

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
December 4, 2018
Presidents Hall – Franklin Hall
2:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M.

Members Present: Heather Akou, Carey Beam, Alan Bender, Simon Brassell, Fritz Breithaupt, Paul Brunner, Daniel Bullock, Todd Burkhardt, Barbara Cherry Judah Cohen, Rachel Cohen, Josephe D’Ambrosi, Kenneth Dau-Schimdy, Lori Dekydtspotter, Erika Dowell, J Duncan, Jane Dutton, Ann Elsner, Alyce Fly, Linda Gales, Lynn Gilman, Dennis Groth, Kenneth Guerra, Pamela Jackson, Colin Johnson, Padraic Kenney, Peter Kloosterman, Robert Kravchuk, Ivan Keilkamp, Moira Marsh, Meg Meiman, Thomas Nelson Laird, Eliza Pavalko, Eric Rasmusen, Lauren Robel, Leslie Rutkowski, Susan Seizer, Jim Sherman, Marietta Simpson, Paul Sokol, Solomon Bruce, Geoffrey Sprinkle, Aaron Travers, Jonathan Trinidad, Richard Van Kooten, John Walbridge, Nick Williams, Alex Wisniewski

Members Absent: Kyle Adams, AJ Asomani-Adem, Hussein Banai, Selene Carter, Frank Diaz, Philip Ford, Krista Glazewski, Maggie Hopkins, Carol Hostetter, Angie Raymond, Patrick Shih, Katie Siek, Alex Tanford, Jacob Warner, William Winecoff

Guests: Jaime Prenkert

Agenda

1. **Approval of Minutes of [October 23, 2018](#)**
2. **[Memorial Resolution for Laurence Donald Brown](#)**
3. **Executive Committee Business** (10 minutes)
Moira Marsh, Faculty President
4. **Presiding Officer’s Report** (10 minutes)
Lauren Robel, Provost
5. **Question/Comment Period**
Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to Provost Robel or President Marsh by emailing bfcoff@indiana.edu.
6. **Presentation on the proposed amendments to BL-ACA-H30 Grades and Grading policy** (5 minutes)
Jack Bielasiak, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee

Simon Brassell, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
[Second Reading - Action Item]

[Current BL-ACA-H30 Grades and Grading policy](#)
[B16-2019 Proposed amendments to BL-ACA-H30 Grades and Grading policy \(amendments begin on page 6\)](#)

7. **Questions/comments the proposed amendments to BL-ACA-H30 Grades and Grading policy** (15 minutes)
8. **Presentation on the proposed Fresh Start policy** (5 minutes)
Jack Bielasia, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
Simon Brassell, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
[Second Reading - Action Item]

[B20-2019 Updated proposed Fresh Start through Academic Renewal policy](#)

9. **Questions/comments on the proposed Fresh Start policy** (15 minutes)
10. **Report from the Budgetary Affairs Committee** (15 minutes)
Lauren Robel, Provost
Paul Brunner, Co-chair of the Budgetary Affairs Committee
Bob Kravchuk, Co-chair of the Budgetary Affairs Committee

- Agenda continues on other side –

11. **Questions/comments on the report from the Budgetary Affairs Committee** (10 minutes)
12. **Proposal from the Nomination Committee regarding non-tenure-track election units** (30 minutes)
Elizabeth Housworth, Member of the Nomination Committee
[First reading – Discussion item]

[B21-2019 Proposal regarding non-tenure-track election units](#)

Transcript

AGENDA ITEM ONE: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ROBEL: We're almost there. We're very close. [LAUGHS] And I'm delighted to be with you all today. And we'll start as we always do with the approval of the minutes. May I have a motion? Thank you, Bob, second? Thank you, all in favor, opposed? Thank you. I turn now to Elisa. Elisa?

There you are. It's like the family dinner table, Elisa. We need to be in our places. Thanks for switching it up just a bit.

AGENDA ITEM TWO: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR LAURENCE DONALD BROWN

PAVALKO: Laurence Donald (Larry) Brown, was born on September 29, 1928, in Waynesville, Ohio, where his parents, Larry and Grace (Walton) Brown, had a farm. Larry matured quickly during years when farmers ploughed fields with horses and got their water from the pump on the back porch. Larry's children and grandchildren remember fondly his stories of his youth. As a youngster during World War II, he learned to pilot a plane. To afford flying lessons, at age sixteen he rented and operated his own farm. Later, he was drafted and served two years' duty in the Korean War as a member of the 7th Cavalry.

The GI Bill afforded Larry the opportunity to get a college education. Larry earned a BS in mathematics (1953) from the University of Dayton and taught mathematics at Franklin (OH) High School. Larry then entered graduate school at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio. It was there in 1957 that Larry met and married Marylou, his wife of sixty years.

Upon earning his masters' degree Larry entered into a doctoral program at the University of Illinois. Among the luminaries in the fields of educational psychology and measurement that served as his mentors were Lee Cronbach, Nate Gage, O.H. Mowrer, and David Ausubel. During Larry and Marylou's years at the University of Illinois, their children Christie (1958) and Buff (1959) were born. Upon completion of his degree in 1962, Larry and Marylou and family moved to Bloomington where Larry joined the faculty at the IU School of Education. It was in Bloomington that their children Melissa (1963) and Todd (1968) were born.

Larry's academic appointment was to the Department of Educational Psychology. During his years at Indiana University, Larry was an individual who seemed determined to not draw attention to himself. Serving the School, the University, the faculty and the students were his academic priorities. One of his early missions was to organize associate instructors and bring some order to their teaching and other activities. In 1970 he was appointed and served four years as director of the Division of Social Foundations & Human Behavior. The Division served as an organizational structure encompassing multiple departments and graduate programs in the School of Education. From 1974 to 1980, Larry served as the School's associate dean for academic affairs. From 1980 to 1981, during the School's search for a new dean, Larry served as acting dean. A petition advocating the appointment of Larry as permanent dean was circulated among and submitted by education faculty. Larry opted instead to become director of the Institute for Child Study for the next five years.

With only four years left to retirement, the Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology needed a new chair. To no one's surprise, Larry was nominated. What was unexpected was that a former division director, associate dean, and acting dean would

consider the position. To those who knew him, it was not out of character. Larry's was a dedication to the needs of others that was at the core of his person. Many secretly suspected that of all the elements of his career, administrative roles were among his most enjoyed. In all, Larry contributed thirty-one years of service to Indiana University and its School of Education.

Even while fulfilling administrative roles, Larry never lost sight of his role as a faculty scholar. During his career he pursued two primary strands of research and development. The first strand was an examination of motives, aspirations, and perceptions of doctoral students in education. Those efforts B19-2019 were funded by the U. S. Department of Education, the U. S. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, and the Morris Proffitt Endowment. Another project, funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, culminated in a Wingspread Conference of deans of education from across the country.

Throughout his career, Larry also explored the relationship between teachers' instructional concepts and teaching behavior. Further, he held that acquisition of these concepts would be facilitated through the media-based introduction of real-life examples. Together with colleagues David Gliessman, Richard Turner and Richard Pugh, Larry was instrumental in the establishment of the National Center for the Development of Teacher Training Materials. As a part of those efforts Larry's films, the Individual Behaviors Series, was created and then distributed through the IU Audio-Visual Center. This series demonstrated motor skills, categorizing behavior, memory, and creativity. These films were followed by the Critical Incidents Series and the Four Individuals Series, built upon the hypothesis that teacher trainees would profit from a systematic analysis of filmed events.

In the 1980's Larry's attention shifted from film to a new medium, interactive video. He was among the first in the country to recognize the potential of video linked with a computer. He set up an Apple I with a video card connected to a videocassette recorder. As technology advanced Larry contributed to the development of videodisc-based models of instruction with *Instructional Clarity: Four Concepts of Clarity of Explanations and Three Forms of Explanation*.

Beyond being recognized for his administrative skills, Larry was also highly regarded as a mentor and instructor. He took seriously the three-fold mandate of teaching, research and service. Faculty who served on doctoral committees with Larry often commented on his high levels of insight and critical analysis. It was not only in his interactions with students, Larry also served as significant mentor to many young faculty members.

Over the years at IU, Larry and Marylou served as welcoming hosts, opening their homes to colleagues and students. Larry was an avid sailor, woodworker and world traveler. His grandchildren treasure the handmade wooden boxes he made for each of their birthdays. However, his favorite thing in the world to do was simply to spend time with family and close friends. He has been universally described as kind, but that word seems insufficient. He was also wise, intelligent and loving. He was generous and humble and never spoke poorly of anyone, treating everyone with honor and respect. He was a person of enormous strength of character, with a strong work ethic. He was a role model to many people.

In addition to Marylou, Larry is survived by four children, Christie (Jerry Davis); Buff (Lisa); Melissa (John Vanderwerp); and Todd (Heidi); as well as six grandchildren (Lauren, Lilly, and Jenna Brown; Ben and Grace Davis; and Hasanah Brown).

