

University Faculty Council Minutes
April 28, 2020 | 1:30 - 4:30 p.m.
Zoom

Attendees:

Co-Chairs: Diane Henshel, John Watson, Joe Wert

Officers: Raman Adaikkalavan (secretary)

Ex Officio: Michael McRobbie, John Applegate, Nassar Paydar

UFC Office: Chad Eagleton, Karen Lee, Elizabeth Pear, Sarah McCammon

Members: Dakota Coates, Judah Cohen, Paul Cook, Andrea Copeland, Erika Dowell, Charles Feldhaus, Andrea Griffin, James Marrs, Moira Marsh, Lindsey Mayo, Meg Meiman, Isabel Mishkin, Laverne Nishihara, Scott Opasik, Megan Palmer, Marietta Simpson, Paul Sokol, Jennifer Thorington Springer, John Walbridge, Stephanie Whitehead, Susan Zinner

Guests: Denise Bullock, Kip Drew, Chuck Carney, Kathy Ernstberger, Kathryn Holcomb, Edwin Marshall, Judith Palmer, Ryan Piurek, Alex Tanford, Jon Trinidad, John Whelan

- **Item 1:** Executive Session on the Review of Chancellor Kathryn Girten
Report by Denise Bullock and Edwin Marshall, Co-chairs of the Review Committee
- **Item 2:** Executive Session on the Review of Chancellor Susan Sciame-Giesecke
Report by Kathryn Holcomb and Judith Palmer, Co-chairs of the Review Committee
- **Item 3:** Executive Session on the Review of Chancellor Ray Wallace
Kathy Ernstberger and John Whelan, Co-chairs of the Review Committee
- Meeting started at 2.05 pm
- **Item 4:** [Minutes of March 24, 2020](#) approved by voice vote.
- **Item 5:** Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)
Diane Henshel, John Watson, and Joe Wert, Co-chairs of the University Faculty Council

Diane Henshel

The financial exigency policy will be reviewed today. UFC executive committee will pass the policy after taking the today's comments to consideration. This was originally planned for fall 2020 but moved it up due to the pandemic and current situation. This follows the approval process used for the policy regarding changes to tenure clock for tenure track faculty and the probationary period for non-tenure track faculty where it was first reviewed by the UFC and passed later by the UFC executive committee after very slight changes.

John Watson

The IFC considered changes to the constitution and bylaws at a hearing as required. There were relatively few comments. There were questions about how it relates to current practice or lack thereof. IU medical school representative Associate Dean Dankoski spoke in favor of the changes being proposed.

Joe Wert

We have received comments on the constitution amendment proposal from the regional campuses and they have been uniformly positive.

- **Item 6: Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)**
Michael McRobbie, President of Indiana University

The COVID-19 pandemic represents the gravest public health challenge that we have faced in a century. Indiana is still in lockdown and extends to May 1st. Governor Holcomb is expected to discuss his plan later this week. In Indiana, to date we have seen over 16,000 cases and over 900 deaths attributed to COVID-19. Nationwide there are more than a million cases and over 55,000 deaths. The pandemic has at least temporarily devastated the economy and now with over 30 million unemployed. Most of the higher education institutions are closed for traditional operations and have transitioned to online. As noted before, IU has reacted with the greatest speed and urgency. To reemphasize, in response to the pandemic, we have always had two overarching priorities. Firstly, the health and safety of all students, faculty, and staff. Secondly, maintaining the continuity of instruction, research and clinical operations. We have had to take an enormous number of difficult, complex and unprecedented decisions almost daily, and steps have been taken through advice of numerous committees across all levels. Since the march meeting, all teaching at IU for a student body of over a hundred thousand have been transitioned from a largely traditional mode of instruction to all virtual classes for the remainder of the spring semester. This transition was accomplished in just two short weeks. It's a remarkable story and this was massive and unprecedented undertaking, and the transformation went remarkably successful, seemingly with very few complaints. All summer classes are being held virtually as well.

The thousands of faculty and staff responsible for this transformation deserve our most sincere thanks and congratulations for this remarkable effort. I've tried to say that as often as I can and the trustees passed a resolution to this effect in their last meeting. In just a few short weeks, around 18,000 class sections were successfully transitioned to virtual sections by over 10,000 faculty and staff against the background of considerable disruption to everybody's personal lives. Just to mention a couple of stats, we have had over 100,000 Zoom classes and meetings and over 20 million connected minutes. Kaltura and the various other tools are being used in a massive way like this. This would not have been possible without IU's long-standing investments in high-quality, robust IT infrastructure over the last couple of decades and nearly 10 years of successful experience with IU Online. A lot of the infrastructure that was needed was ready to go. But this is not the way any of us wish to continue. The consequences of continuing this way grave the education of our students, for the research and scholarship of our faculty, for the financial stability of the university, and for the health of the state's economy, where, taken with IU Health, we are in fact the largest employer in Indiana. However, I'm absolutely confident that IU will ultimately return to a full in-person university experience. This is our overarching goal for every IU campus, and like everybody else, I want this to happen sooner rather than later.

The seriousness and uncertainty of the pandemic demands caution. As Governor Holcomb has said, "This is not a race to be first, but rather to be surest and safest." We cannot be cavalier about the health and safety of any member of our community, and we cannot be confident that the future will play out as we would wish. Therefore, it would be neither realistic nor responsible to promise a full resumption of in-person activity in the fall. The best medical and public health evidence and projections tell us that the coronavirus will not just go away, it will remain active, maybe to a large degree. The potential for recurrence will remain with us until a successful vaccine is widely deployed. Looking at the experience of the Spanish flu, the second recurrence was by far the most deadly and widespread. There's no reason to believe this would happen here, but nevertheless, that is the behavior of a previous virus 100 years ago. Best estimates here are that the successful deployment of a vaccine would not be for 12 or more months, although there are now nearly a 100 separate efforts around the world.

It is essential that we plan for multiple return scenarios in the coming academic year, including, but not limited to, an in-person experience. We are planning for five such scenarios for the next academic year. The first scenario, in many ways the most unlikely, is a total return to in-person teaching and research. It's a scenario that most of us would prefer, but highly unlikely. As the experts have warned, in all likelihood, we need to continue social distancing and many other active measures to detect and protect against the spread of the coronavirus. This will mean that even a return to in-person teaching and research will require careful consideration of re-configuring large lecture classes,

re-engineering courses, performances, athletics, modifying laboratory and studio practices, number of people who can gather, high-level cleaning and so on.

