESTS: Amy Applegate (Maurer School of Law Policy Committee), Catherine Dyar (Office of the Provost), Linda Gales (CWA), Jennifer Kincaid (CPO), Bob Kravchuk (SPEA; BAC co-chair), Debbie Lemon (Board of Trustees), Mark McConahay (Registrar), Ted Miller (FAC), Christiana Ochoa (Law/OVPFAA), M. Reschke (Herald-Times), Ashleigh Sherman (IDS), Anne Tinder (incoming IUSA President), M.A. Venkataramanan (VPSI)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/14-15/04.07.15.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolutions for Harvey C. Bunke and Richard W. Lawson

Harvey C. Bunke: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/B42-2015.pdf>

Richard W. Lawson: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/B43-2015.pdf>

3. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Faculty President Jim Sherman)

4. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)
(Provost Lauren Robel)

5. Question / Comment Period¹

6. CREM Policy (45 minutes)

(Professors Ilana Gershon, Jon Simons and Cassidy Sugimoto) [ACTION ITEM]
Proposed new policy:

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/B34-2015Rev0422Clean.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/aux/CREMTable2.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/aux/CREMFlowchart2.pdf>

7. Shared Governance Subcommittee Report and Recommendations (45 minutes)

(Professor Cassidy Sugimoto and Professor Emeritus Herb Terry) [ACTION ITEM]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/aux/FACCircularCover.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/B37-2015.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/B38-2015.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/B39-2015.pdf>

8. New Business/ Old Business

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/aux/CREMBylawRevs.pdf>

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

SHERMAN: Okay, let's – let's get started. On today's agenda the – the first item of the agenda is the approval of the minutes from April 15th [comment indistinct]

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [comment indistinct]

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

SHERMAN: [comment indistinct] Of both of them. So it is for the 7th as well.

TERRY: It is actually just the 7th.

¹ Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Provost Robel or President Sherman should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/>. To send e-mail to the Faculty Council Office: bfcOFF@indiana.edu.

SHERMAN: Or just the 7th. My bad. So we have got a motion and seconded. All in favor? [Aye] Opposed? [Silence] Okay the – the next item on the agenda, Tom will read the memorial resolutions.

AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR HARVEY C. BUNKE AND RICHARD W. LAWSON

GIERYN: Harvey C. Bunke was born in Oshkosh, Wisconsin on November 7, 1921. He graduated from Oshkosh Public High School in 1939.

In the spring semester of 1941 Harvey enlisted in the Army Air Corps. A highly decorated veteran, Staff Sergeant Bunke was discharged after receiving four Distinguished Flying Crosses and two Air Metals for combat actions in the Asiatic-Pacific Theater.

In 1944 Harvey enrolled in the University of Illinois, where he met and married Margaret (Peg) Carlsten in 1947, the year they both graduated with baccalaureate degrees. Harvey continued his education, earning a PhD degree in 1951. Harvey and Peg had three children, C. Martin (Tina) Bunke, Richard Carlsten (Ellen) Bunke, and A. Christine (Karl) Swenson, nine grandchildren and two great grandchildren.

Following graduation, Harvey entered government service as a U.S. Government Senior Price Economist in the Office of Price Stability in Seattle, Washington. Thereafter, he returned to the University of Iowa where he was a professor from 1952 to 1964.

In 1964 he was appointed President of Western Washington College in Bellingham, Washington, where he served until 1967. While there he was instrumental in planning and obtaining funding for the widely acclaimed and award-winning Fairhaven College.

In 1967 Harvey joined the faculty of the Indiana University School of Business. During his tenure he served in a variety of roles, including Professor of Management, Chairperson of the Undergraduate Program, Director of the School of Savings and Loan, Associate Dean, Editor of *Business Horizons*, and near the end of his career Vice President and Chief Administrative Officer of the Indiana University Foundation.

Although Harvey's research spanned a wide range of economic and business-related issues, perhaps his best known and most influential work is *The Liberal Dilemma*. Here the reader is offered a tour de force of the evolving values of Western Culture and implications for achieving the Good Society. More than any other this was the central question he addressed in a lifetime of scholarly research and teaching. Business leadership is about far more than how to achieve

material wealth or lead a corporate enterprise. There existed, in his mind, more important, challenging, and beneficial organizational and societal goals for a business leader to achieve.

Harvey was both an educator and public intellectual. As an educator he understood the words of Wordsworth:

Enough, if something from our hands hath power
To live, and act, and serve the future hour;
And if, as toward the silent tomb we go,
Through love, through hope, and faith's transcendent dower,
We feel that we are greater than we know.

Harvey understood that, as a teacher, he could serve the future through his students. And to accomplish this it was not enough to help someone learn to earn a living, he had to help them learn to live a life. And this required going beyond the “nicely calculated less or more” to inform the student about those more important issues that are shaping the society they will live in and helping them to formulate their dreams for making the world a better place.

As an intellectual he understood that the purpose of business education was to prepare business leaders to perform the role of helping to achieve the Good Society. His research taught him to see that teaching in the modern business school had become increasingly fragmented, its mission disconnected from the question of purpose. Concepts of leaders as central actors in achieving the Good Society had become displaced by an emphasis on technical training, conceptions of “Investor Capitalism” in which corporate leaders were recast as mere agents of shareholders, functioning therefore as “hired hands” who labored under the yoke of short-term profitability. In so doing the grander conception of the role and purpose of business in contemporary society was lost. And with this loss an appreciation of the important and vital role business must play in moving society to a better future.

Refusing to retreat from, or accommodate, what many believed to be the inevitable trajectory of business education, Harvey continued to engage generation after generation of students in the innocuously titled course “Business & Society.” It served as the venue in which he challenged students to recognize and understand implications of the forces shaping the Western World, giving meaning to human striving and enabling social progress.

Throughout his lifetime of research, teaching and administration Harvey's vision was singular: leadership, especially business leadership, is not about achieving material wealth. Rather, it is

about how an individual could live and lead institutions he or she serves in promoting the Good Society.

Harvey was a gifted scholar and teacher, and wonderful friend whose memory will be cherished by all who had the good fortune to know him.

This memorial resolution will become part of the minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council.

Dr. Richard W. Lawson, Associate Professor Emeritus of the Department of Recreation in the School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, passed away on November 15, 2013.

Born in Marion, Indiana in 1928, he was ever a spirited Hoosier. His early graduate education earned Dick an Associate of Arts degree from Chicago's North Park College, but his Bachelor's (1951), Master's (1954) and Doctoral (1970) degrees all bear the Indiana University stamp.

Dick was the fourth faculty member to be added to what was then the Department of Recreation. His earlier employment as Rural Youth Extension Specialist at the University of Illinois, as Director of Parks and Recreation at Evergreen Park, Illinois and as Superintendent of Parks and Recreation at Amarillo, Texas made him a valuable addition with very practical approaches to personnel and to problems.

His primary responsibilities were in the areas of administration and facilities, but he excelled as a student counselor. Anyone with a problem, large or small had access to an understanding ear. Both male and female students looked for Dick's good humored advice when problems, personal or professional, arose.

Dr. Lawson was an "involved" professional. He served for twenty-five years as the Director of the Great Lakes Park Training Institute, developing it into the premier model for how a university can share its research with professionals in the field. He maintained ready contact with park and recreation professionals for updates to classroom materials. He also served several years as Director of the Indiana Park and Recreation Association.

Dick's engaging personality reset a happier tone when problems surfaced. He was available—sought after for service club speeches, square dance calling, Rec Night duty at the Student Building. His hilarious piano recitals were always welcome and his sometimes "wicked" sense of humor prevailed even under difficult situations.

Dick became an I-Man (1951) in baseball after playing as an undergraduate for Coach Ernie Andres. His involvement in sports served him well as he advised student athletes.

Dr. Lawson will be remembered as a caring counselor, a good teacher and an effective link between academia and park and recreation professionals.

His wife, Helen, was an enthusiastic partner in his efforts. His two daughters and his grandchildren always knew that they had his support and counsel as they chose career and recreation outlets.

In his thirty-seven years of academic service and his several years of volunteer contributions in many areas, Dr. Lawson always aimed toward the goal of healthier, happier living accommodations for all. We will miss him.

AGENDA ITEM 3: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

SHERMAN: [All rise] I – I would like to defer for a few minutes the – the standing until I have made my comments. So the next item is my report on business, beyond Executive Committee business. I don't know why I said only Executive Committee business. I just – the first thing is I want to remind people who are here in the stead of BFC members to make sure you sign the – the green sheet when it comes around, and sign it next to the person for whom you are representing, or whom you are representing so we know who you are and who has asked you to stand in for them. So please do that.

In terms of my updates, I wanted to update you on two things that occurred within the department to which I belong, and that is the department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, one of them good and one of them horrific. The – the good news was Thursday evening we had a – we had the lights lit on our brain in front of the building and the – the – the lights were the brain child of Rob Shakespeare who was also the brain child of the light totem that's in front of the art museum, and he was asked by the donor to light the brain and the donor wanted the title of it to be *Consciousness*. I'm not sure he knew exactly what he meant by "consciousness," but he was more interested in a conscious brain than the structure of the brain. But Rob Shakespeare took it seriously, and indeed the lights have a consciousness. The brain has a consciousness. If you go there and walk around the brain the lights will be responsive to your movement and your direction, and it's pretty remarkable how he did that. So it's – you should all go visit it at some point. It's on every evening from sundown 'til about two in the morning and it was a great presentation.

Of course on the horrific side was the murder last week of Hannah Wilson, very relevant to the department of Psychological and Brain Sciences because that was her major and she [comment indistinct] receive her degree right after the semester was done. She was well known and well-

loved within the department by students and faculty alike, and I know Lauren planned to say some words about Hannah. It's an awful thing, certainly for our department, the university as a whole, for the city, and beyond, and it's another case of leaving you wondering and kind of hoping that our responses in the wake of something like this don't fade within hours or days, and we're all back to normal without recognizing the importance of events like this and – and the fragility of life. So the – the reason I wanted to delay the standing was to not only keep in mind our colleagues, our faculty colleagues who have died, but also our students who have also [comment indistinct] [All Stand] Okay, thank you. [All Sit]

[comment indistinct] may have noticed that Lauren is not here, and I [comment indistinct] the reasons are really serious family crisis in fact. [comment indistinct] had to leave for Hawaii first thing yesterday morning. So she will not be with us today, and I hope that the news will be good when we hear from her next.