He was preceded in death by his siblings, Gene Brown, Eileen Roberts and Patricia Wells. He will also be mourned by countless members of the Bloomington community, and as "Uncle Don" by many nieces, nephews and cousins.

Larry died quietly on Thursday, July 6, 2017, at his home in Carbondale, Illinois, with Marylou, by his side. He was eighty-eight years old.

We respectfully submit this memorial resolution and ask that it be presented in the Bloomington Faculty Council, be preserved in its minutes and archive, and that after its presentation a copy be sent to Marylou Brown.

Jack Cumming
Professor Emeritus, Counseling and Educational Psychology
School of Education IUB

Gary Ingersoll
Professor Emeritus, Counseling and Educational Psychology
School of Education IU

ROBEL: He was a role model to many people. Thank you. Let's please stand.

Thank you all. I turn now to our president, Moira Marsh, for executive committee business.

AGENDA ITEM THREE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

MARSH: Thank you, Lauren. I have a number of things to get through. So first of all, I'm happy to announce, if you hadn't already seen the piece in the Inside IU today in the From the Desk column written by Nick Williams and Jon Trinidad that the constitutional amendments all passed.

We had approximately a 29% Participation rate, so 828 faculty voted, which is good. And so we'll be hearing more about that shortly, later on this afternoon. Also in the area of self-governance, you can expect to receive a ballot very soon with the nominations for next year's Nominations Committee.

So please vote when you get that ballot. It'll be coming in email later this week. I'd like to just briefly put in a plug for the United Way campaign. I participate every year, but I contributed

this time. There's still time to do so. And I'm happy to say that they have made it much, much, much easier to contribute to United Way that you don't have to deal with those stupid forms anymore.

There's an online portal. It took all of two minutes. It couldn't be more painless, so I commend that to you. We have received two questions. First is from Ellen Binda, which she asks three questions, or related questions. First of all, she asks, is it true that the BFC has legislative authority over GenEd?

That is, authority to create and revise policies about GenEd, including policies about the roles and composition of the GenEd Administration Committee. I'm not sure about the second part of that question, but it is definitely clear. It's in our constitution, Article 2, Section 2.1a. Faculty of the campus has legislative authority regarding, Policy and allocation of authority for academic matters affecting more than one school on the campus, including campus curriculum and general education.

So that's very clear. The second question, just to make sure, he asks, is it true that there is currently no standing BFC committee that has GenEd in its title? That is absolutely correct, there is not. And finally, BFC has never reviewed or revised its policy on GenEd, that's ACAH9.

And according to the history of that policy, which you can find on the policies website, it was adopted in September of 2008, and I don't show any date that it has been revised since. If there was any review that has happened since, it's not in the record, but certainly, it hasn't been revised.

So does that answer the questions? Yeah, thank you. Finally, and this is going to take a few minutes, but it's important. And I've come to read a statement that I've adopted from some notes that I received from our BFC president, Herb Terry, concerning the US Department of Education's plans to revise the rules on how universities address alleged sexual misconduct under Title IX.

These new rules have been proposed. If they're adopted, they will replace the Obama administration's guidelines that are the basis for our current policy on sexual misconduct. That's a policy that was adopted by the UFC in 2015 and it's still in effect. The proposed rules were published in the federal register just last Thursday.

And that starts a 60-day comment period, which will end January 28, which is perfect timing, I guess. So there's a very brief window for comments, and these are contentious issues. I don't believe that faculty opinion on aspects of the current policy in the past faculty, but it has been divided, I don't expect that has changed.

Plus, obviously it's going to be hard for our committees to meet and formulate any comments as a body in the time available. However, each one of us can make comments individually. And this will go in the secretary's report, linked to an email to the portal. Where you can submit

comments, read the summary of the proposal, the proposal itself which is massive, and the discussion of how to file comments.

So you may want to file individually, your constituents may want to file comments individually, or on behalf of the groups to which they belong. Of course, if anyone does choose to comment as an individual, please stress that, while you have an affiliation with Indiana University, you are not speaking for Indiana University.

The executive committee will be working with the relevant administrators to ensure that there is a faculty governance involvement in any response that the university makes. Or comment that the university makes, either upon itself or as part of a group. In fact, Emily Springston, our Title IX officer, has just reached out to me today to start that process.

And so we will keep you informed as that goes. Just briefly, there are five major changes that may affect how we handle sexual misconduct allegations in the proposed changes. First of all, they're proposing a narrower definition of what constitutes sexual misconduct. They may change a university's obligation to investigate sexual misconduct that takes place off-campus.

They may change the standard of proof required. Currently, it is a clear and convincing evidence standard. Another possibility is that we'll revert to preponderance of the evidence. Sorry, I had that wrong, it's the opposite. Currently, where the guidelines strongly suggest that a preponderance of the evidence standard, that's the standard that our policy currently uses.

That may change to allow or even require a clear and convincing evidence standard, which is a higher standard of evidence. Fourthly, there opportunities maybe enhanced for parties in a sexual misconduct case to cross-examine each other. And there may be changes in how these cases are handled and by whom they are decided.

So these are all major possible changes that would affect both students and faculty. Our current policy is a faculty policy, but the time frame for this is short. So there will be more information about that in the secretary's notes in due course. And so with that, I would like to wish happy holidays, and almost end of the semester.

And look forward to see you all again in January.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

ROBEL: Thank you so much, well, I just have a few things to say. I want to amplify Moira's message around United Way. United Way is the only campaign that is not affiliated with the university that the university supports.

And we support it with a vengeance because it is the agency that coordinates aid for the neediest of our neighbors. And so if you are thinking about your year-end giving at this point, please do think about United Way. United Way for Monroe County requires a very large participation from the faculty and staff of Indiana University to meet its goals.

And while you're on that year-end giving, if you will recall, Rebecca Spang spearheaded a campaign for scholarship that would be available to students who are not statutorily prohibited from receiving aid from federal or state sources. I have a donor who has indicated that he would be willing to provide a full scholarship for a student.

I think a scholarship up to \$9,000 a year over four years, if the council would be willing to match it. So I would like to encourage all of you to think about, I think we can get to that level. And I'd like to encourage all of you to think about contributing to that fund.

And we'll send, maybe I'll ask Elizabeth if she can send information around about how we can make that easy for you. And finally, I just want to congratulate a lot of faculty members whose work was celebrated last week. It was a very good week for sex research on the Bloomington campus, as it always is.

The outstanding faculty collaborative research award went to Debby Herbenick, Brian Dodge, Stephanie Sanders, Michael Reece, and the IU school of medicine's Dennis Fortenberry. For their decade-long work on the national survey of sexual behavior, which has turned out to be an incredibly useful data set for researchers over the past decade.

A wonderful lecture, and if you ever find yourself, on the day of that collaborative research award, lecture-free, I cannot commend to you more highly attending that lecture. Because it is always interesting, and it always gives a sense of what's possible on a campus like this one, or even a university like Indiana University.

When you can reach across all kinds of disciplinary lines to bring people's insights to a major, major piece of research. We also celebrated the Herman B Wells professorships announced last week to Caroline Chick Jarrold in the college, and Christiana Ochoa at the Maurer school of law. The distinguished service award, which went to Cate Reck in chemistry, chemistry had a terrific end of the week last week.

And the provost professors induction ceremony, which included our own Fritz Breithaupt, John Kruschke from psychological and brain sciences. Lem Watson, who is the new dean of education, and who was being honored that very day for his contributions to diversity and inclusion in the teaching profession. And Bill Yarber from applied health sciences, who, as many of you know, was a pioneer in rural HIV research.

And for many, many years has worked in that particular field to reduce the incidence of HIV transmission in rural areas. And finally, the Tracy M Sonneborn lecture was called The Long

Way Around and Anya Peterson Reus, who all of you know, I think. She's a wonderful colleague in anthropology and it's served in many roles on the campus.

She gave what I think maybe the wisest most elegant and generous lecture I have ever heard in the Sonam Board series. And so I'm asking Anya if I can have a copy and share it with all of you. One of her large points was that as researchers and his teachers, we need to give up on the seduction of control.

I can tell you as someone who has been in administration for a long time, I have many years ago given up on this seduction of control.

I put it in the same category as the glamour of evil. But for those of you who still believe that there's a possibility, I'll send this lecture around and encourage all of you to take a little time and read it.

The accumulated wisdom in that lecture was just absolutely stunning. And with that, I think we've addressed the questions that were submitted ahead of time, are there any others?

Dennis?

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: QUESTION COMMENT PERIOD

GROTH: While we're on awards, I would just make sure people saw the announcement of Jennie Wong, who received the Rogue Scholar just a week and a half or so ago.

So congratulations again.

ROBEL: That was fantastic. And thank you to all the faculty members who have worked with Jenny, Jenny graduated last year but worked with Jenny over the time she was here. And also Dennis to your office for all of the work you do spotting, working with students on their dossiers and helping them get in a position for those kinds of prestigious awards.