The second scenario is the hybrid scenario that involves both in-person and online teaching and research, but in proportions yet to be determined. At this point in time, this is the most likely scenario. All this could change rapidly through some new positive or negative development, even tomorrow. The balance is really going to depend on certain developments and in public health. There are also several variations on this scenario, but they all have in common a high level of flexibility to accommodate rapid changes in the course of the pandemic, as well as the need to accommodate students and faculty who are unable to attend class in-person, whether due to illness, self-isolation, vulnerability to the coronavirus, or travel restrictions. Flexibility can take many forms. For example, it could involve classes offered both in-person and remotely, say, by recording lectures. It can involve prioritizing some classes for in-person or for remote instruction based on their size, content, and other characteristics. It can involve creating modular classes that are designed to include both in-person and remote elements where they can switch from one mode to another very quickly. It could involve rethinking the weekly schedule to spread out larger classes, for example, to allow for smaller sections. In this context, Vice Presidents Wheeler and Morrison have been instructed to do a comprehensive survey of all our classrooms, including those that are the responsibility of various schools to assess them for bidirectional technology readiness. This is something that's been worked on for 20 years, but with the likelihood of this hybrid scenario becoming the most realistic one, we need to ensure that our classrooms are fully capable of handling that bidirectional flow of information. It is of course much easier to describe these measures than to implement them. There's no doubt about it that this, of course, will be hard work, but it will be essential if the university is to weather the storm with our instructional and research programs intact and with a level of student enrollments that are necessary to sustain our education and research missions.

Scenarios 3, 4, and 5, plan for the fall being remote and spring in-person, for fall in-person and spring remote, and for the entire year online, respectively. These three scenarios would correspond to the pandemic remaining so serious that the fall semester has to be held remotely, but where we can resume hybrid operations in the spring. This may be the scenario that mirrors the Spanish flu of 1919. The one that corresponds to scenario 4 is the need to return to remote operations in the spring after having begun hybrid operations in the fall because of a major recurrence of the coronavirus. What would be the most difficult of all of these would be remote operations the whole academic year. That, of course, would be extremely problematic for us. We hope we can avoid these. We might actually see a mixture of these scenarios across our campuses depending on the regional impact of the pandemic. For example, the pandemic could hit South Bend very severely and New Albany not having any issues at all, in which case, the scenarios may need to be different for what happens on each campus.

We must also recognize that students' expectations of the quality of remote instruction will be much higher in fall 2020 or spring 2021 than they were in this spring. The standalone Zoom experience is not going to be adequate. Everyone understood this semester that we moved very quickly to remote instruction, which meant that the great majority of classes offered after spring break were neither intended nor designed for remote delivery in most cases, but they required great patience and considerable forbearance by students and by all concerned.

Here is an overview of how we are planning for these scenarios and for our continued response to the pandemic. Overall planning, as it relates to IU's core academic mission is under the direction of the Executive Committee of the Academic Leadership Council. This council is chaired by the President and comprises the four EVPs and VP Sejdinaj. The larger Executive Policy Group, chaired by the President includes the broader senior academic leadership of the university, public health and medical experts, and affected areas of the university's operations. This sets our overall policy in our response to the pandemic. The first meets biweekly, the second meets weekly and sometimes more. As EVP Applegate described at the last meeting, extensive work continues to be done at the level of the incident management team that has actually been in place since January. This team brings together a host of university campus, local, state, and other health services personnel to ensure a regular and up-to-date flow of information. The Emergency Operation Center, which is now located in president's hall, coordinates response activities, supplies, logistics, and implementation planning. So an enormous amount of work has been going non-stop by those groups since January. In addition, I've directed that each campus establish committees tailored to their needs to plan in detail and

implement, when necessary components of the five scenarios. Campuses focus on the following key areas and others as well. The key areas are health and safety practices along with implications, handling the three categories (resident, non-resident, and international) of course offerings, pricing, marketing, staffing levels, cost structure, and research activities.

How will we decide how to return to in-person education? How will we restart university operations? Until a vaccine arrives, it will involve the deployment of some combination of fast and comprehensive virus testing and antibody testing, using both in combination. Therapeutics, where there are hundreds of trials underway, a number of them are quite promising that would at least greatly diminish the level of mortality of the coronavirus. Temperature monitoring and surveillance, common in Asia, less so here. Vice Presidents Morrison and Wheeler have been instructed to review technologies for temperature monitoring that are available for possible deployment. Continued social distancing and contact tracing.

To advise us on all of these and other measures, I've established the Restart Committee, which is chaired by EVP and Dean of the School of Medicine, Jay Hess, who happens to be up to have a PhD in virology and a pathologist. Its members include the deans of our two schools of public health and other public health medical experts, virologist, and epidemiologists. This committee is tasked with recommending when and under what conditions IU can restart its educational research and other activities. The recommendations of the Restart Committee will then be used to begin a phased resumption of university operations. The strategy is to assist the success and lessons learned from each new phase of restarted operations to build confidence for the next. To this end, and subject to the governor's decision about the future of Indiana's lock down, and to the recommendations of the Restart Committee, it is our aim as one of the first of these confidence-building measures is to endeavor to fully restart all university research activities, as soon as is practicable. To this end, I've created a Laboratory Research Restart Committee, co-chaired by VP Research Fred Cate and VP and Dean of the Graduate School James Winbush, to implement the recommendations of the Restart Committee in the context of the critically important laboratory and related research that had to be suspended last month. It's a significant part of the university's research. There is extensive funding available for research in areas relevant to the pandemic and other public health issues that we have faculty across the university or campuses, who are capable of contributing to those efforts and would want to be able to have their labs fully functioning again, as best they can. Based on the success of these and other efforts, we will be able to consider moving to further phases. As to when this will happen, it will be determined, in part by the Governor's decisions. We might begin our phase of restart like next month there is no guarantee of this at this stage. It really is going to be very important what the Governor says this week and also the recommendations of the Restart Committee.