Okay, the – the next item on the agenda is a return to the – the CREM policy, and I had a – a number of requests for amendments to the policy, and for people who wanted to speak to the policy, and I thought it would be best to start with – with the amendments because some of the comments may become irrelevant if we don't approve the amendments first, so it made most sense to me. John Paolillo asked me to introduce several amendments that come actually from the committee itself, and I thought that would be the first place to start since it comes from the committee. So I do not know who wants to [comment indistinct]

AGENDA ITEM 6: CREM POLICY

PAOLILLO: Sure. I'll – I'll introduce the amendments. They are – this single sheet which has both red and yellow print on it, and I'll just make a couple comments about this and describe each of the changes in the – in the amendment very briefly. As – as Jim said this came from the subcommittee. They asked me to present it so that they aren't in the awkward position of moving an amendment on their own proposal. The – there are five changes that are proposed in each of four different – there's four or five sections. In first section II.A there is a proposed wording change here that deletes the CREM standing committee and just moves "and" to a position where it's syntactically felicitous and this is to comport with suggestions of Lauren Robel that simplifies the role of the CREM committee and makes it less controversial. In section III.A the changes here are intended to clarify the super majority rule, that it applies only to the total vote count rather than to the total of affected faculty, and this is a protection against potential low turnout in the case of a vote that otherwise has strong support. Section IV.A., there was a word "units" that was missing in the phrase, "deans and dean faculty units." This is a typographic error that is just simply being corrected. Section IV.B., because again, at clarification of the provost role in – as the final decision maker, so insertion of the phrase "substantially affected individuals" and adding the sentence, "provost will give final approval to

the list.” Finally, section 5(a), again, this pertains to the scope of the super majority and limits it to the voting faculty in the actual vote total, and that is in subsections (a) and (b). There are changes that have to be made there. So these are the – the proposed changes, and I think that they comport with the discussion that we had last time in Robel’s positions both having a definitive role in deciding who is participating and in limiting the – the super majority to something that’s more manageable and reasonable in an actual situation. So that is the motion for the amendment. I guess we have to entertain a second if it’s going to be discussed further.

SHERMAN: Okay, any comments or –

TERRY: Second.

SHERMAN: Comments? Question?

SPANG: I’m confused about how – because, John maybe I missed it, but I thought you were saying that the changes to III.A.a. in fact were the super majority, but that’s not the internal committee.

PAOLILL: Oh, I’m sorry. That is not the – yes. I misread that.

SPANG: Okay.

PAOLILLO: I was making my notes. Yeah. So this is – this is a different circumstance. It is about – it is about trying to limit the size of committees so that they are reasonable size rather than – so that they would not take in the whole university.

SPANG: Okay.

SHERMAN: Tom?

GIERYN: Do you want to have the one amendment or sets of amendment at a time or are you – do you want to get them all out on the table?

SHERMAN: Let’s get them all out on the table, Tom.

PAOLILLO: Wait you mean –

GIERYN: Is that better though?

SHERMAN: I don’t know. I’m sorry. All of these on the table.

GIERYN: No, that’s what I meant, but –

SHERMAN: Oh no, just I consider this one amendment. I don’t want to do the others now, but I don’t want to divide this into five separate votes. Cassidy? No.

HEIM: Clarifying question. So – and I notice that this is the original plan also. So units sometimes is used to refer to schools and other times it seems to refer to departments and it's unclear, you know, so sometimes it talks about deans of units then other times it talks that schools can have multiple units. I'm wondering if that can be clarified. And maybe it's not, you know, it wouldn't be done here but – but that seemed to be, kind of, throughout the proposal, and I assume we're talking about CREMs that involve two separate schools. Then that's really just two units within the school. Is that correct?

PAOLILLO: Right. We are – because that's what this proposal pertains to, Tom. As to whether this particular language can be clarified I don't think it can, and the reason being that if you go through our various documents, our constitution and the like, there is this word "unit" which is used to refer to structural, organizational things, which are in some way independent, and then sometimes they are schools and sometimes they are not. And other places you will find "units" being used in different ways. It's – I think we can only, at – at – at this, you know, with this – with this policy understand that the policy is about what it's about, which is things that happen across schools and that, you know, things like the language of "unit" can only be made clear in practice and not really in – in the – in the actual text.

SHERMAN: Okay, other comments? Questions? Okay, can we then vote on this set of amendments? Okay, all in favor of the amendments? Opposed? Okay. [Vote passes unanimously] Thank you. Yes, Tom?

GIERYN: I – I – I jumped the gun. I was going to propose another amendment. You have a list, follow the list.

SHERMAN: Okay, I – I was going to call on Jeff Hass next because he –

HASS: I would defer to, Tom. Mine is short.

SHERMAN: You will both be heard, so there's no gain in being nice.

GIERYN: One of the issues that we discussed at the last meeting and really reached no resolution on was how to reckon materially affected faculty members, and I – I – we can either leave it vague which is one possibility and allow those who are involved in dealing with CREMs to decide. There is, however, language that gives a little color to "materially affected" and that is in section II.C. in the second paragraph of II.C., when it says when the CREM Standing Committee is responding to a *prima facie* case, that second sentence says, "The CREM Standing Committee will consider issues including but not limited to: widespread curricular changes that affect schools across" – I have changed it to schools, but it's units – "intellectual organization of multiple units, and budgetary impacts on other units." I'd like to make the argument that this is a bit too expansive especially if you throw in budgetary implications, although I can see why the

faculty would be interested in CREMs that have budgetary implications. I do not think that should be a criteria for deciding who among faculty, or which units are materially affected. So what I would like to do is propose an addition to Section I. It would become “F.” and Craig has a – a number on it, but I’m not going to wait. It might work. It might not. May I read it?

SHERMAN: Yes, please.

GIERYN: It’s an attempt to define what “materially affected” means. “‘Materially affected’ faculty members, sometimes referred to as ‘substantially and immediately affected,’ shall refer to (i) all faculty members whose locus of appointment in a department or school, if departmentalized [sic], will be immediately changed by the CREM initiative, and (ii) all faculty members in a department or school (if non-departmentalized) where 25% or more of the faculty would have their locus of appointments immediately changed by the CREM initiative.” This may be too restrictive. It moves certainly away from the expansive definition of anybody affected. [Gieryn refers to the scrolling content on the screen] Uhh... keep going...

[Multiple Indistinct Comments]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: That’s it!

GIERYN: Good enough.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Make it bigger!

GIERYN: I’m proposing this as a possibility for you all to consider as a way out of that. It may not be workable. There are issues for example, what about a partial FTE? Well, okay, any FTE. The language of appointment is in common parlance in the same way that John was talking about unit being the common parlance even though it’s a bit vague we use it. Same with appointment. It’s like a line. Does it translate directly into FTE? Usually. Does it translate into a tenure home for tenure eligible faculty? Usually, but not always. So we – we have to sort that out but it’s an attempt.

GERSHON: Tom, can I ask about a typo up there?

GIERYN: Yes. It’s doubled. I realize it.

GERSHON: Right, okay. So, “...where are 25% or more of the faculty would have...”

GIERYN: Yeah, I – I just repeated the thing.

GERSHON: And then I –

GIERYN: And 25% is arbitrary. We can change that. It struck me this is in reponse to somebody over there last time, Steve maybe, said what – that the history department would be affected –

KARTY: Rebecca had that.

GIERYN: – if a quarter of the historians were moved. That’s an attempt to put a number on “affected.”

SHERMAN: Okay, is there a second to the amendment?

SPANG: Second.

SHERMAN: The amendment’s on the floor for discussion.

GERSHON: So can I ask about “immediately?” When – when you have the term “immediately” what are you thinking about this? I mean, so because – because I’m concerned that maybe six months later someone comes up. So – I – I actually thought this was a very elegant solution, but “immediately” is something I would [comment indistinct].

GIERYN: I – I think we’re at the – at the limits of precision [laughter], but I see your concern.

GERSHON: Okay.

GROTH: So is it immediacy in terms of clock time or immediacy in terms of consequent?

GIERYN: I – I – I think in my mind the – the objective was if there are discussions, even in an early stage that somebody is to likely to move that would constitute “immediately.” I – I think the idea that somebody would stand up and say, ‘I think I’m materially affected because of the possibility of six months or ten years down the line moving,’ that becomes less immediate. But I appreciate that that does not add much precision to the word. If you want to delete the word it would be fine with me. I thought we might need something. I don’t know.

SHERMAN: Yes, Herb?

TERRY: Tom, do you mean to say immediately changed by the CREM initiative or do you mean to say changed by the CREM initiative if adopted?

GIERYN: Yeah [comment indistinct]

SPANG: By the CREM?

TERRY: By the CREM. Yeah.

GIERYN: By the CREM, yeah.

MCCLOSKEY: Right.

SHERMAN: Jonathan?

KARTY: Does the term “faculty” refer only to those who are tenured or non-tenure-track as well?

GIERYN: The – the loosest possible, that’s why I tried to – yeah.

KARTY: Thank you.

GIERYN: The most expansive – academic appointees – is what I really mean –

KARTY: That includes lecturer?

GIERYN: – and the faculty is defined in multiple ways in different places. In this policy here I think it’s defined expansively –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Certainly including librarian?

GIERYN: It is –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: That’s “E.”

GIERYN: It is already.

KARTY: Thank you.

SHERMAN: Yes?

SEIGEL: Is the word “immediately” outscribed in this policy?

SIMONS: Yes.

GERSHON: Yes.

SIMONS: Yes.

GERSHON: Yes it is. I tried to get rid of it, and I may not have caught every time.

SEIGEL: So it is here somewhere still.

GERSHON: I’m not sure.

SPANG: Because if it isn’t then – then

LEVINSON: Then Craig can pull –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: It's in II.C.

SUGIMOTO: It's in I.C.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: It was – yeah – maybe it was...

SHERMAN: Okay, so are – are we ready to –

GIERYN: The – the amendment really had two parts, which is why I began with that section, under II.C. in the second paragraph. I would like as part of this – and you may want to separate the vote – but I would recommend we remove the second sentence in its entirety. The one stating, “The CREM standing committee will consider issues including, but...” I – I – I would propose deleting that because it offers a competing – potentially competing – definition, and in fact a completely different set of criteria for just citing “materially affected.” In other words, I’m offering the other language as a replacement for that.

SPANG: Yeah.

SHERMAN: Cassidy?

SUGIMOTO: To respond to that, what that’s defining is actually what are affected units not affected individuals, and yours is applying to affected individuals whereas that statement is affected units.

GIERYN: My affected units are the 25%. If you’ve got 25% of your faculty moving you’re affected. I didn’t want to get into these other characteristics. That’s my proposal.

SHERMAN: Jon?

