

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
October 15, 2019
Presidents Hall – Franklin Hall
2:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M.

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

Members Absent: Lucas Adams, Iman Alramadan, Roxie Barnes, Jonathan Brauer, Kenneth Dau-Schmidt, Frank Diaz, Philip Ford, Lessie Frazier, Linda Gales, Colin Johnson

Guests: Selene Carter (alternate), Dan Myers (alternate)

Agenda

1. **Approval of [Minutes of October 1, 2019](#)**
2. **[Memorial Resolution for John M. Miller](#)**
3. **Executive Committee Business** (10 minutes)
Diane Henshel, Faculty President
4. **Presiding Officer's Report** (10 minutes)
Lauren Robel, Provost
5. **Question/comment Period**
Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to Provost Robel or President Henshel by emailing bffcoff@indiana.edu.
6. **Overview of the campus promotion committee and application to lecturer ranks** (10 minutes)
Eliza Pavalko, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs
[Discussion Item]

7. **Questions/Comments on the overview of the campus promotion committee and application to lecturer ranks** (10 minutes)
8. **Proposal to amend the sub election units in the College of Arts and Sciences** (10 minutes)
John Walbridge, Chair of the Nomination Committee
Heather Akou, Chair of the College Policy Committee
[Second Reading - Action Item]

[B5-2020: Proposal to amend the sub election units in the College of Arts and Sciences](#)
[Department breakdown of core divisions in the College of Arts and Sciences](#) (IU login required)
[B36-2019: Indiana University Bloomington Campus Faculty Holding Tenure Related Positions Eligible to Vote in Bloomington Faculty Council Elections](#)
9. **Questions/Comments on the proposal to amend the sub election units in the College of Arts and Sciences** (20 minutes)
10. **Proposed Credit for Prior Learning policy** (10 minutes)
J Duncan, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
Meg Meiman, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
[First Reading - Discussion Item]

[B8-2020 Proposed Credit for Prior Learning policy](#)
11. **Questions/Comments on the proposed Credit for Prior Learning policy** (20 minutes)

Transcript

ROBEL: What a gorgeous day it is out there.

Let's get started and see if we can get through our agenda and return to the beauty of this kind of a fall day.

AGENDA ITEM ONE: APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 1, 2019

ROBEL: To move that along, I will ask for a motion for approval of the minutes.

Thank you, Peter, and a second.

Great, thank you, Jay.

Any discussion? All in favor?

Great, that looks unanimous.

AGENDA ITEM TWO: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR JOHN M. MILLER

All right, I turn to our Vice Provost for a memorial resolution for John M. Miller.

PAVALKO: Wonderful. Thank you.

John McAdow Miller, M.D., former director of the Indiana University Student Health Service and athletic physician, died on June 27, 2018 at the age of 89. John was born on February 22, 1929, and raised in Iowa City, Iowa. He earned his B.A. in general science in 1950 and his M.D. in 1953 from the University of Iowa, graduating Phi Beta Kappa and Phi Eta Sigma. In 1951, he married Geraldine Cobb, and they made a home and had three children while John completed a medical internship at Michigan State University; served in the United States Navy as a Medical officer in Green Cove Springs, Florida; and moved to Bloomington in 1957 to join Indiana University's Student Health Service.

John dedicated his professional career to Indiana University, providing medical care to thousands of students and athletes. He became director of the Student Health Service in 1962 and continued to treat patients until 1978 when he was appointed director of Sports Medicine by the Student Health Service and the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics. He was also appointed to the faculty in the School of Public Health where he taught in the graduate athletic training curriculum, supervised students, and published articles on the management of student health services, ethics in athletic medicine, and care of injured athletes. He retired from the university in 1994 after four decades of service. John was deeply committed to making a difference in the local and national community. He served terms as president of the American College Health Association, the Mid-America College Health Association, the Sports Equipment Research Foundation, the Owen-Monroe Medical Society, and the Monroe Country Public Health Nursing Association. He was extensively involved with the Ambulatory Health Care Council of the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals from 1979 to 1985, serving as a member of twenty-four site visitation teams and as chair for sixteen of these teams. He was also dedicated to improving safety standards for athletic equipment for interscholastic and intercollegiate athletes across the country and was a long-term member of the Joint Commission on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports. He served for 38 years on the board of directors for the National Operating Committee on Standards for Athletic Equipment, ten of these years as president. He also served on the National Athletic Trainers Association Board of Certification and as an advisory member of the Indiana Athletic Trainers Association.