I talked to the board about fiscal implications a few weeks ago. The fiscal implications for IU and of course the state nation will be severe, and that will be felt for many years, even after COVID-19 is defeated. Roughly 50 percent of IU's revenue comes from tuition. If our enrollment drops, as it almost certainly will, our revenue drops. As to enrollment for the fall, that is still relatively early days. But in broad terms, at this point in time, we expect resident student numbers to fall but this may vary across campuses. There may even be a counter trend of more students wanting to enroll closer to home and not move into state. This is something we have seen some evidence of and is something that other institutions across the country also believe will happen and they're seeing evidence of it as well. We'll see non-resident numbers fall and probably more than resident student numbers. It's a corollary of the first that there will be a move to go to college closer to home. Of course, will also be driven by issues affordability too. We will see international student numbers fall significantly, probably less so with continuing international students. Our freshman international class will be only a small fraction of what it's been in the past. In all cases, campuses and other university offices are working with enormous urgency to counter these expected falls. But we still expect and are planning for and modeling significant declines. As I said to the trustees recently, I don't want to sugarcoat any of this as it will equate to a very large fall in revenue and hence the financial consequences will be potentially severe. In expectation of this, we have taken already, as you all know, a number of major actions, including freezing the hiring of staff, prioritizing strategic faculty hires and requiring executive vice president approval for them, freezing mid-year salary increases, canceling previously approved fiscal 2021 salary increases, building the fiscal 2021 budget with a five percent general fund reduction, and planning for additional five, should that be necessary. Delaying non-essential planned capital projects funded through university resources, reducing Grand Challenge funding, reviewing IU

Foundation Funds to ensure their full utilization, and strictly limiting travel and purchases. At the moment no one's traveling, but obviously that may become an issue again in the future. All of these actions and more will be reflected in the budget for the fiscal year 2020/2021. VP and CFO John Sejdinaj and his staff and the fiscal committees and staff in all the campuses and schools are working on with the greatest of energy and urgency. This budget will be presented to the trustees in June. As I said to the trustees, I don't want to sugarcoat the situation with phrases or whole optimism. These are difficult and unpleasant decisions that we have had to make and we will have to continue to make in the coming weeks and months, but they are necessary in the circumstances. However, investments over many decades and basic infrastructure, key efficiencies into campus collaboration, innovation, and fiscal responsibility have put us in a good position to weather the storm. Finally, I would note that in all of this, IU's commitment to supporting and enhancing the excellence of our academic core must remain the foundation of all our efforts and decisions. In all we do, we must adapt to the present while keeping our eyes firmly fixed on the horizon so that the remarkable progress that the university has made over the last 200 years, the last a 100 years, and the last decade, will continue.

- **Item 7:** Question/Comment Period (10 minutes)

Marrs: Thank you for that report. It was very comprehensive and useful. My question is about the students that are in financial trouble due to the pandemic, particularly diverse students. Is there a particular plan on going with that?

McRobbie: Firstly, this is not quite your question, but I think it's relevant to one of the points I made in my remarks. We have to be particularly sensitive to the issues concerned with the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on African-American and Latino students. Across the university as a whole, none of our students in those two categories is approaching 20 percent in total minorities and now about 25 percent of the university. So that's going to take some special attention as well, with respect to financial aid or financial difficulties. Under the CARES Act, funding was made available to all the universities. The total amount that was awarded to IU was 60 million, of which 30 million is specifically to go to students, basically students with financial aid, who quite often are Pell grant recipient students. The criteria for the awarding of this are being finalized now, and that funding will start to flow to students in those categories very soon. In addition, there are a series of different funds available both through the foundation, including some fundraising and at the campus level that will provide assistance to students. There's no doubt this is going to be a major need into the future as well.

Marrs: I would also like to say I really appreciate your leadership and your group of leaders that you are calling upon.

McRobbie: It's an outstanding group of leaders and all of these people, because I interact with most of them every day, probably more so than before. People have worked almost non-stop now for the last two to three months. EVPs, VPs and the deans and dozens of other faculty members and hundreds of staff members who have all been working night and day seven days a week to help address all these issues, for the betterment of the whole university.

Marrs: Communication and the leadership has been great.

Walbridge: There will be huge political pressure on the governor and the state government to reopen as soon as possible. But on the other hand, IU obviously is quite capable of making its own decisions about whether it's prudent to reopen or not. How comfortable would you be in facing a situation where the state was pressuring towards reopening of the economy and the people you are listening to and public health and so forth, they're saying not yet?

McRobbie: I stayed in fairly close contact with the governor and either I watch his daily briefings or I get an excellent summary. I really got nothing but praise for the governor, in terms of, how well he has handled this and the great leadership he has shown. He's consistently said he's going to be driven by science and by data. When we started closing down we probably went beyond what we

could have kept doing under the governor's executive order. We just felt that it was necessary to go beyond what he said. Should the governor come out and say at the end of this week, the resumption of business as usual, I don't think there will be any difficulty at all in us continuing to move at the pace that we think is appropriate to ensure the safety of our students, faculty, and staff in the university. We have a complex environment that necessitates many people in close physical proximity. Consequently, in terms of us returning to business as usual, that has to be seriously taken into account in the context of the public health threat.

Henshel: How Purdue claims they're going to be handling in-person classes versus online classes. Are you going to be leaving it up to the faculty to say that they're comfortable with in-person classes or are you going to have some other way of deciding that?

McRobbie: I don't want to comment on what they may or may not be doing, but with respect to in-person classes and the conditions for them, that will come out of the recommendations of the restart committee. I would expect that in some form, there will be a recommendation, or one would be able to construct a recommendation that will say, here are the conditions under which in-person classes can be resumed and that will probably add a proviso about the conditions under which the particular faculty member can or should not interact with that class in-person. There is a serious issue, which I think is one of the more difficult ones here where people are talking about the risk to people of 60 and over. It's no point disguising that. That is going to be an issue we are going to have to wrestle with, but at the end of the day, people can't be forced to go back into the classroom if they feel that it's unsafe. We are going to see access to very comprehensive testing start to become available to us and that is going to be a major component of any conditions under which we restart the university. IU Health is our partner and they are the biggest health system in this state. We are working with all of the clinicians. We want to work with IU Health to address this issue of testing done properly and safely and at scale and quickly and those discussions are underway and will be one of the outcomes of the restart committee as well. When compared to some of my colleagues and other institutions around the country, we are in much better shape than some in that regard. I chair the AAU at the moment and we had a meeting last Monday. We had nearly all the presidents and chancellors of all 65 institutions participated and the kind of approach that I've described here, incremental approach, is by and large what I think most other institutions have also reasoned themselves as well. I'm hoping we will get lots of good innovation at the grassroots level, individual faculty members coming up with brilliant ideas as to how to deal with some of the social distancing issues and other issues as well. But I think the overall approach of the incremental, confidence building approaches is going to be the one that others will adopt and also combined with some combination of those various measures, testing, social distancing, contact tracing, and all the rest of them.

Henshel: It's already starting to increase at 40 and above and it's higher at 50 and above in terms of risk, but more recently, there have been a few different hospitals that are reporting that it's actually our graduate student demographic that is at very high risk for these unusual strokes that are starting to show up in COVID-19 people. How much is that being taken into account? Because that's out of the blue. Usually people that don't show much sign and then all of a sudden they have this massive stroke.