That was terrific news as well. All right, we have now, yep there it is, Eliza?

PAVALKO: I was also going to add to the awards just to make sure everybody knows that there are two award deadlines coming up, so think about people for nominations. One is the Distinguished Service Award and that's one that was created by this body.

And so think about colleagues who might be deserving that award. And then the other one, both deadlines are February 1. The second one is deadlines for nominations for provost professors. So you can get information on websites, but really think about your colleagues. We have many, many colleagues who I think would be very deserving of this awards.

So, we'd love to see your nominations.

ROBEL: We'd like to see nominations from across the campus. So, think about people in your particular vineyard who we should be recognizing. All right, we now have a presentation.

One more question.

Great, Alex.

WISNIEWSKI: Thank you. I just want to touch upon IUSGs efforts for the proposed Title IX changes.

We are working with the office for sexual violence prevention and victim advocacy, specifically Leslie Fasone, the deputy Title IX coordinator to structure both an event in a comment writing period for students and faculty to offer their support and offer their insights on any of the Title IX changes.

This is likely going to be Thursday, December, or excuse me, January 10, I think. I can definitely give more information out, but we want to just let everyone know that it is an event open to all that are interested in any of the changes in writing how it would affect your specific department or you as a professional at the university.

Thank you.

ROBEL: Great, and there will be a presentation at the Board of Trustees, as there is every year from Emily Springston, who is our Title IX director on just what's happened in the past year on all of the IU campuses. All right, other questions? Yep, Ann.

ELSNER: With regards to the Title IX changes, I haven't been following the news on this.

Could someone just tell me succinctly why these were put forward and what are we doing wrong now that we need to get better?

ROBEL: Well, that's not a quick answer I think Ann, but basically I think the easy explanation is that during the Obama administration there was a very victim protective approach at the Department of Education.

And during the Trump administration, there has been an express concern that the due process of the people who are accused is something that universities need to focus on. And so that's basically the yin and the yang of it, if you will. All right, okay, I think now we can move on to presentation of some proposed amendments to our grades and grading policy.

And I'll turn to the co-chairs of the Educational Policies Committee to present this. This is the second reading and an action item. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM SIX: PRESENTATION ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BL-ACA-H30 GRADES AND GRADING POLICY

BIELASIAK: Good afternoon. Thank you for sharing your time in this busy time of the semester. So this is, as Lauren just said, the second reading of proposed amendments to grade and grading policy, B-L-A-C-A-H-30.

The proposed changes are on page six of that document. Just to give quick context, this regards the Extended-X policy which applies only to undergraduate students and limits the policy to three courses. And both the original grade and the replacement grade remain on the transcript. So, the changes in regard to paragraph four is a clarification that the determination for the replacement grade is to be in the hands of academic units and the dean's office will be responsible for determination of courses which are equivalent, if they have a different content to the original course.

And then the major addition is in paragraph five, which is new added language to the policy, which stipulates that graduate and honors sections can be used as replacement courses.

For the original one with the proviso that the content is the same and the level of the course is equivalent or higher, which presumable it will be and then those are basic two changes. The next slide basically stipulates various implementation policies, but these remain the same.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED AMMENDMENTS

ROBEL: Thank you.

All right, Elizabeth?

HOUSWORTH: Can you go back one slide?

BIELASIAK: Sure.

HOUSWORTH: Thank you. I should preface this with 'math is weird.'

I have a proposed amendment which is that to change this language slightly. To a student may take an equivalent course or course sequence including a graduate or honor's section of the original course.

Provided that the retaken course or course sequence is proven to contain the same academic content with at minimum the same or higher level of academic rigor and expectations of learning outcomes. The reason is that math is weird. People often use the extended x policy to replace their finite grade.

The Department of Mathematics offers two versions of Finite Math with the same content and the same rigor. One is the standard M118 course. And the other is a two sequence, D116, D117 course that we developed with the help of a Lilly Grant way back in the 1990s or earlier.

And what my proposed language does, is it allows a student who, for some misguided reason, started out in M118. Who did not do well in M118, who is qualified for D116 and D117. We do limit enrollment in those courses to students whose mathematical preparation is not as strong as other students.

It would allow somebody taking the sequence D116, D117 to replace their M118 grade with their grades in those two courses.

ROBEL: Elizabeth, can I ask a question, well, is there a second?

Okay.

Can I ask a question then about this? And Jack, if you would, could you go back one more page.

BIELASIAK: Sure.

ROBEL: I took four to be about other undergraduate courses. And I took five, if we turn the page, to be about graduate and honors courses. Neither the sequence that you're talking about is not a graduate or honors course, is it?

HOUSWORTH: No, it is not.

ROBEL: And all you're trying to do is make it possible to replace a grade in Math 118 with a grade in TWO other classes?

HOUSWORTH: In a sequence that is equivalent, yes.

ROBEL: Okay, so would that not go back in for...?

HOUSWORTH: It could-

ROBEL: I think five is intended to deal with the specifics of graduate and honors courses, is that accurate? So if you scoop back to four for a minute, would we be able to accomplish what you're talking about by just adding courses or sequences of courses repeatable with different content are not eligible for replacement unless an academic unit responsible for the course chooses to permit this by means of the specific authorization procedure.

HOUSWORTH: One, that's a negative not a positive. The other thing is that I did speak to the Registrar about this and if my language is adopted...So it's not and impossible that what I'm proposing could happen. It would have to be requested by a student and the Dean of the College would have to approve it.

But the difference with adopting my language in five, would be that once an exception is granted once, it could be hard coded into the system. And four is something that would have to have individual request.

ROBEL: I think you could just read four to mean that there's a specific authorization procedure, it doesn't say it has to be for every single course individually by student. It could be for recurring situations. So, I don't think you're trying to mess with graduate or honors courses.

HOUSWORTH: No in fact my language kept it in five, I did not get rid of that.

ROBEL: Okay, and you're trying to deal with a math is weird situation. So the way to deal with a specific department situation, it seems to me, ought to be by a specific authorization procedure that deals with the generically for those courses over time.

And the real issue you're concerned about, other than the one I just described, is just: can you substitute a sequence of courses for an individual course? So I think you could deal with this a little bit easier by simply saying courses or sequence of courses repeatable and blah, blah, unless by means of a specific authorization procedure.

HOUSWORTH: But that would be courses or sequence of courses repeatable with different content are not eligible. And what I want is a—

ROBEL: Unless.

In other words, I take this to be, and, Jack and Simon please let me know if I'm way off base, but I take four to be a provision that allows authorization procedures controlled by academic units to deal with the situation of courses with different content.

And you're talking about a sequence of courses and, therefore, you're talking by almost definition.

HOUSWORTH: I understand then I will be facing a different hurdle currently the college does not allow great replacements in college GPA's. So, the college may choose not to allow this. So this is the, this would go back to the dean—

BIELASIAK: That would be in both cases when it's in 4 or 5, right?

And actually, I have a question to Mark. And that is, we're talking about replacing one grade with two grades, right? So how is that administrative procedure handled?

INAUDIBLE

ROBEL: Okay. So who's up? Yeah.

DUNCAN: Please correct me if I'm wrong for the people that worked on this actual language.

But it actually seems to me that, four is designed not to address all undergraduate courses, but to specifically address courses such as topic courses, which are often listed under the same number, but each section contains different content. It might be different from year to year as well. Those they're saying, are not eligible without special exception.

To roll what Elizabeth is asking for into that, actually I don't think makes sense, because I actually think it's a separate case from either four or five. I think we actually need a new point here entirely to address the course sequence issue.

ROBEL: We may, but if we do I will raise my generic objection to dealing with a specific department's course situation in a rule that's supposed to apply generically to the campus.

HOUSWORTH: Then I don't whether it's allowed, but I would be happy to withdraw the proposed amendment. And try to work with the registrar and the college, to get this particular exception I quoted in. It was one that did come up when we were asked to address enrollment issues in the department. And it was something that my faculty brought to my attention that was not allowed.

ROBEL: Would that be acceptable to the seconder?

Okay, well, thank you. Let's see if we can solve that specific issue that way. All right, let's see, Jim.

SHERMAN: Yeah, I agree with the comment that it was meant for topics courses and would need a new number.

But when doing this Elizabeth, I would say that math is not the only weird department in this regard. Psychology has an introductory sequence of P101 and 102, but it also has a more advanced course that students presumably ready for it could take, and would they then be able to take P101 and 102 to replace that?

So, I think it's more general than the math department.

HOUSWORTH: This course was designed specifically to be the exact same course, just in a two course sequence.

ROBEL: Are there other comments or questions? I think the proposed amendment has been withdrawn. And we're going to see if we can come up with some language that can deal with sequenced courses. Mark, that was an incredibly helpful intervention, thank you very much. And see if we can't fold that in.