He was inducted as a fellow by the American College of Sports Medicine in 1962 and by the American College Health Association in 1968. In 1980, he was awarded the Ruth E. Boynton Award by the American College Health Association for distinguished service and in 1988 he was designated a Sagamore of the Wabash by former Indiana Governor Robert Orr. In 1990, he received the National Athletic Trainers Association's highest award, the President's Challenge Cup, for his dedication to improving health care. In 1993, then Indiana University President Tom Ehrlich presented him with the E. Ross Barkley Award in recognition of his outstanding service to the university and the community, and the Terry Tallen Indiana Football Complex includes the Dr. John M. Miller Training Room in honor of his foundational contributions to the athletic training program. He was a lifetime member of the University of Iowa and the Indiana

University Alumni Associations, a life member of the I.U. Friends of Music, and a Paul Harris Fellow with Rotary International.

John was also a prominent leader in the Bloomington community. Since 1957, he maintained active involvement in the First Christian Church of Bloomington, serving as deacon, elder, trustee, and chair of the board. He served as president of the Monroe Country United Ministries and on the advisory boards for the Salvation Army (honored in 2004 for 44 years of service), the Bloomington Hospital Strategic Planning Committee, and Indiana University Ministries of Higher Education. He provided leadership on the Indiana Association of Community Councils, the Monroe Country Community Service Council, the Region X Comprehensive Health Planning Council, the Utilities Service Board, the Bloomington Human Relations Advisory Group, Middle Way House, and the Rotary Club. His many acts of leadership and service embodied his faith, compassion for others, and thoughtful spirit, leaving behind him institutions and communities that are stronger because of his contributions. His leadership and service led to numerous awards.

Dr. Miller is survived by his wife Geraldine C. Miller and three children, William, Bonnie and Michael; six grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren. Dr. Miller leaves a lasting legacy both at Indiana University and in the Bloomington community.

This resolution will be presented in and become a part of the minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council, and a copy of the resolution will be sent after its presentation to Geraldine Miller.

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

ROBEL: I'll stand.

AGENDA ITEM THREE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

ROBEL: Turn to our president for the Executive Committee report.

HENSHEL: Hi. So I've been thinking a little bit about governance and what it means. To think about governance, you obviously have to think about what governing is. Governing is essentially, this is from the dictionary of course, exercising or directing a restraining influence over to guide.

So governance to me is personal, and of course in my personal life it's how do I govern my own life, how do my kids govern their lives, and how do I hopefully help them learn how to govern it more wisely, but then there's the public, and more importantly for us the political, and in many ways this is a political organization.

So this is a political governance situation in which we are trying to affect an institution, that's the politics, but at the same time when we influence or think about governance for IU, we're also thinking therefore about how that governance is affecting us personally, because everything that happens at IU is obviously in the end going to come back on us with how we work, how we teach, how we interact with our students, how we interact with our colleagues, and in fact what the work environment is like.

On the other hand, the other side of governance for IU is the administration, and the administration provides the infrastructure, and the infrastructure allows us to function, allows us to lead over our teaching, and is of course necessary for enabling the institution to function.

One of the big issues comes when we want to have more influence over that infrastructure, and that we saw last time when what is considered infrastructure, in this case human resources and our benefits, has some direct influence over our own lives.

So in some way this benefits really just most influences our private lives. It has to do with what happens when we're sick, what happens when we retire, what happens with our kids? But at the same time, if this is all not secure, it's obviously going to have impacts on our security and our feeling about what we're doing as we teach, and as we do research, and as we essentially function as faculty within this institution.

So one of the questions has been; how do we, this is coming from other comments, gain more control over governance on this campus?