SIMONS: I’m not – I’m just coming late but I had the chance to see this amendment before I came in and I’m slightly confused. And from – from our previous discussion – I have been present – people were uncomfortable with the idea that there were people who were not really going to get into this newly reorganized unit or review. But – but would have the opportunity to sort of block it. So I’m thinking about what’d be the case were there’s 26% of people in the school, obviously the school has concerns about this group of people leaving, but there could be other people who’d, other than that, they have very little intellectual interest in what the new unit is going to be up to, but they would then be given [comment indistinct]. Was that the intention?

GIERYN: Yeah, although I specified here department, or school if it is departmentalized to prevent say the College of Arts and Sciences. You’d never get a quarter of the College... Well,

maybe. [laughter] Yeah, that's the intent, and I was persuaded by the argument from across the way that units are affected if sizeable numbers of their faculty are moved. To me that strikes me as something on which the history department, which was the example, as a whole should have a say.

SHERMAN: Brad?

LEVINSON: I think that I'm not going to vote in favor of this amendment. I had arrived at a level of comfort with the phrasing of "materially and substantially affected," and kind of faith in the wisdom of the future provost and committee in interpreting that phrase. I think it's in part because I don't want to define what "materially and substantially affected" means strictly in terms of lines. I think there are a lot of other scenarios in which one could argue that one's being materially and substantially affected in terms of one's teaching load, in the creation or a new program or a new unit, [comment indistinct] new course has been created and essentially cut the rug under out – out from under one – one's own kind of teaching load in one's own department. I'd rather leave it to – to those actors on that committee, the provost, to really allow people to make claims about how they feel they are being materially and substantially affected, quite aside from I think that the inherent problem in trying to put a numerical – to try to put a number on a percentage and – and – and having that be – getting to the issue of actually counting how many people are actually going to be affected or not in terms of their lines.

GIERYN: Brad, you might be right. I – our provost is not with us. Needless to say, she and I have talked. She's also talked with a number of other people. I'm trying to find a real mean that – that could allow many of the members of the Council to vote in favor of this policy, and much of the concern, as most of you know who are tracking, comes from the deans who are deeply concerned about an expansion of the faculty defined as "materially affected." That might make it very difficult for them to move forward, even in concert with another dean or chair in another school on a CREM initiative. I – I don't know if this is the way that would solve – I can't speak for the deans – I wouldn't pretend to, but my sense is that deans are more than willing to have "affected" – in this definition – "faculty" be involved and vote. Remember we're talking about voting rather than the more expansive one which I think is a tripwire right now for a lot of their opposition to the existing policy.

SHERMAN: Jamie?

PRENKERT: It strikes me – I mean, I like this approach better than leaving it un – completely undefined because I think that completely kicks the can down the road to strategic opposition and – and a lack of clarity that I think would be helped by this. But I'm struck by the fact that I'm not sure that when the policy refers to affected faculty in – in the various different ways

that it refers to that, that it actually means the same population of faculty at each stage of the project, such that the last stage, approving the actual plan, seems to me that that's not the same universe of people who have an interest as the people who are taking a look at the *prima facie* case, and so I think that there's maybe a difference between interested faculty at the early stage and "affected" faculty at the later stage.

GIERYN: I intend "materially affected" this way to be pertinent to both. I think the interested parties will be much bigger and to the extent that – that size allows should be involved in the process. The question was the vote, and that's what...

SHERMAN: Cassidy and then John.

SUGIMOTO: I – I have a question for you Tom because if they go together I am afraid I would vote against the second amendment, and if your concern is really the budgetary part I'd ask whether you would be willing to remove that but keep the first two. The first two I think fall under the legislative authority of the faculty, the third is not. So on those terms I can see removing "budgetary." Would you be willing to remove just that but keep the other two parts of that same –

GIERYN: Yes.

SHERMAN: John?

PAOLILLO: I wanted to ask for a clarification of the amendment. Are you, Tom, moving merely the addition of section "F." or are you also moving that there be changes in language to section I.C.? Because there was discussion of that and I was just not sure what we're...

GIERYN: I don't know. I had it slotted in as "F." and intended to apply to anywhere the wording "materially affected" or "substantially and immediately" would come into play. Maybe we want to take out the "substantially and immediately" to allow for that broader group to be involved.

PAOLILLO: Wasn't there somewhere – there was a sentence you said we would remove?

KARTY: That's in II.C.

[Multiple Indistinct Comments]

GIERYN: That's the one Cassidy just referred to.

SUGIMOTO: II.C., second paragraph.

GIERYN: That was in II.C. second paragraph, and all we're going to take out is "...budgetary impacts..."

SHERMAN: Okay, so do you want to, Tom, then make clear what the amendment is now that we're voting on?

ROBINSON: Could we put the word up?

GIERYN: We'll – we'll correct the typo. So the – the only change is to add an "F." here, which defines – yeah. And by the way, the rest of this is not the policy. It's my scribbles, so please ignore it. But that's it – take out "substantially and materially affected," that pair in parentheses goes, take out the double language of "the faculty," the rest would stay, Ilana, unless you want to take out –

GERSHON: I actually just want to take out "immediately" in the change.

GIERYN: Okay, I am okay with that.

[Multiple indistinct comments]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: To do this quickly, maybe we [comment indistinct]

TERRY: No. [laughter]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The whole parenthesis.

FISHER: The whole parenthesis.

SHERMAN: I – I think we've got it.

GIERYN: Yeah, I want –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Leave it, Craig.

GIERYN: We're going to take out the paren, take out the "immediately."

TERRY: There.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

[Various cheers]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And "immediately."

SHERMAN: Well, we...

GROTH: Would that require an amendment to this amendment?

GIERYN: No, I'm proposing this as the amendment.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

GIERYN: And then take out the double language of "the faculty."

MCMANUS: Double of "the faculty."

SHERMAN: Well, we can – let's – let's vote on this without waiting for it to disappear. We have a limited time for this. Yes, Herb?

TERRY: Could you agree, Tom to drop the language about budgetary affect? But the committee could still consider budgetary affect because what this says is that they should consider issues including but not limited to that.

GIERYN: I thought about that, Herb, and if you want to push, leave it. My concern is that the voting, the folks who would vote at the end of the day and in particular vote on the final version would be following this definition, and would not be someone who claimed to affected in a budgetary way, which would probably be the entire faculty in for some proposals.

TERRY: Okay, and I can agree with that.

GIERYN: If that's our understanding...

TERRY: I would simply like for the ability of the CREM committee to consider in its response to the *prima facie* case, whatever it thinks is relevant, and this language does that.

SPANG: Yeah.

SHERMAN: Yeah, Micol?

SEIGEL: Just a question. What is the opinion of the proposers on this amendment?

GERSHON: [indistinct comment]

SIMONS: Yeah, well, I'm good.

SHERMAN: Okay, then let's vote on it. All in favor? [32] Opposed? [3]

DETHLOFF: Abstentions.

SHERMAN: Abstentions? [2] The amendment passes. We move to the next proposed amendment from Jeff Hass.

HASS: Great. Thanks, Jim, and I have faith in Craig to get this up on the screen, but my amendment involves section I.C., paragraph two. I'd like to get a little bit more of a definition for the CREM standing committee to make sure that it has a robust and rotating population that's broadly representative, so after the sentence I propose, "No more than one member shall be appointed concurrently from any single academic unit..." and magically, I define what unit means –

FISHER: Can you tell us how you're defining it? I don't – I haven't read that document.
[laughter]

HASS: There's a long – my favorite is unit 99 – but there's a long list of them. And, "Each member shall serve for a term of two years and may not serve consecutive terms." I think this is important because whether people have had favorable or unfavorable experiences, I think just getting wide representation would be great. I'm not going to propose another amendment to this paragraph, but if we do this the fact that we're eliminating faculty if they are at all related to a particular CREM, if there are multiple CREMs on the table at the same time, we may not have a standing committee left and so the question is if we want to have them recuse themselves rather than be fully removed in cases where, you know, the entire campus may be involved and, you know, we'll pull friends. So this is my amendment, have at it.

FISHER: I realize I was out of order but I really do have the question what does "unit" mean in that document rather than having me go look it up?

HASS: It – it lists all of the titles you're seeing on our –

FISHER: So Arts & Sciences "G" would be my unit, so my unit would be Math, Physics, Statistics and Astronomy, I think. No, no, not Statistics. Something close to that. Those of us in the Arts & Sciences with these – with these funny titles don't always –

HASS: Right. Until we – until we get to the next matter on the agenda where all the units are named. But, yeah. Right now you are unit "G."

FISHER: Unit "G." As long as I understand it.

SHERMAN: Dennis?

GROTH: This is just a mechanic thing.

HASS: Right.

GROTH: Would you consider something at the entry phase something where some people might serve just a single year?

HASS: Yeah, absolutely.

GROTH: And so that you – you’re not –

HASS: Right, you can stagger.

GROTH: Yeah.

SHERMAN: Brad?

LEVINSON: Actually, I – I am wondering whether – whether it would be acceptable to actually say that no more – “to serve no more than two consecutive terms,” because I’m concerned about the learning curve involved within this committee and there being an advantage to having some of us who, you know, [comment indistinct]

HASS: You’re welcome to make an amendment. I’m – I’m happy with this now because of the – the guidance that I think would be there from the beginning, but, you know, we have a lot of experienced people who would probably be –

GERSHON: I – I want to explain some of the logic that went into our creating this, the CREM standing committee as well as is, in fact, Bradley’s logic, which is that we believe we wanted people with historical knowledge of what had happened before. We wanted people with kind of a strong sense of what was going in the university to be able to be providing oversight. So we weren’t saying things like “may not serve consecutive terms,” because we wanted that as a possibility at least. We saw this as a way to rely on historical memory.

HASS: Right. My colleagues can discern what it would be that the committee would be comprised of people mostly with very similar experiences, either very negative or very positive, and we certainly have both –

GERSHON: Right.

HASS: – and just to ensure that – that there not be a block of people that all confront similar circumstances. So if that makes sense.

TERRY: I think we should go ahead and vote on this amendment, but let me point out that the shared governance review does talk about possibly some changes in standing committees and that sort of thing. If this is adopted and shared governance is adopted, then there may have to be some reconciliation later.

LEVINSON: So, if my – my esteemed colleague doesn’t wish to entertain that change, then I just want to say that I will – I will plan to vote against this amendment [comment indistinct] the

identical amendment with the slight change saying that, “cannot serve more than two consecutive terms...”

SHERMAN: Then why don't you introduce an amendment to the amendment and we can vote on it and by the time we vote on what Jeff has...

LEVINSON: I – I propose that we, as a compromise to the positions that Ilana and Hass articulated, that we say “cannot serve more than two consecutive terms.”

SHERMAN: Okay, second?

SEIGEL: Second.

SHERMAN: Okay. Are we ready to vote on this amendment to be amended? All in favor? Opposed? It carries. So we're now extending it to two consecutive terms.