McRobbie: I tried to make it clear that we are going to be concerned about the health of all demographics. We are not going to make assumptions, the statistics certainly do show there is a greater risk for those with preexisting health problems of a certain kind and certainly the older you get, the more susceptible you are. There is certainly evidence that the younger demographics are at risk in ways that haven't yet been fully understood. As you pointed out, I saw the sample report you are talking about, these unexpected strokes on people in their thirties and forties. This is clearly a virus whose effects are not understood yet and probably will not be understood for quite some time. I should have said and was remiss of me not to have mention this, the pandemic has struck one of our own, Professor Dennis Peters in Chemistry in IU Bloomington, who I had lunch with just like last year, died of the coronavirus a couple of weeks ago. Fine man, a great chemist, and a great loss to the department and to the faculty.

- **Item 8:** Proposed resolution on sustainability (10 minutes)
Laverne Nishihara, IU East Faculty Senate President
[Action Item]

The idea of a sustainability resolution for the IU campuses originated at IU East. Last spring, two faculty members on the IUE Sustainability Council approached me about what could be done to facilitate progress towards sustainability. In discussion, we were talking about the idea of a resolution patterned after what had been done in a number of cities and states in the U.S., as well as a number of institutions of higher education that is setting a goal of going carbon-neutral by a specified year. The IUE's resolutions specifies the year 2040. Very briefly, the rationales for the resolution, very IU centered here, it's increasingly a priority with a traditional university age population to support sustainability efforts. We are trying to attract prospective university students. Secondly, sustainability is a part of the IU Bicentennial Strategic Plan and on the strategic plans of the campuses in one way or the other. There are sustainability related academic programs, whether face-to-face or online, across the campuses as well. The IUE Faculty Senate approved two different sustainability resolutions. What most of the campuses examined was the second resolution approved in December 2019. There was a first resolution approved in April 2019. It had a lot of footnotes in fine print. When this was presented to the IUE Student Government Association, the students could not make heads or tails of it. So what became obvious, in addition to how the resolution needed to be clearer, as well as more substantial, was that first, all the groups on campus had to be behind sustainability goals. The administration, faculty, staff, and students all had to back this if it were to go anywhere. Secondly, it was obvious with the emphasis on the enrollment cliff and now with the current state of the economy associated with the COVID-19 pandemic that fiscal responsibility, and IU's financial well-being just had to be maintained while pursuing sustainability goals. Third, the IUE's campus was not able to pursue sustainability goals by itself alone. All the IU campuses had to support the effort. Hence, you see the emphasis on collaboration of administration, faculty, staff, and students. Hence the line in the resolution about preserving fiscal responsibility.

The resolution went first to the regional faculty caucus with representation from the five regional campuses, and then to Bloomington and IUPUI. The resolution before you is a compilation of campuses' resolutions that UFC co-chair, Diane Henshel, and I worked on. By now, all five regional campuses, Bloomington and IUPUI faculty governance organizations have approved sustainability resolutions. Now, Bloomington and IUPUI resolutions set the goal of the year 2030 to become carbon neutral. Other campuses have stated the goal of the year 2040, with one campus not specifying a particular year, but backing the goal. Bloomington, IUPUI, and one or two other campuses have called for campus action plans by the year 2023. The UFC resolution before you calls for a university wide sustainability action plan by 2025. Again, the emphasis is on collaboration and the participation of all campuses and all groups on the campuses. I know the UFC co-chairs are willing to mention this to the Board of Trustees. Diane Henshel can address the plan of forming a task force on sustainability. For some of us, this resolution, if it is approved, is like a preface or it's like step one. The real effort that will last well beyond 20 years from the IU bicentennial comes after this resolution's approval.

Henshel: Here is the steps forward that we are anticipating. When talking with the various Sustainability Office Directors, it's clear that we need an action plan, and the action plan needs to come from across the university. It can't be obviously just faculty. We decided to at least start our thinking about how such a task force would we put together based on the work that we have been doing with VP Whelan in developing in the HR advisory committee. The HR advisory committee has, at this point, 50 percent representation from faculty and 50 percent representation from staff. The staff includes professional staff, clerical staff, and maintenance staff, as all three are part of the university equally and equally important in supporting all of what happens at IU across all the campuses. Similarly, the campuses are either directly represented, such as for IUPUI and IUB, or are represented through a regional campus representative of their job type demographic. This is a good starting place. Obviously we will be working with the VP for capital projects which is one piece of it, that all of the sustainability offices will have to be a piece of it, and that we will have to be taking into account, logistics and financial considerations, as well as all of our some pie in the sky and some reasonably down to earth goals. The other thing we all recognize is that we need buy-in from the

students. Currently, the students took the IUB resolution to form a carbon neutral IU resolution that they are currently circulating and they are completely onboard with trying to work with everybody else on this. So far, everybody who has participated in this, and this includes a wide variety of faculty from across the different campuses, have all pretty well recognized that there is a certain amount of behavior change that's going to have to go into any successful carbon neutral campaign. So it's not just top-down, it has to be across the board, bottom-up and top-down.

- **Item 9:** Questions/comments on the proposed resolution on sustainability (20 minutes)

Henshel: It would be very nice to hear from people about whether or not they're going to support the resolution. We are planning to vote on it today. So this is the time to say I want to change something if you want to change something.

Chat: Two members support it

Moved and seconded. No further discussion.

ACTION: Resolution approved unanimously, by voice vote.

- **Item10:** Discussion of proposed policy on financial exigency (10 minutes)
Jon Trinidad, Chair of the Financial Exigency Task Force
Alex Tanford, Chair of the Policies Review Committee
[Discussion Item]

[U21-2020 Proposed policy on financial exigency](#)

Trinidad: Co-Chair of the IUB CREM committee and Chair of the UFC task force. We started this about two years ago in Bloomington long before financial exigency was on anyone's radar. Here is the brief summary. Aside from the obvious desire to have a financial exigency policy, there are a number of existing UFC policies, ACA 79, 52, 18 and 19, which make reference to financial exigency most notably when tenured contracts would be canceled. But there was no overall description of what that policy should be certainly in a standalone document. So that's what motivated our actions in our committee.

The scope very briefly is just to encompass that we are talking about a university level financial exigency event rather than a lesser crisis that might occur on the level of an individual campus.