We can proceed in one of two ways. We can go ahead and vote on this or we can wait and come back with new language. I think my preference would be just to go ahead and vote it out. And then see if we can work the language out.

Does that make sense everyone?

Any other comments?

Hearing none, all in favor? That looks very definitive.

Any opposed? Alright, thank you so much for your work on this. We'll wait to hear the resolution of this other issue.

Okay, report from the Budgetary Affairs Committee? Nope? Fresh start in academic renewal. I think we are with the Educational Policies Committee still. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT: PRESENTATION ON THE PROPOSED FRESH START THROUGH ACADEMIC RENEWAL POLICY

BIELASIAK: Not that easy. Okay, so this is in reference to the fresh start to Academic Renewal Policy that was discussed also at the last PFC meeting, I think under B17 2019.

This is a revised statement about the scope of policy, which basically reflects changes that I will go into in a moment. But the emphasis is on providing an opportunity for students who performed poorly in the initial enrollment at IUB, to return to campus, put a second chance after a period of three years.

You will recall that the discussion at the last meeting on the first reading, concern primarily two issues. That is the length of the hiatus period, 36 months. And eligibility for the fresh start with a GPA below 2.0. The recommendation of the EPC at this time, is to retain the first requirement that is the hiatus period of three years, to drop the GPA stipulation of before 2.0.

The slide three here is a policy statement, which basically state that this fresh start aligns with the policy that currently in place concerning the treatment of transfer students, who are

eligible for such a fresh start without the encumbrance of past poor grades. The second major point here.

It concerns that fact that coursework in terms of credits, will be retained for the degree requirement or maybe I should say may be retained. But that the grades for the calculation of the cumulative program GPA will not, and it further goes on to stipulate that credit for any prior IU coursework with grades of C or better.

Will count towards the degree, the program requirements. And similarly, it states that Gen-Ed requirements with the grade of D or minus, or better, I guess it can't get any worse, will also be counted. And all grades, credits, etc. remain on the transcript. The changes that were sort of introduced in regards to the two criteria just mentioned, concerned students who are earning their first undergraduate degree, and students who have not been enrolled in past 36 months on any IU campus.

The reason that we are retained, I think the 36 months policy was that after survey of other IU campuses and big ten universities, there is a pretty standard provision in their policies that there be a hiatus between two and five years, with about three being sort of the norm.

So we thought that would be a reasonable. Requirement to make it equivalent to other campuses both at IU and in the Big Ten. On the other hand in regard to the stipulation for the 2.0 or below GPA that seems to be a very rare requirement under the campuses or universities.

So for that reason, and for all the persuasive arguments and intellectual arguments that were made last time we were persuaded. So for that reason, we have removed that requirement. And so that is reflected in this particular statement on eligibility, which just reduces it to those both the requirements that are articulated here.

That this first undergraduate degree in hiatus for the six months. I don't think we need to go. These are all the various conditions. I think pretty much no change there, so we can go. The reason for the policy, there is a change there from the original language in the proposal the first reading.

And that's mainly a way of reflecting the fact that again the 2.0 requirement was dropped. And I think that's pretty much summarizes the policy.

ROBEL: There are discussion on this policy before we vote? Yep?

AGENDA ITEM NINE: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED FRESH START POLICY

BULLOCK: Was curious if there's any follow-up thought given to the query relating to the applicability of these two graduate students.

BIELASIAK: I don't think we really did not undertake that provision. I think that's sort of a separate issue, so we did not discuss it at the EPC, to the best of my recollection.

BULLOCK: Do we have reason to believe that we'll be discussing the future? Is any timeline for such consideration?

ROBEL: I think that the council could certainly take that up, and the graduate school would be the right partner to work on this. I think it's right not to fold it into the undergraduate provision because the considerations are just too different and various for graduate students depending on the program that they're in and the degree they're pursuing.

Right, all right. Yep?

BRASELL: The original motivation was because of wanting a policy for undergraduates that match that of transfer students. And we have not had, at least the EPC has not received, similar concerns associated with how graduate students transferring are effectively different from those who are within our own Campus.

So I think it's something one could explore but one's wondering about a policy that you might implement that has very, very few individual rules that it would apply to. Whereas the sense is that there is a significant number of students who have been negatively impacted by being treated differently from transfer students.

But it's something the EPC can certainly explore.

ROBEL: Thank you. Okay, yes?

MCCORMICK: Hi, I'm temporarily Tom Nielsen today.

ROBEL: I thought that might be happening.

MCCORMICK: Yes

I just have a question about the first eligibility requirement. Because as I read that, pursuing their first undergraduate degree.

This rules out any student who has an associate's degree for being eligible for this fresh start requirement. And I have to assume that's not intentional but as long as we're changing it, we could fix that.

BRASELL: We could change that baccalaureate degree and I think that was the intention.

ROBEL: Sounds like an easy fix. So their first baccalaureate degree. All right. Yep, Colin?

JOHNSON: Yes, I'm not prone to do this but I just wanted to congratulate the committee on having I think made some really useful changes here in terms of stripping away some of the complications and loopholes.

I think one of the way in which our policy-making tendencies sometimes founder on the shoals of good intentions as when we sort of over legislate things and add too much sort of detail into things. And I think the spirit of this is very clearly communicated and it clearly charges this sort of proper administrative apparatus with overseeing the implementation of it in a way matches the intent of the policy, rather than sort of creating all bunch of loopholes that could sort of allow for exploitation or sort of improper use. So-

ROBEL: Or tripping students up when we don't intend it.

JOHNSON: Yeah, and I think that's the marriage of good policy-making and good administration, so yay, yay.

ROBEL: On that note, I think I'm going to call an end to the ensuing high fives unless—did you have one more?

J. COHEN: Yes, I just have one other question that occurred to me as we were talking about GPA's.

The question to me has to do with how this works in terms of academic awards and academic distinction or graduating with academic distinction. For the college of arts and sciences for example, the minimum GPA for distinction is a 3.7. With 60 credits, graded credits, taken. And so my question would be, would someone who then comes back under this fresh start policy and completes.

Let's say, two or three classes with a 4.0 be eligible for that kind of award.

ROBEL: Dennis?

GROTH: I think that's really up to the college. But under the description that you have, it would not. Because if you have to have 60 or 70 graded credits than it wouldn't have matched that.

But we would say that that's a decision deferred to the academic units.

J. COHEN: Okay, thank you.

ROBEL: Great. And with that clarification, are we ready to vote? Terrific. All in favor? Opposed? We are on a roll.

All right, I'm going to thank the Educational Policies Committee very much for their work on this.

AGENDA ITEM TEN: REPORT FROM THE BUDGETARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

ROBEL: And at this point, I think we're moving on to the report from the Budgetary Affairs Committee. And Bob. I think it's Bob and Paul? Or me?

Okay. I had the opportunity to meet, as I do every year, with the budgetary affairs committee to talk through the very hard work that they will be doing in the spring and the process by which they do that work.

And if with your permission I think I will just walk through a version of the presentation I made to the Committee just to familiarize you all with what the budgetary affairs Committee actually does. They will be working very hard in the spring semester, so when you see them thank them.

So I'll talk quickly through what is the process of getting to allocations at the campus level, our priorities and how those are set. What the allocations actually were last year and then planning for next year. So what typically happens when we get to this time of year is I send the memo to everyone every unit that reports to me across the campus, which would be all of the deans, all of the vice provost, and a wonderful, delightful assortment of cultural institutions and ROTC.

And so a terrific representation of all the parts of the campus, many operational but mostly academic. With a couple of things, the memo will ask, will state if we have strategic priorities for the year that we are hoping to have a discussion with the schools in particular about.

It will state what those strategic priorities are, they are developed consistently out of the Strategic Plan that we adopted in 2014 and that we have been working to complete by the Bicentennial next year. So they're, they come out of a process that was campus wide process. And our sense of where we are under that plan and what the next step that would be useful for the campus and the academic units primarily but not always would be.

We talked about available funding for the year. And I'll talk a little bit more about how that works in a moment, and for the last many years, we have been working at the campus level to help everyone develop the ability to do multiyear planning. It's important for us as an institution not to live hand to mouth and day to day, none of you do that in your academic homes.

You think towards the future, and where you see your field going, and you hopes and dreams for your department given the resources that you have available. We like for that to happen at the school and college level as well because it's not helpful for schools to be surprised by a budgetary shortfall nor is it helpful for them not to be able to plan with excesses if they're able to put a surplus aside.

So we think of this at the campus level as a way to facilitate that kind of planning. And then we have meetings, hearings is not the right term for this. But we have meetings with every single one of the folks who report to me directly and the Budgetary Affairs Committee representatives.

In which we really hold a conversation about what are your plans? What are you thinking about? What are you trying to achieve? How does it fit with your vision of excellence? How are you thinking about the resources to fund it? I always ask the Deans to bring whomever they would like to bring.