MARSH: Abstentions, I think.

TERRY: Abstentions.

FISHER: There were a couple of abstentions.

GROTH: There's abstentions.

FISHER: Various abstentions.

[Multiple Indistinct Comments]

SHERMAN: Abstentions? It still passes. Okay, are we – we ready to vote on the amended amendment?

ROBINSON: Can I just ask how – how big is the CREM committee? [comment indistinct]

HASS: The other – the other standing committees are what? Eight to ten people? So that's kind of what I had in mind when I was thinking about this wording –

SIMONS: The Nomination Committee decides.

TERRY: Behind you.

FISHER: Ted – Ted wants to say something.

MILLER: If I could just make a friendly suggestion here, I mean, these units you're talking about are not academic units. I mean these are BFC election units.

HASS: Correct.

MILLER: Academic unit I think just is not appropriate in this context.

TERRY: It should say, “BFC election unit.”

HASS: I’m happy to change that to BFC unit or whatever we consider.

SHERMAN: John?

PAOLILLO: I’m – I’m personally a little bit uncomfortable with making BFC election units be the units of representation for the CREM committee. They might work for purposes of BFC representation, but I think that BFC representatives understand these units very poorly, and they are not necessarily motivated by strong academic coherence and for that reason I think that one would have to really seek a different principle, particularly when you’re looking at reorganization of academic – actual academic units.

MCCLOSKEY: Can I ask a quick – I just had a question? Just for John – ?

REISING: Coming from the “Other” units I would support John’s – [Holds up name card with designation “Other Bloomington Faculty,” laughter]

SHERMAN: I just want to remind everyone that we have a time limit, and if you really want to vote on this item I will stick the way Lauren would, and if there is still more and more and more discussion we’re not going to get to it. So keep that in mind.

RUTKOWSKI: A point of information. What’s the process by which we could initiate a paper ballot assuming that we make it to a vote today?

SANDERS: It just requires – somebody needs to move that there be a ballot vote, and it requires – and it’s non-debatable – and it requires a majority vote to do the vote on the substantive issue like that.

RUTKOWSKI: Can I move to – can I move to initiate a paper ballot, assuming that we make it to a vote?

SANDERS: It’s about the amendment, because we still haven’t adopted the amendment yet. So we need to dispose of this first.

HASS: I’m – I’m happy to entertain any wording for units that would ensure diversity. I was concerned if I just put “unit” COAS would be considered one unit and not highly represented. I don’t come from COAS, so not – not my problem, but if anyone has a better way of defining a diversity of units across the campus I’m happy to entertain it.

SUGIMOTO: Could we just remove the parenthetical and keep to the single academic unit?

FISHER: And that allows it to be either school or department depending on the instance?

GIERYN: Yeah.

FISHER: Is that what you are meaning?

SUGIMOTO: And depending on the type of CREM.

GIERYN: Ordinarily if the school is not departmentalized, it's the school. If it is, the unit becomes – for the purposes of this – the department. So if it's the College, Math and Physics could have two people in the CREM.

SPANG: Right.

SHERMAN: Is there a wording change or are we voting on it as is?

HERRERA: I have [comment indistinct] to the wording. If – with this amendment are you also considering not just the – like all the – all the ranks? If there is any, for example, influence for an NTT or it's just one representative from one academic unit. It doesn't matter if it's NTT or any rank.

HASS: Correct, and that would be up to the Nomination Committee.

HERRERA: So it would be important to clarify that because if the Nomination Committee doesn't select an individual...

HASS: [comment indistinct] that would be at the discretion of what sort of rank diversity the nominating committee would want, but that's the same with the other standing committees as well.

SHERMAN: Rae?

GREINER: I just want to go back to Cassidy's suggestion. Are we – did we settle that or is that still up in the air?

SHERMAN: The what?

GREINER: The suggestion to remove the parenthetical.

HASS: That's fine by me.

GREINER: Okay.

FISHER: If it's fine by him. Do we have to make that a formal amendment to the amendment or can we –

GIERYN: No, let's just -

HASS: No, I – I remove. I hereby remove the [comment indistinct] [laughter] and I'm happy to go to a vote.

FISHER: I'm happy that you're happy.

SHERMAN: John?

PAOLILLO: I would like to move the previous question up to the main proposal on the floor to make sure that we need to vote.

SPANG: What?

SANDERS: I think that requires two-thirds and it's non-debatable. It's essentially calling the question.

HASS: I didn't hear what you said.

SEIGEL: Point of information. How much time is left of our 45 minutes?

SANDERS: If we stick to an allotted 40 – I looked at the clock. I believe we started the debate at 3:40, and so it is now 3:15, so that would be 36 or 37 minutes into a 45 minute period.

[Multiple Indistinct Comments]

SANDERS: I think John's motion, though, would require a second. John, are you moving the whole proposal or just the amendment?

PAOLILLO: Oh, the whole proposal.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

BAILEY: Second.

SANDERS: That requires a second, a two-thirds vote, and it's non-debatable.

GIERYN: What about the amendment?

PAOLILLO: The [comment indistinct] has to be handled first and then the...

SANDERS: Yeah.

[Multiple Indistinct Comments]

FISHER: And – and you just had a second at –

BAILEY: Second.

RUTKOWSKI: Now, would be a good point to – to initiate a paper ballot?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: No, no, no. We have to vote on the amendment first.

[Multiple Indistinct Comments]

RUTKOWSKI: Okay, but the next – the next – the next step is –

SHERMAN: We need to deal with the amendment that's on the floor right now. Nothing has replaced it.

RUTKOWSKI: But my understanding is the next step is to vote.

SHERMAN: If people want to vote on the amendment, we will vote on the amendment.

FISHER: Wait, wait, John just – John just made a procedural motion whereby we now vote up or down two-thirds to vote first on the amendment and then on the full thing, and I think – If I'm understanding Steve correctly, we have got to have that two-thirds vote immediately.

SANDERS: We have to – okay, I misunderstood. We have to dispose of the amendment. John is – John is free to move the previous question, that is, to end debate on the amendment, which requires a two-thirds vote, then we would vote on the amendment. Then he's free to also move the previous question on the overall proposal, but something affecting the overall proposal can't take precedence while an amendment is on the floor.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I think that we're ready to vote on the amendment, therefore
[comment indistinct]

[Multiple Indistinct Comments]

SPANG: I'm missing my notes – I lost track of whether there is a definition of unit in the amendment.

FISHER: No, that's a parenthetical.

SHERMAN: All in favor of the amendment?

DETHLOFF: Opposed?

SHERMAN: Opposed? Abstain? The amendment passes.

LEVINSON: Can I – can I advise the secretary that the language was never changed, but as my understanding is the amendment –

SPANG: Yes.

LEVINSON: – that was just passed –

SPANG: Yeah, yes.

LEVINSON: – is “may not serve for more than two –”

SPANG: Yes, yep.

HASS: “...two consecutive terms.”

SPANG: Yes, that one I have.

SHERMAN: Okay, are we moving? Where are we moving? [laughter]

[Multiple Indistinct comments]

RUTKOWSKI: I’d like to move to initiate a paper ballot.

SANDERS: To address that, let me suggest that if someone is making a motion to end debate, move the previous question, that takes two-thirds and it’s not debatable. We should dispose of that and then the proposal about how – if it’s clear we’re going to take a vote – then a motion about how the vote should be conducted should be entertained. But first we should dispose of the question of whether we are essentially ending debate or not.

SHERMAN: Since it’s non discussable. We can’t discuss it. [laughter]

SANDERS: It’s – it’s been – it’s been moved and seconded. Is there a second?

RUTKOWSKI: Second.

SHERMAN: All in favor? Opposed?

SANDERS: It requires two-thirds.

DETHLOFF: It’s got two-thirds.

SPANG: Are you sure, Craig? Abstentions?

DETHLOFF: We need 36. I have 48 people here.

SPANG: But did everybody vote?

DETHLOFF: We need to hear abstentions, too.

SHERMAN: Abstentions?

SPANG: What are the numbers?

DETHLOFF: We have right now 40 in favor, 6 opposed, 2 abstentions.

SPANG: There were more than 6 opposed.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: There were two up here who might not have gotten counted.

FISHER: If you add two more it is not going to change back from being –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah, if the threshold's 36...

FISHER: if we have 40 in favor that is almost two-thirds of the entire body even if everyone was here.

DETHLOFF: Let's see the opposed again, just to be sure.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Do you all want to keep talking?

[Multiple Indistinct Comments]

RUTKOWSKI: I'd like –

SHERMAN: Please.

RUTKOWSKI: – to move to initiate a paper ballot for this vote?

TRIX: What – can – can – can I ask you why?

RUTKOWSKI: Well, as a junior faculty I felt a lot of pressure given the controversial nature of this proposal, and it would give me security to vote my conscience on the vote.

TRIX: But – but then we're not going to find out what's going to happen.

FISHER: No, we'll find out what's happened. Craig will count the votes.

TRIX: [comment indistinct] right there. That will make it [comment indistinct]

PAOLILLO: Does that require a second?

MULTIPLE UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: Second.

[Multiple Indistinct Comments]

SANDERS: That's what I'm checking.

[Multiple Indistinct Comments]

SHERMAN: It is not debatable. All in favor?

[Multiple Indistinct Comment]

SHERMAN: Paper ballot.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

SHERMAN: All in favor?

TRIX: I – I'm sorry what we're – ?

GRAY: We're voting about –

DETHLOFF: Paper ballot.

GRAY: – the ballot.

FISHER: All in favor of a paper ballot.

TRIX: In favor of it, because then –

DETHLOFF: I'd like to see opposed.

SHERMAN: Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, we'll have a paper ballot.

DETHLOFF: We have 38. We need 32.

SHERMAN: But it's – it's majority.

SANDERS: A simple majority vote.

[Multiple Indistinct Comments]

FISHER: Could I ask a question on the paper ballot? Are we going to be labelling by them names?

[Multiple Indistinct Comments]

SHERMAN: Before you hand them out, Craig – I'm not sure how this works most effectively and efficiently. I think you should – I think you should mark – should mark each one to be the ballot card and hand one out to each member

[Multiple Indistinct Comments as the Ballots Are Handed Out]

BOSE: Can you guys explain what we are voting on and are we –

SPANG: We are voting on the entire policy.

BOSE: And are we just saying yes or no...?

SHERMAN: As amended today.

SPANG: As amended today, yes or no.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Rebecca.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Or abstain.

SHERMAN: Or abstain.

SPANG: Yes, no, or abstain. What we are still researching is a relationship between a paper ballot and a secret ballot.