So I'm going to go back to what I believe governance is. To me, governance really needs to be consensual. That means, the different people that are involved have to have a say.

So when it comes to this institution, it means that we have a say over things that influence us, and the administration has influence over things that influence them, and where we come together, we need to discuss it.

Discussion is to me, a huge part of consensual governance. So when you think about the BFC, even though we run this meeting through Robert's Rules of Order, we actually run the BFC mostly through consensual governance.

Most of the work of the BFC is done outside of this room. It is done in committees. Committees generally are run through consensual governance, and it is run through small meetings, and one-on-one meetings, in which people try to work out the issues that ultimately will come forward on this floor for us to discuss and develop into policy or sometimes just resolutions.

So I would just like to point out that I think we are functioning as a consensual governance organization.

I do think we have some sway. I think that what happened at the last meeting with regard to our retirement and people's perspectives of what was going on before the meeting, and therefore the feedback that I and others were getting about what they were thinking was about to happen in

terms of retirements, and to be honest there are concerns that people have about where they might have thought they were "set" and they find that they are not quite as set as they thought they were.

What it said to me was that we had a communication problem, because that's of course the root of all consensual governance.

So I just, at this point, only have the ability to let you know that I have open communication with John Whelan, we've been talking both personally just me and John Whelan, and then John Whelan with the other faculty council chairs.

We are working out a better way for communication between all of the faculty and the HR office so that what happened last time where the faculty felt like they were a little bit surprised, hopefully doesn't happen again.

Anyway, thank you.

ROBEL: Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

ROBEL: I have no announcements this week and I'm hoping I will have some next week or the week after.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

ROBEL: I did receive three comments or questions ahead of time and only two of them do I have answers to.

I got them last night so I apologize. The first was, whether we have our first recipient for the BFC scholarship, and could we get an update and explain to new BFC members what the BFC scholarship is.

I'll start by just explaining the BFC Scholarship which was put in place in order to provide funding, scholarship funding for students who are ineligible for state or federal funding for one reason or another.

Often that is because of their immigration status. So we have had I think two recipients of the BFC scholarship.

You should be proud to know that the scholarship was an important match source for getting a donor to the University, who has been very supportive of students' scholarships for students who need them and are willing to engage in service, to commit to a scholarship, an additional scholarship just for students who are docked students who might have additional needs that can't be met through state or federal funds because of the limitations the government has put on those funds.

Jim, would you like to say a little more about this?

SHERMAN: Yeah. Thank you. So the match was from a man named Scott McDonald, who lives in California has extensive ties to IU.

Scott was willing to donate \$36,000 if that amount could be raised by others.

So we at BFC worked really hard and a lot of us are responsible for meeting that goal which we just recently met.

Now there are \$72,000, and the two scholarships are to two incredible undergraduates who could not be here otherwise if not for these scholarships

So to let you know, I wanted to put on the agenda for one of the November meetings, a time when we could talk a little bit more about this and introduce the two students to you so that you can meet them and that they can thank us.

In addition, I think Scott McDonald will be in town in December, and we are trying to put together an evening five to seven reception where we could meet Scott and people who donated to the fund could meet him and thank him for what he did.

So there will be more on that later but when you meet these students, you'll see how important this scholarship was.

Of course the \$72,000 covers these two students. It's \$9,000 a year for four years for each of them, which means in a sense, we're out of money. So if we want to support other students then we have to find either other donors or ways of funding, but when you see what good use it's been put to, I think you'll want to do that.

Thanks for the opportunity.

ROBEL: Well, and thank you because you've been a wonderful leader for the campaign for our faculty giving to the campaign and it has been wildly successful on the faculty fronts.

So I really appreciate that and I encourage all of you to think about your own giving and whether you would be willing to provide to give to the BFC scholarship because in order to keep it going we're going to keep it going.

It was an important initiative to begin from this council, and I'm glad that you all have supported it.

The second question that I received that I can't quite answer today, it has to do with adding an additional plaque to the IMU plaques that are all sort of congregated around the entrance to the hotel on the second floor.

They were all recently redone.