The Jacobs School always brings the entire Jacob's Budgetary Affairs Committee and has a wonderfully assembled presentation for the vision of the future. Other schools do it differently but I do request that the Chief Development Officer is there because they need the opportunity to hear what the academic vision is and what's needed to support it in all of the units.

All of the planning documents from all of the parts of the campus are put in a box account, they're available to all of the other units. The point of that is to see if people can find overlap and ways to collaborate with each other. And they're available to the members of the Budgetary Affairs Committee.

And maybe I'll just stop right here and ask for Bob or Elizabeth, who has chaired the committee in the past, or Paul to make any comments that they'd like to about this process.

KRAVCUK: It tends to be a little bit of a gauntlet. There's a lot of meetings, and may be as many of 32 that are packed into about an eight or ten week period of time.

The discussions are frank and open, I would say that in many cases the discussions revolve around management and structural issues, program issues, and their financial implications. And so at the end of the process after the Committee has a chance to discuss all of the reports from the various committee members who attended the conference, the memorandum that we write to Lauren more often than not resemblances a kind of management letter.

As opposed to, you know, simply a spreadsheet full of numbers but there's a great deal of commentary that accompanies numbers.

ROBEL: I think one of the huge utilities of having the Budgetary Affairs Committee members involved is that you, the members of the Committee really do get a comprehensive view of the campus.

And so I'll talk a little bit more about how that happens? Once we have all of this requests pulled together. As Bob mentioned, the Budgetary Affairs Committee makes a recommendation. Puts together a report on their comprehensive recommendations, and any other observations they'd like to make and their observations have been enormously helpful.

That Committee has a good overview of the plans, hopes, dreams, and limitations, that academic units are facing. They can often provide advice about places where we should be doing some planning that even the unit has not really been thinking about, but would be helpful to the unit over time.

We explore opportunities that we've seen to collaborate with other units. Either other academic units or support, the Vice Provost for instance. And I. I want to talk here a little bit about the potential use of alternative funds and or fundraising potential. I mentioned before that I have really, we're in a very big campaign and that campaign should be doing a lot of good for our campus when it is, by the time it is completed.

If you were fiscally responsible for a part of the academic mission, you need to be able to be thinking about all the ways in which a particular piece of the vision of your unit is funded. And fundraising needs to be a part of that discussion. Some things you can raise money for.

If you need more scholarship money, that's something you can raise money for. If you need support for faculty, you can raise money for that. If you need money for a person to provide support, say, for the career aspirations of your students or an academic advisor, not as easy to raise money for that kind of thing.

So we talk about are some of the things that you're requesting from the campus, are there ways for us to think about the fundraising potential here, and could we think about maybe a pilot program or a matching program over a short period of time as opposed to a longer term allocation?

I also have to think about other possibilities for funding, and those can come from three different directions. One is if it's an ongoing expense that the campus believes, in consultation with a budgetary affairs committee, needs to be funded, and it belongs in a support unit, it probably should be funded through assessments, right?

So, a good example of this would be we made a major push over the last couple of years to provide increased resources in the form of staffing in the counseling center for students who are facing various challenges for mental health. That kind of funding is not a one-time hit, it's going to happen over time, so it really should be provided through what's called base funding and not one time cash.

And it is something that will be shared as a resource by the entire campus and therefore should be put into, should be paid for, probably, out of assessments. There are other kinds of programs on the campus whether in research through the various vice presidents, whether in research or in diversity equity and multicultural affairs, that people who come to the budgetary affairs committee and make presentations may not be as aware of as I might be, and so if we see an alternative use or a different place to find funding, then the Provost's Fund, we will try to fund an initiative that is recommended out of that alternative place.

And finally, there's the Provost's Fund. The Provost's Fund is a separate fund that was put together as a bit of a counterweight to the RCM model back when we adopted it. I think it, I don't know if it was when we adopted it, or it was the first RCM review, I think, and one of the, I can tell you the tendencies and the responsibilities in centered management model have gone in two directions.

One is every review every five years has recommended more funding at the center to help academic units collaborate with each other and achieve their academic visions in ways that aren't otherwise possible. And the second is more transparency, more simplicity, less accuracy in assessments. So you want a simple, predictable, easily understood model, and that's what every RCM committee has gone for.

So as many people in this room will remember, at the dawn of RCM, well, not many people actually.

I remember it, but I'll be 65 in a few days, so. At the dawn of RCM, there was a complicated set of algorithms that were used to determine assessments, and there was a real effort to work to make people pay for what they used, and through this complicated set of algorithms it probably was real accurate, but it was also opaque as could be, and nobody could figure out what they would actually be paying at the end.

Possibly Elizabeth could have, but there's Bruce. But for most deans, it was pretty opaque, and it also allocated credit hour compensation through a similar algorithm. So honestly, as a dean, you could not figure out what was going to happen next year. You would find out but you couldn't figure it out yourself.

And the downside of that, as you can all imagine, if you apply it to your own finances, personal finances is, no planning, right? You're not going to buy a house if that's your financial situation. So we've worked very much towards a simplification, more accuracy, or less accuracy, more transparency.

The Provost's Fund over that time has become really focused on academic needs, and particularly academic collaboration. So we use it as seed funding for academic programs or collaborations mostly, that's what we do. And we also look, of course, at what is being proposed has a sustainability plan built into it for the short or the long term.

Any comments you'd like to make at this point Bob or Elizabeth or Paul? Okay, so, I think the total funding that was requested was about \$4.6 million. Not very big on a billion dollar plus budget, but if you think of most of the costs on the campus as being fixed costs, buildings, lights, heat, and all of you, you realize that it's these little incremental increases, they actually have a fairly big effect at the right time.

The budgetary affairs committee recommended about 1.7 million in funding. And we gave out of the provost funds, and then I'll talk about others, 744,711 out of other sources that I've talked about, so about 1.4. Now why, and as usual, the budgetary affairs committee had a remarkably strong hit rate for the provost fund, 93% of the recommendations were funded, 7% were not funded.

And the reason for that was that I knew we would be hiring a new dean of education. And expected that that dean would need some resources to be able to come in and do the kinds of things that the dean needed to do. And probably should not be putting funding into something based on the interim, or previous dean's recommendations, when I knew that there would be a leadership change that quickly, so that was that.

Let's see, 92% of the, the last one, I'm sorry, the last one was base funding, so it's recurring funding. Cash funding was about \$874,000 in budgetary affairs committee recommendations. Again, 92% of those recommendations were funded, 8% were not funded, \$70,000. This was because of a question about how the requested amount fit into the strategic plan of the unit requesting it, in this case, SGIS.

And we requested that the unit come back with its strategic plan and sustainability plan for this. About 15% of what the committee recommended was supported from other sources. And so you can see the other sources there. We did collaborations with some of the vice provost, DEMA put in 200,000, OVPR put in 100,000.

We got some foundation funding for some of them, and then put 187,000, almost 188 into assessments. And thinking about next year, I should tell you, some of the commitments that the budgetary affairs committees authorizes are multiyear commitments. That is, what's being proposed isn't going to be achieved in a single year, and we have a number of those multiyear commitments that are ongoing.

One has been the libraries, which I've been providing fairly significant funding for. I think you would all approve of that, and your representatives have approved in your stead. So I think that's it, and I'll open it now for questions. Maybe not, there's a couple more multiyear commitments. Okay, yeah, Bob.

KRAVCHUK: I just wanted to make a comment for members of the council that might not know the distinction between base and cash. Lauren's already explained that for a single year.

But in terms of the operation of a provost fund, money given as cash is one-time money. Because it comes out of what is a steady stream or flow of funds into the Provost Fund.

Those funds are actually available in future years for disbursement. And so the fund can actually expand or contract, depending upon how rapidly the payout is. And that has a great deal to do with how much of base is transferred directly from the fund to a unit, and how much is retained.

And so cash funding is also available for commitment in future years, perhaps in the form of future base allocations. But it's something that, it's the gift that keeps on giving, in other words.

ROBEL: Some examples of the kinds of requests that were funded through the various sources that we talked about.

I think my overall hope for this presentation is that you get a sense and an understanding that there are faculty eyes on the entire process. That by the end of this process, I think the faculty members on your behalf have a very good sense of the state of the campus, generally, and the values that are driving decision making.

AGENDA ITEM ELEVEN: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE REPORT FROM THE BUDGETARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

ROBEL: And a very actually definitive voice in how these allocations are made. So with that, open it up, any questions? Yep, Alan?

BENDER: Yeah, so a couple of things I'm just trying to understand better about budgetary matters in general. So I'm wondering, what are different sort of discretionary funds that are available, so are there president's funds?

And then also, I'm wondering, how much of a surplus there can be in the provost funds? I keep wondering where the Grand Challenges money came from. If they have anything to do with provost funds or president's funds, if there is such a thing.

ROBEL: Grand Challenges were funded in two ways.

One is, the president does have funds, you would assume that he would, to run the university. And among those funds are funds that are given by the state, or had been historically given by the state, as a part of the research funding of the university. And the president has used those funds in a variety of ways.