SANDERS: So I – I – I mean my reading of *Robert's Rules* is that it is not essential that people's own names be on the ballot as long as there are reasonable procedures to be sure that no one has voted twice or is casting a vote who is not eligible to vote. So if we're confident that Craig's only given pieces of paper to people who are actually eligible to vote and were elected. If we're confident that no one has, you know, used two pieces of paper or something like that, then I don't see any mandate that names have to be on the ballot – on the individual ballots. The overriding thing is we need to be confident of our security belts.

MCCLOSKEY: I'm confident in Craig.

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Seconded. [laughter]

[Multiple Indistinct Comments]

SANDERS: So – so, I mean –

SHERMAN: Just – I think if you write "yes," "no," or "abstain," –

SANDERS: It's a "yes," "no," –

SHERMAN: – you don't have to put your name on it, there's nothing preventing you from doing – if you want to put your name it, then do.

[Multiple Indistinct Comments as the Ballots Are Collected]

SHERMAN: If you're – if you've indicated your yes, no, or abstain, just fold your card and Craig will pick them up.

KARTY: Parliamentarian, does an abstention – is this carried by one half positive majority or a plurality of the votes cast either way? In other words, do we need 24 yes's or do we need if 12 abstained do we need 19 yes's?

SANDERS: No, you would need a majority of those voting, plus one of those –

KARTY: So we would need 25 yes votes. Period. And it's a one-half majority vote.

FISHER: Well, you also have the option of not voting and not putting your ballot in the box, you know, if you want to abstain in that way you can.

[Multiple Indistinct Comments]

SHERMAN: Okay, Craig...

KARTY: But does a non-vote...

[Multiple Indistinct Comments while the Ballots Are Counted]

SHERMAN: I do want to say that for the future ending debate on an issue was a really, really important vote. There were a number of other amendments that came to me, and people who asked to speak and did not get a chance. It would have improved what was there, but we ended debate. So it's easy to say, 'Let's just end the debate and vote,' but if we want full participation and inclusion, doing this ends it.

SUGIMOTO: Can I just add that all policies are always open for amendments? So if there are amendments that people want to bring in – in future semesters, then feel free to do so in the first fall semester.

AGENDA ITEM 7: SHARED GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SHERMAN: Alright. Then we're moving on to the next item on the agenda which is – Herb, do you want to introduce it or talk more about it? [comment indistinct] before the recommendation?

TERRY: I think they're getting close, but they interrupt me when we get there. Let me explain that there are three things that are listed on the agenda for the Council to consider today. The first circular, B36-2015 [sic] is titled, "Principles for [sic] Shared Governance." We are proposing that, the Faculty Affairs Committee and the subcommittee are proposing, that that be adopted by this Council. The second is B38-2015. That's the long list of recommended actions directly

developed by the subcommittee and recommended by the subcommittee on the Faculty Affairs Committee that we believe will enhance shared governance at the Bloomington campus. We are recommending B38-2015 be adopted by this Council. If it is adopted, as will be explained the later slide. What you'll be doing is coming to the Executive Committee and saying carry out B38-2015. There are a variety of ways that one could carry that out. 37 and 38 are basically products of the subcommittee. I promised the subcommittee, and – and they can tell if I did it right, that I would produce some document that would explain how you could actually go about implementing 38 if it was adopted. B39 is my version based on experience to how this campus works, who does what, and all of that sort of thing as to a plan that could be used by the Executive Committee to implement what the subcommittee recommended. There may be other ways to do it. So we are not proposing that you adopt B39-2015, but we are proposing that you favor – if 38 passes – sending that to the Executive Committee and say here's a starting point. Here's the way you could go about implementing these proposals.

Quick background. We're not the only campus in the United States where we allow [comment indistinct] for shared governance, okay? So while in a technical sense this began with the strategic plan, which had a group called team faculty, which made recommendations for reinvigorating, I think that is what it – shared governance's at IUB. We're actually part of a national movement, especially of research intensive universities to be honest, that are concerned about the functioning of their shared governance systems and how well they're working, and how engaged [comment indistinct] faculty are. Nonetheless, team faculty made its recommendations, and then strategic plan that Provost Robel finally adopted calls for the BFC to consider those recommendations during, believe it or not, academic year 2015-2016. Lauren changed that date from an earlier draft because [comment indistinct] due to the president's approval of campus drafts on something. There was a delay. We're supposed to review this. The BFC's supposed to review the recommendations in academic year 2015-2016 and recommend any changes. We're ahead of the game because we actually started to do that based on the draft version of the policy. We did that by having the Executive Committee constitute a subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee, review shared governance starting with the team faculty's recommendations. I want to thank every member of that committee. It was a hard working committee. We met a lot. It consisted of people with long experience in – in shared governance here. It consisted of young faculty members in their first semesters at Bloomington. It represented schools on the campus. It represented people who have what we might call a progressive approach to faculty governance or shared governance, and it had people who had opposite approaches. It had people whose experiences were in [comment indistinct] universities. It had people who came to the United States and are unfamiliar with our governance system, and they worked very hard. They did a lot of work for which I am very grateful. We met repeatedly between September 11th and March of 2015 before we gave our

recommendations to the Faculty Affairs Committee on the 9th of March. Met with that committee [comment indistinct].

How did we do our work? The very first thing we did was meet with the members, as many as we could get – we couldn't get them all – of team faculty in order to understand not only what they recommended, but why they recommended it, and what research and process they had followed in making their recommendation. We wanted to make sure we understood what we did. We learned, I think, really we learned, that they – they had an agenda. They had lots of things to do as – as part of the strategic plan and a relevantly short timeframe from the provost to accomplish it. They were constituted and all that they had to report back by December. So they spent some time thinking about shared governance but they didn't have time to do a lot of additional research into it. And to some extent many of their recommendations were based on – on Penn State. We learned that they intended to be provocative, and they were. They provoked this process, alright? And – and they are credited with – with getting things started. We decided to do additional research. I'm very grateful for the committee members for doing that. We tasked two members of the committee to look at every big – CIC institutions, two so there were multiple eyes on the phenomena. We also charged two members to look at the governance systems of every school on the Bloomington campus because team faculty's report recommended a smaller governance body for the campus with a close relationship with policy committees for the schools. We figured we had to – to know that. We certainly examined what they said about themselves, their documents, their constitutions, their governing documents, but in many, many instances members of the committee followed up with faculty of other universities or other schools or faculty of – in other schools on the Bloomington campus. Much of what we recommended does come one way or another out of that research, and in some instances things the team faculty thought were good ideas were things we ultimately decided not to recommend because they had been tried somewhere else and they didn't – at that institution at least – fix the problem they were intended to fix. Let's take size, for example. I think we came to the conclusion that this is about the typical size of a governance body of an institution of our size. There are some out there in CIC that are much larger than this, there are some that I would regard as truly unwieldy, and there are some that are tiny, but they often have different relationships with their schools. So we – we – we studied what was – what was going on elsewhere. I met, once we had developed our recommendations a few weeks ago, with the associate deans of academic affairs at the IUB schools, and it's obvious these associate deans had read our proposals. The principle thing that they raised questions about is probably something that as we go forward in implementing it may be debatable about the role and the power of the BFC. Team faculty recommended an integrated relationship with the school policy committees, and what we learned is that the school policy committees are a mixed bag – how they are elected, how representative they are of faculty, what role administrations play in them, [comment indistinct] varies a lot. When we

met with the associate deans some of them said, 'Why are you going to interfere with our school policy committee? It works well. We should not be forced to change.' If you read the recommendations for how to implement this thing it says we would obviously have to work with the school policy committees to see if we can agree on best practices, but it was very hard to build a faculty council around school policy committees when there was so much debate about whether the school policy committees would meet the best practices if you had best practices. Other than that I have not received much comment, particularly adverse comment, some positive comments about these recommendations that have only been out there for some time. So – and – and I think since the associate deans circling in we're kind of depending on them to take any concerns they had to their deans, although I believe deans were aware of this as well.

The first policy before you today are documents, circular B37-2015, is where we started. [comment indistinct] After a couple early meetings we decided we needed some principles to guide what we were doing, and so a subset of the subcommittee wrote these principles of shared governance to guide our work. What we [comment indistinct] BFC adopt these to guide this Council and others on this campus, including the policy committees of the schools in their work in shared governance going forward. What status did that have? Tom or somebody does – how do we put this in the Academic Guide? Well, it's not a policy. It's no more of a policy than President McRobbie's Principles of Excellence is a policy. The president published the Principles of Excellence, which became the basis of the university's bicentennial plan, and the campus plan as objectives, goals, broad goals, broad reasons for doing this. This is what we tried to do here is write a document that says this is why we have shared governance, and some of what we think are the most important characteristics of it. So that's what we would propose you do today: adopt this thing, this statement of principles for shared governance on the campus. I actually think we probably will do best if we divide these issues and vote on that separately from 38-2015. That is based on the principles. We started looking back, but we tried to include – tried other things that – that grew from our experience with what works and what doesn't. One of the characteristics of team faculty was there were not too many people on that team who had much experience with the BFC, a good and a bad point. Good to bring fresh eyes but maybe left out some of the unique characteristics of Bloomington and [comment indistinct] of shared governance here. What the subcommittee I think overwhelmingly concluded was that we had a halfway decent constitution, we compared it to other constitutions of other CIC institutions, that we had quite a number of policies that sometimes we [comment indistinct] weren't very good at enforcing or following, that if they were followed with substantially improved shared governance, and I think it's fair to say that what we decided to do was try to make the system we have work better rather than invent some totally new system, and we concluded that nobody had invented the perfect system and there wasn't a model out there for us to just adopt wholesale in safety.

That brings us to the specific recommendations in B38-2015. We'll talk about those in a moment. I trust that you've studied them. You've probably got your favorite one on top now. That's good. We propose that that be adopted by the BFC, get commended to this year's and next year's Executive Committee for implementation, and obviously if you make amendments to this one today the amended document is what would be sent. And finally there's this thing that I wrote saying, 'Okay, let's assume all the proposals are adopted, how would you go about implementing them?' It's important to remember that some of the things can be done by this Council. We could change our bylaws. We could adopt amendments to the constitution, but not for faculty welfare. But there are other things that this group recommends that aren't in our control. I – I'll be honest with you I've started in one of them already just because it's far beyond us. We recommended that the chair of the BFC essentially join the president's Academic Leadership Council. The Academic Leadership Council is identified as the principle academic leaders of Indiana University. That's a presidential decision as to who serves on the Academic Leadership Council and who doesn't. All we could do would be to pass a resolution saying it would be a good idea, President McRobbie, if you would include the president of the BFC in their capacity as one of the co-chairs of the UFC on the ALC. We similarly recommended that the president of the BFC should meet with the campus vice provost, the deans, when the provost calls those groups to meet together. I did hear from Lauren that that would be an awful lot of meetings. It's under her control anyway. The implementation document says the BFC should ask and sit down and work with the provost and try to figure out how to improve the relationship between the BFC, the vice provosts, and the deans. If that means meeting with them every time they get together, surely they have a name for that group exactly except the vice provosts and the deans, that can be worked out, but that's not under our control any way. All we can do is ask for it. So what the implementation document does is it tries to breakdown all the recommendations and say here's how you go about doing this, and it would charge the UF – the BFC next over the summer – people were not excited that they would have summer work to do [laughter], including our new president – soon to be our new president. But it would charge them at getting going on this which would mean, guess what? We would not only make recommendations to the campus in 2015-2016, we might actually get it done being very nimble. So – it's an inside joke.