The policy statement has a number of subsections. Basically in contrast to the procedures which we will talk about, the policy statement really just wants to, in broad terms, define the scope of what we consider financial exigency do constitute and the process by which it would be declared. So if you look at various financial exigency documents at different universities or the AAUP, there is this phrase, "severe and imminent financial crisis that threatens the survival of the university." So that's really what we are talking about here. Something so severe that people might lose tenure or long-term appointments because those would be the only mechanisms really, or those would have to also be evoked to keep the university solid. Then in B, C, and D here to further define the scope, we are touching on what wouldn't constitute a financial exigency or at the very least wouldn't be the initiating event. So indeed, merely shifting resources away from teaching or research or from one campus unit to another, would not constitute financial exigency for any of the units involved. In C, we really want to emphasize because there were some concerns on the parts of certain campuses that were talking about a university level event here, not one within a unit or a campus and that a CREM-type event. In D, reorganization merger would not be financial exigency. In E, it discusses that there would have to be transparent accounting principles used in any declaration of financial exigency. In F, it discusses that this would be Board of Trustees or President level decision. Nevertheless, it would have such a significant impact on the teaching and research mission of the university that F outlines why that justifies faculty involvement in the process. G, is limiting what is or isn't financial exigency and again, reiterating that it's really a university wide financial exigency. At least what this policy is meant to

cover, rather than issues specific to individual campuses and to the extent that those campuses might have their own policies regarding financial exigency. The policy we are talking about today is not meant to supersede that. It is a question of timing. The main point here is that declaration of financial exigency isn't expected to be open-ended. Of course, hard to know how long a given financial crisis will last, but the expectation is that it would be up to a year. If it needed to be extended beyond a year, there would be some formal discussion or announcement along those lines.

The procedures section has the steps that would be involved. So there is an announcement, there is providing information, the announcement on the part of the President or Board of Trustees. Where the faculty comes in would be where those parties provided with the relevant information to the UFC. The UFC will then constitute an ad hoc committee to deal with their role in the process. That committee will analyze the situation and report back to the President. Then finally, some aspect of dealing with consequences if, for example, a regional campus in particular might have to be shut down. A, establishes a line of communication between the President and the University Faculty Council. B, discusses the relevant information the UFC will need and some timing with which ideally such information would be provided to the UFC. C, discusses the Financial Exigency Committee that will be put together by the UFC. There is a number of subsections here. The basic point of that is to make sure all of the relevant stakeholders have a seat at the table. D, is the charge of this Financial Exigency Committee. Some key language, where we are trying to assess how individual units that might be threatened with closure, how they contribute to the overall mission of Indiana University and their place in the larger landscape of the intellectual endeavors here at IU. This winds up with the committee basically providing a report to the President and Board of Trustees outlining the cost benefit, if you will, of those individual units. Of course, closure of a specific campus is not necessarily the main way one of these exigencies will be resolved. But in the event that such an option is a possibility for a given financial exigency situation, we have some language here about how to best or minimize the negative impact, which of course will be severe, on everybody at that campus. The bottom line being, we recognize that tenure is campus specific, so in principle, if that campus is closed down, those faculty members do not have tenure at another campus nor long-term contracts. But the university will make a good faith effort to find placements when possible for those affected faculty members. Of course, the units into which those faculty members might be found a home would be consulted in that process.

Tanford: This policy attempts to define the faculty role in an exigency that is triggered when there is a risk to the loss of tenured faculty positions or long-term contracts. If there is an exigency, the midst of a crisis that the trustees and the president believe can be resolved without having to lay off or dismiss tenured faculty or long-term contracts, this policy doesn't kick in. So it is fairly limited in which we charge a faculty committee with responsibility for being the spokes committee for faculty whose jobs may be at risk. So it's a very limited policy that started just from the fact that the policy review committee and others noticed that in a number of our existing policies there are references to financial exigency with respect to financial exigency affecting faculty and academic programs with no policy that defined it or gave a process by which faculty could participate.

Applegate: Jon and his colleagues met with me and John Sejdinaj and Venkat a couple of times. I think it was when it was a Bloomington policy and had some very good discussions about it. I think that first of all, the translation to being a university policy is very nicely done. That some of the issues that Jon alluded to that we talked about compartmentalizing exigency are again very nicely handled by this university version of the policy. I think it's fair to say that the basic idea of how one would handle something that serious in the policy is just the way we would want to handle it at IU. That is, talking with faculty budgetary affairs committees, early on if things began to look like they were going that way, we actually do it. Even if they don't look like they're going that way, we should be transparent about the kinds of issues that we are seeing develop and the kinds of solutions that are on the table. Certainly, having a systematic look by the constituted faculty committee, as Jon says, of particular solutions makes a great deal of sense. This is a discussion item at this point. There are some things I think we may want to look at about dates and deadlines and so on. But really the gist of the policy seemed to us to be entirely consistent with the way we would want to operate under those kinds of circumstances.

- **Item 11:** Questions/comments on the proposed policy on financial exigency (30 minutes)

Adaikkalavan (chat): At the campus level, who declares/authorizes/approves a financial exigency and removal of tenure/contracts? President/Executive Vice-President/Chancellors?

Trinidad: So the short answer is that would be up to the campus. Since we had some IUPUI folks on our UFC committee, we were looking at their documentation, in particular. The chancellor would take the lead as far as, again, removing tenure contracts. Those contracts are with the Board of Trustees, to my understanding. So again, just to recap. If someone is losing tenure, it's my understanding that the Board of Trustees/President would be involved. Although at the individual campuses, it may be up to the campus policy to decide who makes the secondary decisions.

Adaikkalavan (chat): What is the role of the UFC if a campus declares financial exigency? Example: UFC plays a role in chancellor review as we saw today. It may be critical to have one. In which case, should that be part of this UFC policy or a separate policy?

Trinidad: We wanted to very tightly define the role of this policy to a university level financial exigency event. If individual campuses or units are having financial crises, addressing that wasn't the goal of this policy. It's a separate issue of to what extent the UFC or the university would be involved in any case.

Marsh (chat): According to AAUP guidelines, financial exigency is defined as only being system-wide.

Tanford: These are questions that are beyond the scope of this particular policy that is in front of us today. We followed AAUP guidelines, so as Moira Marsh has pointed out, in which the term of our financial exigency refers to a university-wide crisis, not a campus crisis. This defines only what that means as it is defined in university policies involving faculty process. Each campus, ought to have its own policy on what is the faculty involvement at their campus level in case of a financial crisis that is going to affect CREM. But that's beyond the scope of this. The question of whether a campus at the campus-level, they could take away someone's tenure whose tenure had been approved at the Board of Trustees level on President McRobbie's advice, that would strike me as a question for the trustees. Again, beyond the scope of this policy, it doesn't try to address that.

Adaikkalavan (chat): Are there recommendations for campuses to create certain policies related to CREM and financial exigency?