He's used them to help build research facilities, and he's used them to fund grant challenges. At the point that we adopted the strategic plan, we also adopted a plan for funding it. And so we did put aside funding over the course of a couple years to fund strategic plan initiatives.

And we have been spending that down over the course of the strategic plan. The strategic plan, as you know, will be completed by the bicentennial. And past that, there be dragons. And then the, I feel like I'm missing one, was there a piece I missed there, Alan?

BENDER: I guess the one point was the strategic plan, the funding for that, that was set aside, that was in provost funds?

ROBEL: Some of it was in provost funds, some of it was, we just didn't spend money for a while. We do assess the campus for a variety of things, and we built that funding up. Some of it came from a good revenue mix of non-resident and resident students for a bit, and that helped, so, great, Colin?

JOHNSON: I sort of have a, I don't know if I'm going to do a good job of formulating this question but it's sort of existential philosophical question about how faculty and units relate to the budget generally. Which is one the things that over the years you have explained I think fairly clearly is that there are different sort of set of investments and commitments involved in making, allocating base funding as opposed to cash funding, right?

Which people on this council, I think, kind of understand, and people who are involved in budgetary affairs understand. And I guess, theoretically, the faculty understand it generally. But it seems to me, just in sort of my observation in talking with people in administrator positions. One thing I always hear about kind of standardized kvetching about resource sort of availability is I've heard a lot of people say faculty and units are not very good at asking for anything other than new hires.

Like that's the only thing they know how to ask for, right? That typically when budgetary requests are made, everyone wants to hire. Everyone wishes they could hire more, but that's a different kind of commitment than going in and saying, we as a unit need x amount of money to achieve a describable goal in the shorter term.

And I'm just wondering in terms of addressing some of the, you know, I think amorphous and under-described angst that people feel in some quarters of the institution or just generally about resources, feeling under constraints in some ways, and people not growing in the way that they want to. Is there any wisdom in trying to sort of encourage people to think creatively about making cash requests to their units for sort of describable projects that would yield concrete goods in a fixed amount of time?

And would it be easier from a budgetary perspective for the university at every level to accommodate those kinds of requests? As opposed to getting a list of seven hires you'd like to make and then having to be told we don't have the money and the budget to make a 30 year commitment like that right now.

ROBEL: Yes.

JOHNSON: Okay.

ROBEL: And particularly if the cash investment is going towards something that might over time lead to generating some resources for the big picture. I mean ultimately, we all want excellent faculty. We all want excellent students. And we all want to be able to do our work in facilities and labs and libraries that make that possible.

So if you can help your academic unit think about ways it or in collaboration with other units, it can do something that might be innovative to over time develop a funding base. Those are great projects to fund.

Eric?

RASMUSSEN: Hi, I agree with you this is a good procedure.

And I was on that committee one year and found it very valuable. It was about \$1.5 million but then I was thinking about the Grand Challenges. And I looked that up and that's \$300 million and I really don't know. Does it go through a procedure like this as well?

ROBEL: It goes through a procedure that involves peer review by panels of faculty members and Rick, you might want to talk more about this. But yes, it does go through, it doesn't go through this procedure, it goes through a peer review procedure because these are research proposals.

Anything you'd like to add?

VAN KOOTEN: Now the projects that are selected or the teams that will go forward are always selected by faculty review panels. So it's always like governance on the campus, at least for the Bloomington contributions to the branch office.

ROBEL: I want to be sure we leave enough time for the proposal from the nominations committee, but I don't want to stop conversations about this.

Elizabeth?

HOUSEWORTH: If I can ask, it was my understanding that the Provost Fund was about 4 million a year in base.

ROBEL: In base, is that about right, Vinkat? Hold on, sorry. Let me turn this phone. There we go.

That was very.

HOUSWORTH: I understand that in addition to the 1.7, 1.8 million that you gave out, some of which was in cash, some of which was in base, that they're recurring things, but it doesn't seem to quite make it up to 4 million. And I was wondering if you had plans for the excess?

ROBEL: Well, what you will see, it accumulates and can be given out. When I came into this job, I feel like the Provost Fund was maybe 8 million, 7.5, something like that just in accumulated funding because it hadn't been pushed out.

Does that sound right?

11 million? Well, there you go. And my own view if you look back at the requests we got, we did get over 4.5 million in requests, but we only had 1.7 in recommendations. So there were things about those other requests that for one reason or another the committee didn't think it made sense to support.

But it doesn't go away, and I don't spend it on other things. It just accumulates. Yep, Barb?

CHERRY: Yes, a thought just crossed my mind. The Research Affairs Committee for the BFC is considering some issues, one of which is a dark money issue. We're looking at where certain sources of funding, and I'm just asking just for some insider clarity here.

Is there anything in particular that perhaps the Research Affairs Committee needs to better understand about the budget process and how it might interact with if money is coming, potentially from a dark money source and how it may be matched or not, or other kinds of funds? I know I hadn't thought this through because of brazenness here but I just want to make sure the right-hand knows what the left hand is doing.

So as we look into this, is there something that we need to know better about how money works? To know what things we may be looking at might somehow be impacted by this failed process?

ROBEL: I don't think so, the campus doesn't really have a whole lot of funding from foundation sources. Most of the funding that comes to the campus from foundation sources is scholarship funding that goes to OEM. I just don't think we have a lot of foundation accounts. And I certainly don't have any foundation accounts that have come from anybody nefarious, so I think you're okay to not worry about this one.

CHERRY: I just thought I'd double check.

VAN KOOTEN: Well, regards to that is that OVPR and the campus cost shares quite a few grants. And we do, there's a recent Mellon Grant awarded.

ROBEL: That's true.

VAN KOOTEN: And we cost share those, but there's been none that had any kind of connotations of being dark and gray.

ROBEL: Yeah, those are all the foundations that are well recognized, the Loose Foundation or the Mellon Foundation, are well recognized as supporting academic research.

Okay.

All right, let's turn then to the proposal. Thank you so much, Budgetary Affairs Committee, and I'll be seeing you a lot in the spring.

Yep?

AGENDA ITEM TWELVE: PROPOSAL FROM THE NOMINATION COMMITTEE REGARDING NON-TENURE TRACK ELECTION UNITS

There we go. We have our proposal from the nominations committee regarding non-tenure track election units and I think the remainder of our time will be devoted to that. It's a first reading. Is it Elizabeth? Do you need the-

HOUSMAN: Are you going to wait? I think that Elizabeth is going to help me because I can't do two things at once.

ROBEL: Okay, great, thank you.

HOUSMAN: So I'm standing in for Diane Henshel on behalf of the Nominations Committee. The constitutional amendments passed. One said that the Nominations Committee would propose election units for lectures, clinical professors, research scientists, and professors of practice. And so this is the first reading of the proposal from the nominations committee.

So the current voting composition of the BFC is on the left with the Constitutional Amendments. We will decrease the tenure track records slightly in order to keep the council at a manageable size. And we will increase the non-tenure track representatives, which has to do with, I think, the next slide.

Are there any questions about this slide? Okay, can we go to next one, all right. So professors of practice are not included here. I believe that there's somewhere between 30 and 35 of them on campus. It make sense for professors of practice to be their own election unit.

There was some discussion in NomCom that why are we separating out lectures, clinicals, research scientists and professors of practice? Why don't we just lump them in with their departments or other units? But that was not, in fact, what had been historically done in this council. It is not what the non-tenure task force proposed and it is not what we adopted in this council or that the faculty adopted.

So what the non-tenure track task force was charged to do was to determine what election units lectures, clinical research scientists, and professors of practice should be divided into. We are proposing that professors of practice be an election unit. We are proposing that research scientists be one election unit.

We are proposing that clinical faculty be one election unit. And we are proposing that lectures be divided into three election units. One for the college, which will have four representatives. One for Kelly, which will have two. And one for all other units, which will have two representatives. The number of representatives per election unit is currently governed by the bylaws.

The bylaws say that there will be one representative for every 50 faculty or major fraction thereof. So election units that have over a minimal size, which is 15, get one representative until they reach 76 and then they get to men and so forth. So that is the basis of our proposal.

Lecturers have so many in that category that we decided that breaking that up into three election units made sense. And that is the proposal you have from the nominations committee. There is another slide, but it isn't mine.

ROBEL: Do you want discussion at this point on that?

HOUSMAN: Yes.

ROBEL: Or do you need to go to the other? All right, Bob.

KRAVCHUK: I think the proposal sort of nixes two different ways of cutting the data. On the one hand, we're cutting it by faculty entity category, lecturers, clinical and research scientists. But on the other hand, within lectures, which is the big enchilada here, to make things manageable, we're then allocating numbers of representatives to specific academic units.