So in any event, here's some of the things that that thing does. Some require a BFC constitutional amendment, but not many. But that requires us recommending the constitution be amended for the IUB faculty for a vote. We control our bylaws. So all it takes to change the bylaws to implement this is for some group to specifically write the language to accomplish the objectives in the second document, bring it back here to next year's Council, say let's adopt this set of amendments to the bylaws. Some require the modification of existing policies. I think the one that may be the closest there is that – that we proposed for example that there be review on a periodic basis of campus administrators, deans, and vice provosts, and their offices.

There's a very good reason for that. We do currently require review of administrators, but if they don't serve their own term – their term to a conclusion they never get reviewed and neither does their office. Now, they often leave for good reason. Some, for example, leaves to be provost somewhere else and this sort of thing, but they have a habit around here of – of not completing their terms or getting reviewed, or they take on team faculty and we extend their terms almost never having been reviewed. It happens. So what we're proposing is change that. Well, that's all written in the document of policy we have to change. So that would mean coming back to the Council next year [comment indistinct] to carry that out. And some are just things the BFC Executive Committee or the staff can do. We recommend manuals and education in various ways of the faculty and of the members of the BFC. I think those can be written by the Executive Committee and the staff, and don't have to be debated line by line with the BFC and approved, but maybe the BFC Executive Committee will decide differently. My implementation document is simply a recommendation. This could probably be done by the BFC Executive Committee or the [comment indistinct] they want to bring it back. [comment indistinct] method of what we would accomplish. So that's the package of things that we're bringing to you today. We'll see if Cassidy on the behalf of the FAC has anything else to add, and then we take the questions.

SUGIMOTO: Herb has been thorough, as always, so I don't think there is much more for me to say except that the Faculty Affairs Committee endorses both principles here and tasks the Executive Committee with implementation, and I think I'll just say personally as the incoming president, I appreciate the charge. And that is what this is. This is a charge for the BFC for next year, and I think that that's exciting. I would urge you to vote in favor of it.

TERRY: So?

SHERMAN: Okay, time for discussion. Frances?

TRIX: Yeah, I – I read in here that there was a budget for the BFC, too. Do you want to mention something there?

TERRY: Yeah, I will. We had a great difficulty with that because quite a number of things that are recommended in here can't be done without additional resources. We – we learned that while some CIC institutions run their shared governance bodies on about the same shoestring budget as we do, that others have better budgets. I mean, for example, we proposed, as team faculty did, various kinds of websites and electronic means of keeping the faculty aware of what we're doing. We run with Craig and how many students?

DETHLOFF: Two.

TERRY: Full time?

DETHLOFF: Half time.

TERRY: Half time. Okay. That's it. The idea of this being a responsibility center may not mean too much to some of you, but it's an important one. Under our system of budgeting, there are academic responsibility centers, generally the schools. They get a share of the state appropriation. They get to keep their indirect cost recovery, and they get an – an – an average share of tuition income. This just doesn't get as much money as it would like because it doesn't get the direct proportion of the number of out of state students that we have as a campus average. Obviously this is not a revenue generating responsibility center, but it's more like the library. It's infrastructure that if you want to have a good university you have to support. And we weren't in a position to develop a budget, if you read the implementation document it says do that, besides we're about settle on the campus budget for next year. As soon as the General Assembly leaves Indianapolis we'll formulate the budget because the fiscal year starts July 1. We have to do it. We can get that next year, but it is important to stress that – that at one point it was the first thing in the document. The thing is – this doesn't sound like – we're – we're requesting money and things for ourselves before we get to what we want to do. All of those things we control. It is crucial that we have a budget, a budget also makes you accountable, and I am a proponent of RCM to be honest. And RCM makes people accountable, and this would make us accountable, yeah.

TRIX: But I'm especially interested in committees that end up working over the summer and I could really see that because that's – that's rough to –

TERRY: It's in here.

TRIX: Yeah. No, I noticed that –

TERRY: And – and – and also in here is the idea that we need to look – again looking at the shared governance mechanisms in schools. We look at the – we look somehow at the support of the schools offer for their – I – I will be honest with you if I were looking ahead and saying what are going to be some of the big issues of this Council next year, it's federal. It – it's how much do we intervene in the behavior of the schools. When can we establish shared – best practices, that's – and we got into that a little bit here with – with CREMs. And – and that's a tough issue, but we addressed it enough to say we need to look at the resources we put behind the faculty component of shared governance. We suggest in here that it could become a part of the salary –

TRIX: And because some Big 10 schools do have –

TERRY: Yes, they do. And – and we borrow a model from the way that some [comment indistinct] to improve that and administrative [comment indistinct]. Again, this turns to the

Executive Committee and says, you may have some discretion in trying to figure out how to achieve this objective, but we have different ways than is done at similar institutions, but this is an objective that this Council, whether it endorses the second of these two documents would say is important to pursue it.

SHERMAN: Sharlene?

NEWMAN: I have a couple questions. What – what – what are we – are we voting on – on adopting these?

TERRY: Voting on the principles.

NEWMAN: Okay.

TERRY: Voting on the resolution, on the document that lists the objectives. The second one.

NEWMAN: Okay.

[Multiple Indistinct Comments]

TERRY: 38

NEWMAN: Okay. So I have a question about 38 and it's – it's 9.a. on the back –

BOSE: Sharlene, are you on 38?

NEWMAN: 38. 9.a.

TERRY: "...contribute to the base salary of BFC officers, Executive Committee..."

NEWMAN: So I was interested in finding out why it was suggested that we contribute to the base salary as opposed to a supplement. So there are a lot of people who serve by being directors and things or... They – they don't get increases in their base salary, they get a supplement. So why the sup – the base salary as opposed to a supplement? And if you go base salary then shouldn't that be across the board, across the campus where everyone's base salary is impacted by serving as opposed to just this one committee – or [comment indistinct]?

TERRY: Everyone's base salary ought to be affected by teaching, and research, and service. There are three components. I think we recommended this because we discovered that there were a number of units around here that penalized people who took on very responsible positions, and we wanted the Executive Committee – basically asked the question can we find ways, as we do for administrators, for those who take on, the language we chose, "substantial service obligations," to not fall behind in terms of units by and large [comment indistinct] research and creative activity. It's very hard to attract people to serve in this Council if they

know that they're going to suffer a financial hit in the long run because their base salary will not be [comment indistinct] for doing it. So that's why we did it. We gave them the [comment indistinct] in salary policies [comment indistinct] advise those that set salaries to think this one through.

MCCLOSKEY: Yeah, I have a –

TERRY: Jim, you – you need to recognize [comment indistinct] –

SHERMAN: Go ahead, Laura. Go ahead.

MCCLOSKEY: So I have a – I want to follow up on Sharlene's question about [comment indistinct] in a FAC that I was attending [comment indistinct] brought up concerns about it, and I was actually at that meeting critical of the idea of any compensation for somebody who we elected service because, and there are, there – you know, you can argue I suppose for/against it, but my reasons against it would be first of all you want the kind of person who would do it not for pay, right? It's a kind of catch-22. You don't want people running for office because they're going to get a summer salary or they're going to get 10% or 20% of their base covered. So you don't want, I mean that's not, you don't want that to be the motive, and it could become the motive. And the other thing is I felt like it was a bit hegemonic. So it says, you know, gives it to the BFC officers or the committee chairs. So I was privileged to be a subcommittee chair this year, and I can tell you that my colleagues on that committee worked as hard as I did.

TERRY: Yeah.

MCCLOSKEY: And so, you know, I'd be happy to take the money and buy pizza every – every Thursday but, you know, the point is – is not everyone would do that. So – so some of them might keep the money, so I think that that, you know, that doesn't seem fair here. I think it kind of creates a whole – a whole set of values that I'm not sure that this body would necessarily endorse, but it's up to them.

TERRY: Let me explain one thing and that is – this is out of personal experience – at least some of these posts are exceedingly demanding, being the president of this thing is incredibly time consuming. For quite some time the campus theoretically covered release time for a member – person who got elected president. Under Provost Hanson that ended. I think since then it has been a little harder to attract people to [comment indistinct] they know that their predecessors received something. What tended to happen as well [comment indistinct] is the campus was supposed to make [comment indistinct] whole for the people for whom they provided release time [comment indistinct]. David Daleke served as the head of this and got no support whatsoever from the IU School of Medicine. [comment indistinct] Jim?

SHERMAN: So, Herb, there – there are a number of other things that people do with regard to service. They edit major journals, they chair grant study sections of serv – they're incredibly time consuming. That is service as well.

TERRY: And in – in some units you get credit for that.

SHERMAN: But why are we not suggesting that those have the same benefits in terms of base salary or something else? Why – why would we discriminate, carve out, serving as chair of a BFC committee but not serving as a chair of a NIH grant committee?

TERRY: I can answer that, but I want to let other people to discuss –

SPANG: I wanted to speak to that. It's because serving as the chair of an NIN [sic] grant committee at least tangentially is related to your research, and at a research university people are generally rewarded for their research. So if you're editing a journal in your area –

SHERMAN: That falls under service –

SPANG: It does, but it's –

NEWMAN: We're talking about changes to the base salary as opposed to a supplement. Right? So giving someone a supplement for doing it, but changing their base salary which would – will impact their –

TERRY: What I will tell you is that varies by department and school. Because of the federalism of this place we have some units that would count that in base. But we have other units that would not. It varies. What's unique about this, is that it's not service to any school or any department. It's service to the campus, and what we are saying is that sometimes service to the campus gets lost and that makes it hard for us to attract people.

SHERMAN: So I mean the outcome of this in a sense is that if you serve as a committee chair for one year you have that base salary for the rest of your career.

TERRY: No.

SHERMAN: It's not? Base salary is base salary.