Trinidad: The short answer is yes. I know IUB and IUPUI both have CREM-like policies. I would recommend looking at either of those policies. This had come up at the UFC subcommittee or financial exigency committee last week. The UFC website has a document recommending for campuses to adopt CREM policies. IUK has more or less adopted that.

Applegate: The UFC has such a policy.

Trinidad: The Bloomington policy is quite a bit more extensive. It was revised in 2015. So the UFC recommended policy I just referenced does I think a fair job at hitting the key points. There are some other aspects later in that Bloomington document that might be worth adding.

Henshel: If you have got comments, please send them to Alex Tanford because we are going to revise the policy one more time. I think the meeting is planned for next week. So there is a short time frame on trying to get this passed through Executive UFC.

Applegate: If we could give John Sejdinaj at least another chance to take a look at this and get his thoughts that would be great.

- **Item 12:** Proposed amendment to ACA-20 Regulation of Research Appointments (5 minutes)
Alex Tanford, Chair of the Policies Review Committee
[Action Item]

[Current to ACA-20 Regulation of Research Appointments](#)

[U22-2020 Proposed amendment to ACA-20 Regulation of Research Appointments](#)

This actually was an outgrowth of the financial exigency task force. Each of the policies that regulate non-tenure track academic appointees has a paragraph in it on the circumstances under which they can be dismissed and they all repeat the words from the trustees resolution, in 1994, I think. The trustees resolution, that involuntary termination can occur because of incompetence, misconduct, or financial exigency. They do that for tenure faculty, that triumvirate of those three things was in the policies, but not in the policy for research scientists. Essentially the same paragraph appears in ACA-18 under clinical appointments in lecturer and teaching professor, and Professor of Practices. Carrying it verbatim from the clinical faculty was not possible as there are huge amount of research scientists appointments that are very specifically linked to funding, to soft money. We also made one other slight change, which is the university counsel's office and the chief policy officer want us to use the word appointment rather than contract as using the word contract, it just causes confusion. The actual language that we are asking you to vote on is this language here, which contains a couple of modifications from what was actually distributed a week ago with the agenda. You all should have gotten that in e-mail. It came originally from the task force to the executive committee which approved it, and then kicked it back to the policy review committee so it comes to you as a motion from the executive and policy review committees, to adopt this amendment today

- **Item 13:** Questions/comments on the proposed amendment to ACA-20 Regulation of Research Appointments (5 minutes)

No further discussions

ACTION: Motion approved unanimously, by voice vote.

- **Item 14:** Motions from the Policies Review Committee (45 minutes)
Alex Tanford, Chair of the Policies Review Committee
[Action Item]

These are basically mostly cleanup projects from existing policies. When the committee looks at a policy and says this needs major substantive revision, we send it to the executive committee and say form a task force, give it to another committee. The committee takes mostly policies from the 1980s and 1990s and updating them so that they reflect current practices so they are consistent with the university's template for how it wants policies written, expressed, so that they are searchable by people.

A. Amendments to ACA-26 Oversight and Support of Adjuncts and AIs

- [Current ACA-26 Oversight and Support of Adjuncts and AIs](#)
- [U13-2020: Proposed revisions to ACA-26, Oversight and Support of Adjuncts and AIs](#)
- [U17-2020: Redlined proposed revisions to ACA-26, Oversight and Support of Adjuncts and AIs](#)
- Tanford: The existing policy is based on a resolution of the trustees from 1994. The resolution refers to associate faculty, a classification that no longer exists, and called upon chancellor or provost to set up offices or designate offices to provide training, assistance, quality control to make sure that basically the people at the bottom end of the instructional hierarchy were getting support, training methods of evaluating how well they do in a classroom, and support of various kinds. The campuses generally still have to setup these things. We have one new paragraph in this, that the letters

and documents appointing adjunct faculty and associate instructors shall include the duration of the appointments, compensation, benefits, and responsibilities. This went through the university counsel's office to make sure that we got buy-in on that language from the University Counsel. So this is basically a revision of an existing policy that doesn't seem to be doing anything significant instead of saying, continue to have a policy that requires that the campuses provide support and training as needed for adjunct professors and associated instructors.

- Watson: So the only change is the insertion of paragraph D
- Tanford: That's the only substantive change. There were minor language changes.
- **ACTION: Motion approved unanimously, by voice vote.**

B. Amendments to ACA-27 Access to Academic Employee Records

- [Current ACA-27 Access to Academic Employee Records](#)
- [U14-2020: Proposed revisions to ACA-27, Access to Academic Employee Records](#)
- [U18-2020: Redlined Proposed revisions to ACA-27, Access to Academic Employee Records](#)
- Tanford: This is updating a policy that dates from 1983. We were guided by two things. One is an AAUP statement on access to faculty personnel files from 1999. On discussions with the university archivist about old records and to the extent possible, since some of the same administrators are going to have to be providing access to records to both faculty and students to make sure that the standards for access were similar for both faculty and the students. Mostly what we do is update the language and this has been circulated in advance. There was apparently in 1984, effective January 1st 1984, there was a change I believe in state law or federal law governing access to public information. It ended up with all the universities having to change their policy on letters of recommendation and letters of evaluation that had been supplied with the university's promise of confidentiality. So this was a provision. It was something to do with letters that were written prior to 1984, and there is just no point in having four paragraphs devoted to files that basically are of no interest or don't even exist anymore for all of that. So we did not carry over that provision. Just a clarification, over the last couple of years, the university has developed and refined its fairly extensive program on sexual misconduct. Some of the provisions in that policy, recognizing the sensitivity of the issue and the extent to which some of what we do is determined by federal law and not our own views, makes some of the records of a sexual misconduct policy, including one that involves a faculty member, confidential. Therefore, access to and control of those records is completely covered under UA-03, the Sexual Misconduct Policy. So that is made clear that this does not do that. Second thing it makes clear that this involves access to records, not the preservation and retention of these records in the first place. The university adopted a comprehensive records retention policy, UA-18, that controls the creation, retention, and maintenance of faculty, of records about faculty including personnel actions. So this policy again covers only access to those policies. It makes two related changes to bring some clarity to the policy. Most of this deals with guaranteeing faculty access to their own records and delegates public access to records to Indiana State law and the university counsel's office on the interpretation of the access to public records act. But we had one paragraph in about university administrators need during some instances to have access to the records of faculty members of academic appointees. The old policy used the phrase, "need to know", guided by the AAUP policy and by some reports that people had very different interpretations about what that meant. That we are proposing new language which phrase is that as, "a legitimate interest" rather than "need to know." It's a slightly broader category, and that if we don't try to define what it is, or why they need to know just related to the operation of the university and its academic mission. Then again, consistent with the AAUP's policy, there's this language, which is that the determination of legitimate interest is made by the officer responsible for the

maintenance of the records because that's the person's going to get into trouble if they don't release the right thing. The second thing we did is the old policy talked about access by university administrators and other employees. Well, we dropped the section about other employees as we don't know what that means. University administrators was changed to university officials, which covers any administrator, university person who has an official reason to be looking at it. We added faculty governance, bodies, committees, and boards of review that was a hole in the existing policy. We heard anecdotal information, that some faculty boards of review seeking documents from the administration in the course of a board of review had trouble getting them. Because the administrator-in-charge of the record said that the policy did not provide access by the Faculty Board of Review only to the individual grievant to the faculty member in front of the Board of Review. It created a situation where a Faculty Board of Review might not be able to pursue an inquiry into the context of a grievance. So that is really the only substantive change in the policy, the rest is the updating of language.