So that within that category of lecturer, representation would be fragmented among all the smaller units but concentrated in the college and in the Kelly school, effectively giving them more representation directly than any other unit. I would feel much more comfortable if we were to keep lecture as a single category and randomly allocate each election the individuals within that rank, to separate units, and have the elections take place within those units. That way there would be no systematic chance of over representation of any one academic unit on the Bloomington Faculty Council

ROBEL: Did you want to respond or just gather data at this point since it's our first reading?

HOUSMAN: One, we are a proportional body. Two, your proposal is roughly the same as ours, except that maybe under yours, the lecturers would not be subdivided. They would be their own election unit. But to be clear about what has passed, we have no option of combining lectures, clinical, and clinical, or lectures and research scientists, or having the college have an NTT election unit.

We have election units for clinical. We have one or more election units for electors, one or more election units for clinical, one or more for research scientists, and one or more for professors of practice.

KRAVCHUK: Why not have the lecturers' representatives all elected then at large?

HOUSMAN: That is a possibility, it is not the proposal from the nominations committee. We're a proportional body, and there are so many lectures in the College, and so many lectures in the Kelly, that each of those just support multiple representatives. If we kept the same roles, there would be eight lecture representatives on this body, there's no change in that.

The College has 195 that supports four, Kelly has 106, that supports two, and there's no other unit that's that large, but there would be two lecturers from all other units. But this is in keeping with the idea that we are a proportional body.

ROBEL: Bruce?

SOLOMON: I support the nomination committee's proposal.

I understand the concern about fragmentation, but I'm thinking, it could go the other way. Because if there were simply one election for lecturers among all the different units, there are so many in the College and there are so many in Kelly that they could dominate the whole thing.

I think the nomination committee's proposal kind of protects the smaller units to make sure they at least have some representation.

ROBEL: Alan?

BENDER: So just to make clear, is the voting for the lecturers is that going to work kind of the way the voting happens in the College where everybody votes for each representative unit?

HOUSWORTH: No.

BENDER: Okay.

HOUSWORTH: You vote in your election unit, everybody votes in their election unit. The College is an election unit. It is divided up in order that one department doesn't dominate everything, so that things are distributed around the college. Those are the sub-election units, but the way the constitution and the bylaws are phrased, you vote in your election unit.

The amendment that we passed is that nom com is proposing election units. So if our proposal were adopted, College lecturers would be an election unit, and only College lecturers would vote for College lecturers, etc.

ROBEL: Other thoughts or observations?

ELSNER: I have just a flat-out question, administrative units have one lecturer, and one clinical, and 51 research scientists.

So who are the research scientists in administrative units? Because the College only has 56 of those, presumably these are people who are doing research projects normally funded by grants, so administrative units have—?

ROBEL: That's probably an Eliza question, but Rick, do you know?

VAN KOOTEN: A big chunk of the research centers, and they're actually not listed in here, so that's not accurate, well, they're listed in the administrative.

So there are OVPR research centers, and there's also other research centers, but they're included in the school. So that would be a chunk of it, but not 50, does Eliza know?

ELNSER: It says 51 on the thing, on the slide, it says 51. Do these people not have a home department?

HOUSWORTH: These were people like OVPR, Vice Provost, maybe Vice President for Research, and other administrative units. So like Rick said, those are the types of positions that they have, running centers and equipment—

ROBEL: Are any of them in UITS, that might make—

HOUSWORTH: No, I don't think, at least that was not what Elizabeth Pear's census indicated, it didn't seem like it was UITS.

ROBEL: If you're interested, we can find out for the next meeting. Eliza, do you have any more information?

PAVALKO: Yeah, I think the biggest chunk, like Rick said, is OVPR centers. But various units have one or two for a variety of reasons. And certainly, we can pull out exact, but I think the OVPR centers is the biggest group.

ELSNER: This bothers me a lot, now that I hear the explanation of what it is. And the reason it bothers me is because, if you compare, I think, what that sort of person would be doing as opposed to somebody on optometry or the College. You could see how possibly the research scientists might be on a career path, as opposed to just being a high level technician.

So when I think of a research scientist, it's a person who's more established in the post-doc. They might not want to run their own laboratory, but they may have a good deal of independent thought, and be a contributor to academic creative activities. Where if they're just running a machine, I'm not sure that's a proper job title.

VAN KOOTEN: They're split. For example, the Indiana Institute for Disability and Community has a lot of research scientists, and they're all doing research. Indiana Geological and Water Survey, that they're all doing research. It's sometimes mixed with service for corporations and people in the state, but it's a mix.

But even the ones that, for example, the person in the Center of Genomics and Bioinformatics, there's a bio-informatician that serves faculty, but he's often included as a coauthor in a lot of papers. And that's true across the board, a lot of these research scientists are doing true research and creative activity.

RASMUSEN: I wonder if Eliza could also find out, how many of them have PhDs? Is this all of them or a quarter of them, or—

VAN KOOTEN: All of them.

PAVALKO: By definition, research scientists have to have PhDs.

JOHNSON: And I'm just curious, Elizabeth, if there was any discussion of, because of the size of the lecturer category.

Right now, I understand you to be proposing three separate electoral units, is that correct, as sort of designations? Was there any discussion of treating it as one unit, with sub-units that are described in terms of the constituencies they represent? Which would effectively create a situation in the College where there would be earmarking based on proportional representation.

But the dynamic whereby lecturers as a whole would be sort of voting on one another's election. I'm wondering if there was any discussion of that. And I only raise it because some of these concerns about over-representation in other mechanisms of accountability, whereby people could say we're not being represented.

I mean, there is some leverage there, right? And it might actually induce lecturers to start to think of themselves as a kind of group of people with shared interest across divisional or disciplinary lines or unit based lines, too.

HOUSWORTH: There was not that specific discussion about sub-election units.

We discussed not breaking up lecturers at all, we discussed breaking them up a great deal more than we proposed. We also had deep discussions, unfortunately, about whether this was the right way to proceed. Or whether faculty in a unit, whether they're non-tenure track or tenure track, but we did not discuss sub-election units, that is not what we were asked to do.

We were asked to consider election units for these categories. And so we did not consider that as something that we could propose particularly, or something that we should be proposing, because what we were authorized to do was to establish one or more election units.

JOHNSON: The only reason I could raise it is because I think the question of are we satisfied with these election units turns in some regard on the question for example of whether that atomizes representation and earmarks it too heavily.

And therefore for example creates a population of 195 people who get to vote directly on a much smaller group of people or whether or not there could be some checks and balances across the range. Actually treating it as the lecture election unit with subunits would actually allow for good things.

It would allow for earmarking proportionally, but it would also allow for checks and balances across the rank which might speak to the issue of sort of over-representation and people not listening or thinking that they're actually representing lecturers as lecturers.

HOUSWORTH: The main problem is I think we would have to amend the constitution again.

The sub-election units for the college, I believe are mentioned in the constitution and so we would have to do something similar for the lecture category.

ROBEL: Okay, Moira?

MARSH: Speaking as one of the members of the Nominations Committee who has worked on these proposals all semester, I just want to remind everybody of a position that we reminded ourselves of from time to time, to pull back and realize that the amendments to the constitution that were just ratified are going to make a major, substantial change to the composition of this body, whichever way we go.

I mean, I can't think of a time we've made such a change to this body in one fell swoop. And so we're probably not going to get it right the first time. What we need to do is get something in

place and then we'll try it. And then on the basis of experience, we can come back every year if necessary and tweak and modify until we get something that is closer to be perfect.

HERRERA: If I can add something. I was also part of the NomCom. I shared information with the lectures in different units and there was an agreement in this situation because we would like to avoid what that we could have in one election years, a lecture from the College or a lecture from Kelly without giving the opportunity to lecture us in the other small units.

So that's why the division in a way that the College may be more represented because of the number of lectures in the College, but also we would like to give opportunity to all the units with less lectures but with a chance to represent another a school or another department.

ROBEL: Alan?

BENDER: Yeah, so, I mean obviously, the faculty voted to not only increase the number of NTT's. But also to set a limit on the number. And so, one question is what is that limit?

What do we think that faculty thought that they were voting on in terms of what the limit would be? So these are two possibilities. On the left is if you—

HOUSWORTH: Alan, can I clarify one thing. What Alan is referring to is that one of the amendments limited the insured that tenure track faculty representatives would have at least 60% of the weight of this committee.

So, what all of this is does are different ways of calculating the numbers for that 60, 40 split.

BENDER: Yeah, right so it's the sense and question is the number of voting tenure track faculty and library and representatives shall be no less than 60% of the total voting membership.

Yeah, so I don't know the faculty really given a clear sense of what sort of limit they were voting on. But I think that the simplest reading of this amendment about the 60% is that, well... it's on the left column rather than the right...that administrators would be counted not as being elected and not as being 10 year representatives but instead they'd be counted in the other category.

Anyway, so this is just an issue that I think we need to discuss and for the moment it doesn't make much big of a deal whether we're going to have 15 NTT's or 14, but it seems that right now we are making a precedent on how to interpret the 60% rule.