TERRY: It's up to this – we're rec – I'd have to dig it out of here – but we are recommending that the details of how we do this comes back to the Council, okay? Because [comment indistinct] broad recommendation possible, we're saying that this one should be pursued

MCCLOSKEY: So – so then how does the base – [comment indistinct] one of the problems with the bass is that it doesn't give a raise to the person. That's why Sharlene's saying this. That's

why people do things for summer salary. They teach summer school for extra money. You give the department 20% of the base salary what are you buying out? Are you buying out so that they're teaching? Are you saying, 'Oh, they don't have to be committees in their department,' but they want to be, you know? So it doesn't make sense really, and it's not an incentive, you know? But I don't think we should have it anyways.

SHERMAN: Steve?

SANDERS: Herb, my understanding of all of this even – even the recommendations as opposed to the principles are, I mean, nothing happens as a result of this vote. These are still things this BFC commends to next year's BFC, and maybe if there's a specific proposal about stipends we'll do it but we are not committing to doing it by voting for this. Is that correct?

TERRY: I – I think that is fundamentally accurate. We – we are – we would be turning to the Executive Committee and saying implement this to the extent you can.

SHERMAN: Right, but does "implement" mean change as well? "Implement" means take what's here and make it work, not change it.

TERRY: To the extent you can. We don't set compensation policies. That's our consultative process, that's not our legislative process.

SANDERS: That – that – that was actually sort of a preamble. But what I really want to ask is about number six. Our constitution lays out broadly what the auth – the constitution of the Bloomington Faculty lays out what the authority of the faculty is in their schools and grants broad authority for various things. Some of these things under six in circular 38 purport to constrain the school policy committees or tell school policy committees you must do something this way or you must not do that. That struck – that and it uses the word, "enforce," as if these are commonly understood policies and prohibitions now. The things under six – at least some of the things under six seem here to me to go well beyond anything that's in the constitution and bylaws and potentially to infringe on the authority of school policy committees. The BFC has never purported to be able to tell schools how they can and cannot do things as long as they stay consistent with broad campus faculty policies. Are we now purporting to say specifically you may not meet with your dean? Or you may – you must have 60% tenured and untenured faculty? And – and – and my colleague – Amy Applegate from the Law School policy committee is here – she was hoping to speak on the last thing, but I hope she might have an opportunity to speak from the perspective of a policy committee. I just want to know what this is, you know, how – do you view these things as mandates or as kind of, 'These are best practices, think about them?'

TERRY: The implementation document acknowledges that this is something you'd have to work out with the school policy committees and see if they agree upon best practices. We do recommend that each school have a faculty policy committee and a budgetary advisory committee. When –

SANDERS: Yeah, but this goes considerably beyond that.

TERRY: Well, it – it sort of does, but it's rooted in team faculty's recommendations. Since team faculty said we should build a campus body that has an organic relationship to the school policies committee, and then people said well some of those meet our standards for what a school policy committee should be, it might be useful to do two things. Gather information about how much variability there is in the school policy committees. We've got that. And second, recommend in the – the implementation plan that you see how far you can go. This is exactly the – the concern that was raised by the associate – by the vice – associate deans, that – that function with what they think is a good school policy model. If we have the authority at least to recommend that every school have a policy committee and a budgetary advisory committee, we probably have the ability to at least recommend that every one of those schools have some characteristics.

SANDERS: Okay, but – I – I – I'm sorry. Just one more question. Would you purport to say if a school doesn't do some of these things they are actually in violation of a campus faculty council policy –

TERRY: No –

SANDERS: – because this uses the word “enforce.”

TERRY: Okay.

SUGIMOTO: If – if –

SHERMAN: John Gibson had his hand up.

GIBSON: Oh, I was just going to reinforce what you were saying by virtue of a specific case in my school, in Music I think we're one of the ones that objected to this.

TERRY: It is.

GIBSON: We have a lot of trouble with “b.” and “d.” specifically. We do have a policy committee. We do have a budgetary advisory committee, but in fact our policy committee has mostly department chairs on it and I don't see how the School of Music could really function without a lot of those people in there. Partly it's because we're kind of also a performing arts

organization, and we really need the advice of these people who are very experienced in these matters. They're very small departments, as well.

SHERMAN: Cassidy?

SUGIMOTO: Just to respond to this, the Faculty Affairs Committee talked at this at great length. 'Wait, what does it mean to actually approve this and are going down through each line?' because not everyone on the Faculty Affairs Committee agrees with every single point that's here. And so the language that we came up with that's at the bottom of your cover letter says, "In voting in favor of these documents..." you're tasking, "the BFC Executive Committee with implementing," "...within the confines of the financial resources and legislative authority of the Council." Because we also talked about [comment indistinct] is this within our authority? No, it's not right now. But what we're doing is setting an agenda to say start this discourse, have this conversation, begin to do this, and anything that would extend out authority would have to come to this Council for voting before we were able to enforce something that extended our authority. So that's the language that – that helps, sort of, the Faculty Affairs Committee get over this [comment indistinct]. What are we voting on? Do we need to go through and vote on every line of this document? Do we need to amend every line of this document? Or are we setting a charge that is going to require interim conversation with the Council throughout next year?

SANDERS: That's fine.

SHERMAN: Tom?

GIERYN: On 6.b. in particular, a lot of these issues under 6 arose from the meeting that I [comment indistinct] with the other associate deans who elected what they do – so we had a big grid of how they actually conducted themselves including what the school policy committee did and who was elected or who was on it and we found wide variation in places like Jacobs and also Kelley. It was felt though around the table, and these are the associate deans, that there i – that there may well be a need for a dean to propose a group of his chairs. The College does this, other schools, but that that would probably invite a different body than the school policy committee, which was in a sense taking votes from the faculty on proposed policies and giving advice and counsel to the deans, the chairs. So I – I – I – I don't think it's impossible, even in the Jacobs School of Music or Kelley to conceive of two very different bodies that have different functions based on those membership differences. If – if you want to know where a lot of these points came from they were actually endorsed – almost all of them – by a majority, quite a large majority of the assistant deans [comment indistinct]

TERRY: And Tom shared that data with us, which is how it got in here.

SHERMAN: John?

PAOLILLO: So I just want to ask for a clarification of— of the motion. Is it essentially a motion to give a charge to the BFC, the Executive Committee, and other standing committees to pursue this line of work for next year?

TERRY: Yeah. And I have ventured to offer time frames and suggested committees and that sort of thing for each of these recommendations.

SHERMAN: Rebecca?

SPANG: I wanted to propose an amendment to 37, Principles of Shared Governance. Where the amendment would simply be to remove point five under “...affirms:” It seems to me that point five is already covered under point four, “accountability,” and so we can just streamline [comment indistinct].

FISHER: Do you want to remove all of five?

TERRY: Is there a second?

SPANG: So we currently have – it would be to remove, “That successful shared governance depends on... ..implementing...” And we already have accountability above. I think accountability covers the same points that are made in five. I think that five is redundant.

SHERMAN: Is there a second?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Second.

SHERMAN: Any discussion of the amendment? Micol?

SEIGEL: I would oppose the amendment. This was something that we discussed in the body as a subcommittee. I think we kept five in there because we felt that the implementation was a key aspect of the relationship of shared government was the administration implementing the policies developed by the faculty. And we wanted also to underline the legislative authority of the faculty in creating the policies, which then are the responsibility of the administration to implement, and we also felt that there was great usefulness in noting that the faculty leadership is – is that sort of nebulous but still important, relevant body that should hold the administration to account if that should ever become necessary. So I think there are at least three different points in five that are not covered by four.

SHERMAN: Any other discussion? Are we ready to vote on the amendment? All in favor? [2] Opposed? [46] Abstain? [5] The amendment fails and we go back to [comment indistinct]

TERRY: May I propose that we focus to begin with, since Rebecca started us that way on B37 and see if there are other amendments to that. And I would offer the same comment that Cassidy said. We would like your principles to be enduring and forever, but if we get something wrong here we can go back and change it.

GIERYN: I have a [comment indistinct] just give me a minute. If we do vote on B38 and it's a majority positive, it would still be allowable for the Faculty Council next year to take a different position. In other words, upon further review we change the course. That – that – I think it's important – I think what – I think the documents are extremely important as a guide as Cassidy said but it was just a subcommittee of a faculty committee, and I think bringing things to life would force reconsideration of some issues and that would be right.

TERRY: I would agree with that although I would stress that we did a lot of work and we communicated with lots of groups and interest groups. I mean we really vetted these things, so further vetting may reveal further opinions, but – but it's not as if we proceeded without them.

SHERMAN: Amy?

APPLEGATE: I'm Amy Applegate, I'm from [comment indistinct] I'm one of the members of a policy, the elected policy committee, at the law school. I just wanted to speak, I'm not really addressing B37. I'm talking B38, and I think it – and – and I guess I wanted to say that I – I totally appreciate all of the work that went into this just as I think we all also appreciate the work that was done on the CREM policy. We would have a major concern with the Bloomington Faculty Council – Council, kind of, I guess, going against what the faculty in the individual school wants. And there's concern in – in both the CREM policy which I was not afforded an opportunity to talk about so – and I don't know whether it passed – but we had pretty major concerns about that. But when I look at this I see the same thing about the policy committee somehow being accountable to the Faculty Council or being told what to do by the Faculty Council, when in fact we are elected by, in – in my case, we are elected by our faculty members. We have – we have two tenure, one tenure-track, and one – one faculty non-tenure-track, which is the position I fill and – and I am really concerned and I think my – my colleagues on the – on the policy committee as with my colleagues at the law school are very concerned with this trend that I am seeing here today of – of telling, you know, I guess telling the faculty in law schools what they should be doing and not really – not really listening to or deferring to what those faculty members want. I was very, very concerned about the CREM policy for that reason. We could have – we could have an entire faculty wanting it and yet there'd still be this very complicated review and, you know, in CREM it looks like you could never get a CREM actually implemented under the policy as it – all of the various committees, and reviews, and flow chart. But – but really speaking about this I would urge you not to keep looking at what – not look to stifle what faculty at individual schools want, but think about that they, too, have – I didn't

think it was funny, but they've – but they have a right, you know, to faculty governance in their own schools.

TERRY: At this time do you have a specific amendment to propose?

APPLEGATE: I – I don't because I just saw this today.

SUGIMOTO: [comment indistinct]

TERRY: [comment indistinct]

MCCLOSKEY: [comment indistinct] but Micol was first.