- Marsh: There is one exception in this policy now for the sexual misconduct records. Is there anything that would stop another policy being amended, or created, or imposed on us that would add additional exceptions to this policy in terms of access? Is that something we would want to do something about?
- Tanford: I don't think there is any problem with doing that, but if it does, one can always amend this policy. UFC created this policy review committee, whose job is on a periodic basis, to go through all the policies including this one, and make sure every few years that it's still consistent with other policies that had been enacted.
- Marsh: We've had language and other policies, well, which say things to the effect that this policy shall rule if there are exceptions being mooted in other places, or something like that. Because otherwise, what's to stop just access to records being whittled down one step at a time, potentially.
- Henshel: This is going to be coming up in the data management issue later.
- Marsh: But are records subsumed by data management?
- Henshel: As far as I understand, everything is subsumed under data these days.
- Tanford: The core of this policy is simply faculty access to their own personnel files. I'm not inclined on behalf of the faculty to put in some boiler pre-provision which says, the university can continue to create exceptions to this. I think sexual misconduct is a unique situation, and I don't see the need at this point to create any exception to faculties access to their own records beyond the peculiar needs of confidentiality.
- Marsh: I agree with you on that, but my point was to try and prevent additional exceptions.
- Tanford: You can't. The university has, for example, a whistle blower policy, and I think that there are a couple of other policies in existence that in one way or another promise confidentiality. We can put on a broader agenda for the coming year to begin to look. We try to look at whether policies are consistent with each other across the board. You can't catch everything, and part of our long-term goal is to look at that kind of internal consistency.
- Marsh: That sounds good to me, and just make clear, I do support this amendment.
- **ACTION: Motion approved unanimously, by voice vote.**

C. Amend ACA-73 and bylaws §§ 10.1 and 13 Preservation of UFC Records

- [Current ACA-73 Preservation of University Records](#)
- [Current ACA-05 Bylaws of the University Faculty Council](#)
- [U15-2020: Proposed revisions to ACA-73 and bylaws §§ 10.1 and 13 Preservation of UFC Records](#)
- [U19-2020: Redlined Proposed revisions to ACA-73 and bylaws §§ 10.1 and 13 Preservation of UFC Records](#)
- Tanford: Maybe two years ago, when we were updating the bylaws to the UFC, we had a section, Section 13, in which the UFC had its own fairly detailed policy on the

creation and preservation of the records of UFC meetings. That was put on hold until the university finished the process of creating a comprehensive records policy, UA-18, which it has now done. There also was an orphan policy, an astray paragraph that had been in the faculty handbook on a policy apparently passed by the UFC, telling the university that because we are all academics and historians of that records, please keep records. ACA-73, telling the university to keep records is now superseded by UA-18. Much of the content of our bylaws on records retention also has been superseded, because U-18 clearly defines the records created by the faculty council as the property of the university and subject to UA-18. Current ACA-73 was this one-paragraph requirement that the university maintain records and that they go to the university archives, that's been superseded. So step one is, the content that is deleted. That leaves an empty shell. Then in the grand tradition of the Indiana Legislature, we have stripped out the content of the bill and we substitute into it the section from the bylaws on retention and disposition of faculty council files because we purport to follow Robert's rules of order, and they say your records policy should be in a free standing policy, not in the bylaws because of the issues of way things can be amended and things like that. So we propose taking that out of the bylaws, putting it into the empty shell of the ACA-73. Having done that, then we go through and edit it. So step 3 was to correct the title to faculty council records and basically go through our existing bylaws and clean up the language in order to make sure that this policy applies to records does not apply to executive sessions, and that our records are subject to the university policy in UA-18. Then it just takes much of this. The existing bylaw was a combination of how one accesses these things and finding on what records we are supposed to create with things specifying time-frames. Our meetings are supposed to be recorded, our records are supposed to be maintained, and that responsibility for this lies with the director of the Faculty Council Office. Then this part, again, is new and comes from the University UA-18 policy. Instead of us trying to fashion our own policy about what records need to be maintained and how, it requires the director of the Faculty Council Office to consult with the University Archives and the University Records, Retention and Disposition committee which is headed by the university archivist about how to create, maintain, and preserve the records. It makes one substantive change and was added in consultation with the University Faculty Council director and the university archivist. That basically said that when the director of the Faculty Council sets up an official email list, there is one for the executive committee, there is one for the UFC, there is one for our policy review committee, and that all emails sent back and forth through that official system get electronically saved and archived. If we just shoot off on our own personal email by just sending into three or four people on a committee, that goes through a system, technically, archived, is impossible to find. So that for proper preservation of the kind of records of the context in which the university faculty council takes action, this is a requirement that when communications are intended for an official function, the full membership, they must use the official email list. The last section was simply to amend the bylaws to add this language. Just to make clear that the duty of the director of the Faculty Council Office is to create and maintain the records of the UFC as provided in ACA-73. Because this was on the agenda last meeting, the UFC has had the necessary written notice of intent to amend the bylaws so it may act in a single meeting. No second reading of the amendment of bylaws is required.