So I want us to be knowledgeable about what we're dealing with here, and knowledgeable about that there is this issue for what the upper limit of the forensic entities is.

ROBEL: Does the committee have a position on this?

HOUSWORTH: Yes, the committee discussed this at length including trying to parse that language over and over again.

And the committee came to the conclusion that administrators are faculty. That while there isn't a named election unit associated with them. They are representing their functions and roles in this university, and we believe that they count in the elected-representatives category. And that the 40% calculation of others comes out of the body that includes all the elected tenure track members and the administrative members.

And that that puts a larger maximum cap on the number of non-tenure track representatives more practically, or maybe less practically. At any rate, it's a problem for me as a mathematician. If one said that the administrators were not tenure track representatives on this body and don't include them in the numbers one calculates the 40% of.

We would be capping the number of non-tenure track representatives at 14 and yet. The bylaws would require, because they are election units, that we have 15. One for professors of practice, three for clinical, three for research scientists, and eight for lecturers.

SOLOMON: Thank you. I get the problem that 15 is greater than 14.

But as I've been thinking about this, I think about how we have shared governance on this campus. And it's usually thought of, in my mind, that's faculty sharing with the administration. And there are, in my experience on this council, administrators already have sort of a head start on faculty in terms of governance.

They have control over budgets, they have executive authority to make decisions, which they can do. To give them equal representation, person by person representation, on this council as well strikes me as a kind of double-dipping. And I prefer the calculation on the left for that reason.

ROBEL: What turns on this?

I mean, certainly the number of non-tenure track faculty members for purposes of this calculation. But are we talking about disenfranchising me and the Vice Provost? Is that a part of this conversation?

HOUSMAN: Not from voting, it's whether you count in a line and constitution that reserves 60% of the vote of this council for tenure track faculty.

ROBEL: So, it's basically, symbolically, are we faculty members, for purposes of the 60/40 rule?

HOUSMAN: Not faculty, faculty representatives, you are clearly faculty members. The question, when we were discussing it, lingered longer on the word representative.

ROBEL: Mm-hm, okay. Jim?

SHERMAN: Yeah, was there any thought given to simply saying, there are so many tenure track representatives in the faculty?

There are six administrators in another category. And then there are others, which I believe would put the possibility for NTTs at about 20.

HOUSWORTH: No, no, your calculations are, I believe, not accurate. We'd have to go back and check all the math, but I think these numbers are the two logical maximums based on—

SHERMAN: But if you had the six administrators not on the left side of the bottom—

HOUSWORTH: So you're talking about not including administrators as others either.

SHERMAN: Right, just—yes, they're voting members and they have the same rights and responsibilities. It's just a different way of dividing up the pie, you don't have to put them with either.

ROBEL: We're sort of constitutionally-mandated participants.

HOUSWORTH: That's an interesting—but I think it still hinges on what we passed in the constitution. It says that the tenure track faculty have to have 60%, faculty representatives have to have 60% of the vote, so I think you could not do that—

ROBEL: But at the bottom, that's why I'm asking the question, what turns on this? If you're not talking about disenfranchising the folks who are required by the constitution to come, as opposed to all of you, who are choosing to do this out of your love of service, the question then becomes, what actually turns on this, and is it just the number of non-tenure track faculty members?

HOUSWORTH: It is and that concerns me. The bylaws give each election unit one representative for every 50 faculty, or a major fraction thereof. And we could not have that for the non-tenure track faculty representatives.

That is what, in my mind, turns on this.

ROBEL: Jon, sorry?

TRINIDAD: To expand a little on Bruce's comment. I mean, if you consider the administrators to be primarily administrators, and you don't want them to accrue too much power in both roles, Then it would actually seem to me that you'd want more faculty that aren't administrators, in other words, more non-tenure track.

And so, if you're worried about, so it would be the right proposal, would be what you want, if you had your concerns. And just this whole argument, that we don't want the administrators to have too much power, so we're going to take power away from the NTT faculty, I don't see the logic, basically.

CHERRY: Yes, I don't know if everybody had a chance to read the email exchange that went on earlier this week, but I offered—

ROBEL: No.

CHERRY: I offered in an email, an analysis to help us through. And I think part of the problem is related to the fact that we have to have consistency in how we interpret terms in the constitution.

It may well be as Moira and Provost Robel have indicated, That with these new amendments to the constitution, we may need some clean-up work in implementing all this. But in the email that I distributed this week, I sat down and actually looked over the structure of the constitution.

And the structure of the constitution, just to paraphrase now, but it is available in writing in the email. The constitution is very clear that the relevant section 5.5, it labels as representatives, only those that are elected. In section a, those that are elected and referred to as representatives governs representation affecting library units.

Subsections B, C, D, and E each provide for additional categories of representatives at large campus, non-tenured track, retired faculty, so on and so forth, they are all each elected and referred to as representatives. When you get to subsection G this is where defines, or recognizes that administrators, or certain administrators, shall be considered voting members.

The term representative is never used to describe them. So, when you look at the language, and what the terms mean, what it means according to this, is that administrators are included in the denominator, for purposes of saying 60% of all voting members, that's what the Constitution Amendment reads as follows, just make sure we understand.

The Constitutional Amendment actually says, the number of voting tenure-track faculty in library representatives shall be no less than 60% of the total voting members of the council. The administrators are voting members, expressly said so in subsection G of section 5.5. They are not deemed representatives under this language and therefore they should not be included in the numerator.

That's the truest reading of what this constitution requires. Now if there ends up being some friction in how to interpret this language with some concerns about the number of represented with bylaws, first of all, the constitution overrules the bylaws, okay?

So if the bylaws call for something else, and that's where the dilemma is, then it may be that in going forward as been suggested, that part of the cleanup may require reconciling this. But I suggest that the language constitution itself is very clear that administrators are neither elected, they aren't, nor representatives, but they are voting members so there's nothing about the 60% rule that's trying to disenfranchise the administrators voting at all.

It's just whether they count for purposes of the 60% and according to the language of the Constitution, they shouldn't. That's what I suggest, is a correct reading of the constitution.

ROBEL: Nicely done! We're going to Eric and then to Kim.

RASMUSEN: Yes. Barbara's right. Administrators just aren't faculty representatives and we have to do some cleanup in a year. Possibly we don't have to do anything now though.

I'm going to suggest something else. Why aren't emeriti tenure-track representatives? If they are then we can squeeze in with 15 non tenured tracks just barely. In fact, we have one to spare and though in a couple years we'll run into conflict because we want to have more NTT's.

We'll be okay for now and can defer this question and we better fix it up in the meantime.

DAU-SCHMIDT: —To drop the administrators out of both the numerator and the denominator. But I would say that she's right, that they belong in the denominator now and not in the numerator.

And one reason why that appeals to me is the idea of appointed administrators, as much as we value them, as much as we value their opinions and their contributions, they can't be faculty representative on an elected body.

ROBEL: I agree with you. We're not elected representative. We're constitutionally mandated.

Your predecessors chose to include us as voting members. Okay?

BREITHAUPT: Thank you. I actually agree to most of what has just been said. I just wanted to remind us in a certain sense, I mean, there's one danger that I see in this which is that suddenly people feel like they have to vote as something.

I have to vote as a TT faculty member is to vote as an NTT faculty member. Luckily, I think in 95% of issues that place no rule for us. Voting here as members of one campus with joined interest, which is a good thing to remind us of that.

And I also agree that the elected officials have to be free, they have to not vote as the one or the other kind of thing. They have to have high interest in mind here, as we luckily, mostly do.

So the first thing is I wanted to say, the one thing that I want to caution about is that we set in motion something here, certainly people feel to be loyal to the one or the group in some odd way here.

And the voting procedures could do that of course as we suddenly feel like you elected s, that and that kind of faculty member but not just the other one, and that is the one thing that I want to be sure that we are careful about. At this point, and then of course the other principal that is important is that ultimately the democracy rules.

This means that one faculty member has the equal amount of chance, I mean TT or NTT, both are faculty. They have an equal amount of representation. I think those are the two principles that I would like to stress again here to the committee making the final recommendations.

Thank you.

ROBEL: Any other discussion for the good of the order? Alan?

BENDER: Yes, so personally, I'd like there to be lots of NTT's. I'd like for there not to really be a limit. But I think that the fair accurate reading of what was passed is really represented in the left column here.

What we could do is go ahead and go by the left column. But then if people don't like that, we can work to change the Constitution. I know that sounds like a horrible thing to do, but it's not necessarily that hard. I mean, it just amounts to the—

No, seriously. It amounts to the BFC deciding to pass something. And then yeah, you have to send out a vote, but it doesn't have to be all that big of a deal is all I'm saying.

ROBEL: But we're at the end of our time, and this was a discussion item, so discussion continue over the break.

And we'll come back in the Spring and renewed and think about whether something even more elegant has occurred to us all. Have a wonderful holiday.