SEIGEL: Okay, I just want to say, you know, having been a member of this subcommittee that the subcommittee doesn't consider that these principles would – would substantially alter the actions of a school policy committee except in as much as those policies might be inconsistent with the constitution of the Bloomington Faculty Council, and so what we were trying to do, especially in the number "c." that you were pointing to is work to give the faculty in those units as much – as – as much weight and authority as possible where they have that legislative authority. So these – these principles are written to – to protect faculty, particularly to – some of the perception of the committee was that faculty authority has been eroding. So it wasn't actually to deny authority to faculty and schools, it was to enhance the authority of faculty in schools where administration is eroding that authority and to bring the schools into alignment with the principles expressed in the constitution. So maybe if you'll read, and especially in point six in relation to the BFC constitution it will make more sense as enhancement rather than diminution of the faculty authority.

APPLEGATE: I – and I appreciate that. I don't mean it that way. I haven't read it to the end. I think this is problematic.

SHERMAN: Ben?

ROBINSON: Yeah, I just want to try [comment indistinct] to the BFC action of 1983 and 1985, that elected policy committees are – the way I understand it someone correct me if I'm wrong – they're actually a creature of the BFC statement calling upon deans to form each of these. So it's certainly not – it doesn't seem like the proposal is asking individual faculty members of these committees how to vote or how to – but just saying revising the elected policy committee statement of 1985, and just saying that they should now be – and to that specification they are saying they should be constituted with a clearer separation between those with an administrative – current administrative office. But since the roles are again initially promulgated by the BFC, I don't understand why it's a conflict –

APPLEGATE: Well, did anyone consult with the policy committees? I don't recall being, you know, I don't – were we – I do not recall being consulted, but I could say –

TERRY: I'd have to check my records but – but somebody was assigned law and –

ROBINSON: Yeah, I did talk to law.

TERRY: You did?

ROBINSON: Yeah.

HASS: I just have a – I'm sorry, I wasn't recognized.

SHERMAN: Jon was next.

SIMONS: Ben actually just beat me to it because I was going to refer to exactly the same policy, that's on the books since 1985 because that – I mean as a precedent that would supply a significant intervention because rather than saying the faculty of the school should decide. [comment indistinct] the faculty could have a non-elected policy, but the third causes it. I mean, that it does leave the decision with the local faculty, but places a strong directive from the BFC because it says, if a majority of the faculty of a given school indicates in a referendum that it considers an elected policy committee inappropriate for the school it may delegate the authority to a non-elected committee. Clearly there is a precedent to the idea that the BFC provides guidelines about how these school policy committees should run. I mean, provided, it's a fairly extreme case. It's – if the faculty decide to give up their vote. I don't why they would do that, but they do strange things. And but I think there is – there is precedent here for it, and – and then the same for the BFC as a whole shaping what the policy committees should look like.

SHERMAN: Jeff?

HASS: Yeah, I was just wondering, I saw one of Cassidy's very nice e-mails to the Faculty Affairs Committee thinking that this was a place to start a dialogue. Just a point of information, did the entire Faculty Affairs Committee vote on all of these and vote them up?

SUGIMOTO: So – yeah. So we had several meetings and people were given a chance to give any objections? And there were no objections.

HASS: Good. But there – there wasn't an actual vote.

SUGIMOTO: Yeah, no votes. And there is not mechanism for formal votes in BFC committees. So each of those are left to the idiosyncratic eccentricities [comment indistinct] which is something we may want to look at in the future years.

SHERMAN: David?

FISHER: So I – I will say that – that I understand the concerns about the second of these documents, which is B38. I – I – I – I firmly endorse the sentiments of B37. I – I – I think – I think B37 is great. I think taking B38 the way it's intended to be taken as I understand it from both Cassidy and Herb as guidelines that we have to consult and discuss further on, I'd be willing to vote for it. I do wonder given that there are ten minutes left and there seem to be a lot of objections as to B38 as to whether you want to vote on these two documents separately. I don't know how to propose that as a motion but – but – if – I – I wouldn't want us to run out of time without voting on B37 if there aren't lots of substantial objections to B37. So...

SHERMAN: When we get closer if we need to separate them we will.

SEIGEL: How close do we need to get to vote?

SHERMAN: It takes a minute to vote.

MCCLOSKEY: [comment indistinct] because I think it's a really, really great policy so [comment indistinct] My amendment is that under 9.a. on permitting a supplement for the presidents of – the BFC president's salary in the form of one-tenths summer salary or one course reduction via the arrangement of [comment indistinct] authority. It's not as expansive as what you folks are offering in your policy, but I think it's cheaper and it's, you know, and it's probably [comment indistinct]

TERRY: Is there a second?

MCMANUS: Second.

SHERMAN: Any discussion? All those in favor?

DETHLOFF: [comment indistinct] in favor.

SHERMAN: Opposed?

DETHLOFF: 14 opposed.

SHERMAN: Abstentions?

FISHER: Can I ask a – ?

DETHLOFF: 11 abstentions. 21 in favor, 14 opposed, 11 abstentions.

SHERMAN: The amendment is accepted.

FISHER: Can I ask a point of information? When we're going to hear about the vote we took by paper ballots?

TERRY: Oh, yes! [laughter] We're running out of time.

SHERMAN: I don't know the results yet, so I can't give it to you.

BAILEY: Does somebody know?

SPANG: We do know and I think it makes sense to conclude this discussion and then announce that. So we've amended 38, but we are not necessarily voting on it, okay?

SHERMAN: So if – I – I want to be clear on the – the steps that this goes through next. I understand that if we vote to accept 37 and 38, then it goes to the Executive Committee for what they would call "implementation." [comment indistinct] include the possibility of change?

TERRY: I think that we were guided by what Cassidy wrote in the cover letters, implementation to the extent it's consistent with the resources of the Council and the constitution.

SHERMAN: So that even –

TERRY: They may conclude that some of these things can't be done.

SHERMAN: So if one disagrees with the content of 37 and 38 with no chance to change it if it doesn't conflict with the underlying [comment indistinct] than one should not vote – one should not vote "yes" because change is not possible.

TERRY: I believe – I believe like many things you would have to imagine that next year's Council will make the change.

SHERMAN: Jamie?

PRENKERT: I – that – that kind of strikes me as fanciful in the sense that most of these things cannot happen without a change that would require a BFC vote. So there could be no way for the BFC Executive Committee to implement something that for instance, amends the bylaws, without it coming to a BFC vote first.

TERRY: And saying here's the specifics that we propose. [comment indistinct]

PRENKERT: So this to me is like the – it's just a roadmap that cannot – the – the car cannot go down that road unless the BFC votes for it go down that road.

GREINER: Can I move that we vote on 37?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Second.

SHERMAN: Has the question been called?

SANDERS: A two-thirds vote for calling the question.

SHERMAN: Yes. Is that what you want to do?

GREINER: Mmhmm.

SEIGEL: Yes.

SHERMAN: Alright. All those in favor?

DETHLOFF: Opposed?

SHERMAN: Opposed? Abstentions?

TERRY: Now we need to vote on 37. [comment indistinct]

SHERMAN: Okay, we are separating 37 and 38.

FISHER: That is what that motion did, unless Steve tell us it couldn't have?

SHERMAN: What?

FISHER: He was being very studious. Maybe he's telling me we can't have separated them?

SANDERS: Oh no, no, no. It's fine to separate them. I'm just looking at something else. I just want to say though as long as Fisher remains on the Council the job of parliamentarian really ought to be compensated. [raucous laughter and applause]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Is that a motion? [laughter]

SPANG: Second!

SANDERS: You have no idea what the e-mail is like.

TERRY: In favor of 37.

SHERMAN: Okay, we're voting only on 37 for now. All of those in favor of 37?

DETHLOFF: Opposed?

SHERMAN: Opposed? B37 passes.

DETHLOFF: Abstentions?

SPANG: Abstentions?

SHERMAN: Okay, we move to 38.

TERRY: As amended.

SPANG: Yeah.

SANDERS: If I could, the only thing I was checking on, I wasn't totally clear. It – it sounded, it sounded for Laura's amendment, the number of no's and abstention's outweigh, exceed the number of yes votes, because if it did, it fails. [comment indistinct] What was the vote on Laura's amendment?

MCMANUS: It was 24-14-11, wasn't it?

TERRY: It has to be a majority or [indistinct comment].

SPANG: Yeah, you're right. It fails.

[Multiple Indistinct Comments]

SANDERS: If it was 24-14-11 it fails.

SPANG: Yes, that's right. Yeah.

SANDERS: Okay, okay.

DETHLOFF: It was 24-14-11.

SPANG: Yeah, it fails.

SANDERS: So, is that – that – is that correct?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Wait, what happened?

MCCLOSKEY: The abstentions to the –

SANDERS: Laura's amendment failed. I thought there was an impression that it carried, but it actually failed.

TERRY: So without amendments.

TRIX: Can we vote on 38?

MCCLOSKEY: Yeah, let's vote on 38. [comment indistinct]

SPANG: I propose that we carry –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: We table 38.

SPANG: No.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: No. We want to vote on 38.

SANDERS: Well, so long as – if – if – if Jim is not saying that Rebecca was out of order a motion to table requires a second and a majority vote. It is debatable, but – but the movant should specify whether you’re talking about recommitting to the committee or tabling to the next BFC meeting. So do you understand? Tabling essentially means we’ll take it up at the next meeting.

SPANG: Yes. I think it should. It seems to me that there are just so many questions about it.

MCCLOSKEY: I disagree. Is this a motion? I mean we’ve got three minutes. I’d like to vote.

TERRY: It needs a second.

[Multiple Indistinct Comment]

SANDERS: It needs a second.

DETHLOFF: Is there a second?

TRIX: No – no there’s people – I asked first if we’d like to vote on 38.

FISHER: She did – she did speak first so –

SEIGEL: Yeah, she did and she called the question.

SPANG: I was perhaps out of order.

MCCLOSKEY: So call the question.

SHERMAN: Alright, let’s call the question.

TERRY: Voting to end debate, and then voting on 38 if we end debate.

SEIGEL: Yes.

[Multiple comment indistinct]

SHERMAN: We are voting on 38.

TERRY: We have to end debate first.

SHERMAN: All those in favor of ending debate to be able to vote on 38?

SANDERS: This requires two-thirds.

DETHLOFF: [comment indistinct]

SHERMAN: Opposed?

DETHLOFF: 4 opposed.

TERRY: Abstentions.

SHERMAN: Abstentions?

DETHLOFF: 4 abstentions.

SHERMAN: Okay, we can now vote on 38. All those in favor?

DETHLOFF: 33 in favor.

SHERMAN: Opposed?

DETHLOFF: 6.

SHERMAN: Abstentions?

DETHLOFF: 33 to 6 to 8

SHERMAN: Okay, so both 37 and 38 pass.

SPANG: And so did the CREM policy via a vote 30 yes, 18 no, and 2 abstentions.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes! [applause, gavel bangs]

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:30PM