- **ACTION: Motion approved unanimously, by voice vote.**

D. Rescind ACA-35 Outside Activities and Extra Compensation.

- [Current ACA-35 Outside Activities and Extra Compensation](#)
- [U23-2020: Justification for rescinding ACA-35 Outside Activities and Extra Compensation](#)
- Tanford: The history of how things became designated as policies and put on the university policy website if they were academic policies attributed to the university

faculty council was basically, they cut and pasted things out of the old academic handbook. Going back to the history, this was one that however it got designated as a UFC policy. There is no history that this was ever actually enacted or approved by the UFC. The best we can find is that these two little policies that were stuck together were administrative practices that date back prior to 1966, which is when the paper trail ends. The first one was what we have all gone by all of our careers, we all know that you get the equivalent one day a week that we can work on our own sort of consulting and professional stuff not strictly related to our research and teaching. Then the second part of this was an early statement as faculty began to have income that came in from grants in ways beyond their salary that said, university has to keep outside the compensation and university base salary separate and not mix them in the general fund. The first part of that policy which addresses outside compensation is now been superseded by the university-wide revision of the policy UA-17 on conflicts of interest and commitment. The important part of that was the old ACA-35 the total amount of time devoted outside work average of one day a week. As you could see that language has been included in the far more comprehensive UA-17 policy on conflicts of interest and commitment, and there is no reason to have a little truncated policy floating around that does not fully address all aspects of the conflict of interest and commitment policy. The second part, basically, this is the operative language of the second part of this policy which is, "to insure accountability and control of all funds expended by the University, outside funds will not be commingled with the general fund." I am pretty certain that the UFC lacks the authority to tell the university how to manage its general fund. Indeed, here is the complete statement of our legislative authority under the constitution and it does not include telling the university anything about how to manage the general fund. So this policy was delayed once at the request of a couple of administrators who thought, Well, we can't just go on and repeal this language about separating outside compensation from the general fund. It's been kicking around for a while. It's gone through now the UFC Budgetary Affairs Committee, CFO Sejdinaj, and VP Cate, about grant funding requirements and all of that. The university has a comprehensive financial management policy, and were controlled by state legislation, with all sorts of things about how the general fund works and how budget and accounting has to take place. It is just inappropriate for there to be this little stump policy purportedly by the UFC that gets involved in this. Now, we make it clear in the documentation and I'll make it clear in this that the motion to rescind this part of the policy is based entirely on jurisdiction that we don't have any authority as the UFC to be getting into the management of the general fund. It is not in any way to be interpreted as, well, we think the funds shouldn't be merged together; it's not substantive at all. One note. We heard from one academic affairs administrator still concerned about whether rescinding this policy somehow leaves the university without a policy of any kind. It is our belief after talking to everybody we could have imagined to talk about that that is not the case, and that if it is, if they discovered that there was some language in here that actually is not repeated anywhere else, it would take 30 seconds to post in the interim policy that would control until the right people could get this into the financial management policy. That is a motion to rescind ACA-35.

- **ACTION: Motion approved unanimously, by voice vote.**

E. Amendments to ACA-52, Permanent Separations for Academic Appointees

- [Current ACA-52, Permanent Separations for Academic Appointees](#)
- [U24-2020: Proposed revisions to ACA-52, Permanent Separations for Academic Appointees](#)
- [U25-2020: Redlined proposed revisions to ACA-52, Permanent Separations for Academic Appointees](#)
- Tanford: This is updating of our comprehensive policy on permanent separations for academic appointees, which covers, resignation, retirement, non-reappointment,

involuntary dismissal of tenured appointees, then a parallel section on involuntary dismissal of non-tenured academic appointees. Again, we discovered only about two days ago that we had inadvertently, as a committee, created inconsistency between this policy and the one we just enacted on the job protection paragraph for entities. So you got this morning an e-mail, a substitute text, and in Section E2, adds this phrase “or on other grounds specified in policies regulating specific non-tenure track appointment categories,” because otherwise, if it had simply said involuntary dismissal of non-tenure track appointees can occur only for reasons of incompetence, misconduct or financial exigency, it would be inconsistent with those four paragraphs on non-tenure track. So each of these contains an additional condition under which they can be dismissed. So rather than list all of those, the language just incorporates that by saying “or on other grounds” in the specific policies. We made one substantive change. There was an odd requirement in the old policy, that if you were looking at a possible outside offer, you had to keep your chair and dean informed of the negotiations before it is a firm offer. It struck all of us that that is not going to happen and not appropriate, and would really put the faculty member in a terrible position, especially if the outside offer doesn't come through. I understand the reason behind it, which is, if you are not going to be here next year, you need to keep your chair informed so they can adjust who teaches what courses. That basic obligation is elsewhere in the resignation policy, it requires you, once you realize you are not going to be there next year, to let the dean and the chair know, so that the programs of the unit are not adversely affected, but ongoing negotiations need to know. So we deleted that. Everything else, though rewritten a little bit, no substantive changes over our policy on permanent separations. There are some clarifications, as language used suggested they were only talking about tenure-track faculty. We made sure that that language made clear that they were talking about all academic appointees and when they resign, retire, get terminated from faculty.

- Marsh: There's a missing verb or something in the amendment in that sentence, in D4.
- Henshel: Is there any official policy associated with how to handle somebody who is professionally incompetent, based on a progressive illness?
- Tanford: To my knowledge, there is no policy that tries to define that.
- Marsh: It's the bottom of page 2, D4.
- Tanford: I don't see it in the version of the policy that I'm looking at, but if it is grammatical or typographical, some time ago, the UFC authorized the policy review committee in conjunction with the Chief Policy Officer, and the Director of the Faculty Council Office to make typographical, grammatical changes so that the policies make sense. We'll make sure that the version that goes up is complete.
- **ACTION: Motion approved unanimously, by voice vote.**
- Tanford: I would make one just general request of the members of the UFC, which is, in all of these policies, when we are doing what we consider routine revisions, we circulate them to administrators. We are trying now to get as a routine that we circulate these things to all members of the University Faculty Council. We really appreciate early on in the drafting process, any comments that you can get. I think one of the reasons why the policies, as we have done about 10 this year, have gone through this body, without much discussion or amendment has been because you all have been sending us your comments early in the drafting process, when we can compromise and accommodate them and account for them. I just urge you all, at least those of you who continue on the UFC next year to continue doing that. Read the endless e-mails you get for me and send me your comments.
- Henshel: Could you take one minute to just talk about what's going on with the grading policy?

- Tanford: The ACA-66. There was a comprehensive grading policy revision done by the policy review committee, which looked to us just like a jigsaw, a reorganization of scattered grading policies into one. A couple of places where we made changes because the practices of the various campuses differed from the actual written grading policy. When this was released, it caused widespread panic among the faculty. So that there were things in there that seemed to some faculty inconsistent with current policy. There were also things in there that some of the registrars wanted time to think about how to implement, whether language meant a potential change in current implementation. So that there has been or is in the process of a taskforce being appointed that will be made up of concerned faculty and some registrars to take this and work through the details of it so that you can expect next year to get a comprehensive revision of the grading policies.

Meeting adjourned: 4.23 pm