I think the President was looking for a way to make them all a little more standard and attractive than they were before. There's a request to consider putting up a plaque that includes the IUB facet recipients.

So I'll talk to Kelly Kish who was responsible for doing all of that and see if that's a possibility.

The final question was whether it would be possible to give an update or a final report related to the investigation regarding the flyers left by identity Europa in Ballantine Hall in 2017. That identity Europa was a hate group that has morphed into a different hate group.

These flyers were posted not just in Ballantine but also in the Mauer School of law.

Let me just back up and tell you what I think it's important for you to know and do if you see concerning literature flyers posted around campus. The first thing you should do is call the IU Police Department, and just call the number and report them.

The police will then inform me and I'll be in contact with the police about the investigation.

When we get a report like this, it is investigated.

The police check cameras, they interview witnesses.

If there is something that is criminal that has occurred, we will take steps. If somebody from outside the campus has been on campus posting things and we can identify them, we will ban them from the campus because they have no right to be here.

That's our procedure with these.

So when you're talking to students or you're thinking if you run into something like this yourself, please call the police department and they have a pretty good protocol they run through when we get a report like this as we did this summer.

All right. Any questions from the Council at this point? Israel?

HERRERA: Yeah. Regarding the BFC recipients, I would suggest or recommend to have something on our BFC website and also if it might be possible to have a press release to recognize these two first BFC recipients.

So that's my suggestion for these first two ones.

ROBEL: Well, thank you. The recipients of scholarships of course, it is their right not to have their identities released without their permission but it sounds like they're willing to be recognized in this case.

I'd be happy to do that.

As you probably know, IU was one of around 60 universities that filed an amicus brief in the DACA case that's pending in front of the United States Supreme Court. We don't take those positions lightly but this is an issue that we've been absolutely consistent on.

We just been absolutely consistent on and we intend to continue that piece of advocacy as long as it's necessary.

All right, other questions?

AGENDA ITEM SIX: OVERVIEW OF THE CAMPUS PROMOTION COMMITTEE AND APPLICATION TO LECTURER RANKS

ROBEL: Okay. Turn now to Eliza Pavalko for an overview of the campus promotion committee in application to lecture ranks.

PAVALKO: Thank you. This comes up back to the request of the executive committee to answer a number of questions and provide some overview on the campus promotion advisory committee and how that operates.

The background for this is particularly in terms of the lecturer ranks.

If you all remember in March, may or may not remember, March 2018, we voted to add the following to BLA CA3, it's actually A1. But the section on appointment advancement, the wording in red is what was added, and this was a decision that promotion and rank of lectures and senior lecturer should go through the normal faculty procedures appropriate to the unit of the university.

So with that in mind, I thought it would be useful to go through what that campus level review is.

What we do for the campus review, for promotion review, and this includes review of clinical faculty of research ranks and it will include lectures starting in next year.

So starting with the dossiers that come to us next fall, they would go through this process as well.

The campus Advisory Committee is appointed every year, although members of that committee often serve two or three year terms. They review all the dossiers for associate professors who are going up to full, assistant and associate clinical professors who are being promoted and assistant, and associate research scientists. The committee includes full professors, clinical professors and research scientists.

So what we've been going through is having a two-year plan to then add in lecture ranks as appropriate for that.

A couple of core principles that guide the committee and actually rewrite all of our promotion reviews, one is the principle of rank appropriateness, that anytime there's a review being done, the reviewers are at or above the rank being sought.

Also, another principle is that primary reviewers for Clinical and Research Faculty should include faculty who were at full rank in that category.

To give you an idea, so this years for campus for motion advisory committee, I realized the wording is small, but as you will see, the committee has a number of four professors and it's also got two Clinical Professors and two Research Scientists on the committee.

Then the Promotion Advisory Committee Liaison is Beth Gazely who is Associate Vice Provost in our office.

So in terms of this two-year plan, what we will do next year since we will have lectures coming through for campus promotion review through this committee, next year, we'll add senior lecturers to the committee for that year.

So that way, the senior lecturers can review the promotion dossiers for those who are going up from lecturer to senior lecturer.

Then because we won't have any teaching professors at that time, instead what we will do is we'll include some additional clinical faculty, who can then review the cases going up from senior lecturer to teaching professor.

Clinical professors struck us as the most appropriate example because clinical faculty are also obviously non-tenure-track faculty, but they go up on the basis of teaching and service.

So it's the closest parallel.

Then in the 21-22, so the following year by that point, presumably, we will have teaching professors. So at that point then we would include two teaching professors who will serve as the primary reviewers for the lecturer to senior lecturer promotion cases as well as the senior lecturer to teaching professor cases.

As always Campus Promotion Advisory Committee will continue and include clinical research and tenure line faculty as well.

So that's the overview of how that committee works.

I realized that was a pretty fast overview. So I'm happy to answer any questions.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE OVERVIEW OF THE CAMPUS PROMOTION COMMITTEE AND APPLICATION TO LECTURER RANKS

ROBEL: Are there questions for Eliza?

THOMASSEN: Thank you.

So if you could roll back what three slides, I think, it said the folks who were on the committee are hearing cases at or above the rank being sought, rank appropriateness.

So I'm curious why there wouldn't be senior lecturers who are, I guess, it's because the promotion goes to teaching professor?

I guess my concern is that while clinical are also in TT faculty that there have not be any lecturer involved, I mean even if not a voting member when these are portfolio review.

PAVALKO: Right. So they need to be there at or above the rank being sought. So we would need to have teaching professors already in place to review people who are seeking that rank.

But we will include senior lecturers to review the dossiers they're going up from lecture to senior lecture, and then the following year, then we would have teaching professors.

LEVINSON: Was there any particular reason why you have the Promotion Committee looking at the assistant lecturer and clinical cases?

Is that because the other committee is exclusively devoted to tenure, and since those cases don't involve tenure, you've just shifted them all over to the promotion committee?

PAVALKO: Yes. Because these are technically promotions as opposed to the other committee—the Campus Advisory Tenure Committee. So that's exactly why.

GLEN: Thanks. Can you explain what the categories are for campus evaluation?

PAVALKO: So categories in terms of the criteria, the-

GLEN: —teaching and service and creative activity...

PAVALKO: Right. By policy senior lecturers at that rank are evaluated on the basis of teaching and then either in service or research in support of teaching, if it's assigned.

So it's all focused on teaching.

Clinical faculty are evaluated on teaching and service, and then tenure-track faculty are evaluated on teaching, research, and service.

GLEN: So I guess I'm not quite understanding why we wouldn't have service included with the lectures. There are quite a few places where service is required. Like the School of Music, for instance.

PAVALKO: Right. I don't realize that there's a lot of discussion about that. In terms of the policy—talks about it in various ways, but the service should be service in support of teaching, and service and support, if there's research, it would be in support of teaching.

So, all of those things become relevant for putting in, but they're put in the teaching part of the dossier.

GLEN: So there's only one category then for lectures to be—?

PAVALKO: That's correct.

GLEN: Okay.

ROBEL: Yeah.

KAVOUSIAN: So what are the examples of service in support of teaching? Anything can be interpreted somehow broadly as that. Is there a specification or the departments and units will decide those?

PAVALKO: Well, the departments, and certainly this is consistent because certainly the promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer is what's been being done all along until it's consistent with that, but departments and schools will have more elaborated criteria.

So they may specify what kinds of service may be considered. But in general, and this is something we talk a lot about in our workshops, we leave it up to the candidate as well to make the case for how their service supports their teaching.

So the candidate can really put together that argument and put forth the argument of why.

So rather than saying these are the five kinds of service that would count because people are going to be doing a wide range of service, the candidate is really given the task of explaining how their service is supporting their teaching.

WALBRIDGE: I get that previously promotions to senior lecturer were not reviewed at the campus level. Will they be reviewed at the campus level this year?

PAVALKO: This current year no and previously they were only reviewed at the campus level if it was a negative decision. So we have reviewed some, but only negative ones.

This year we'll continue with that same practice. So the changeover will happen. We'll start with the dossiers they're submitting next fall.

ROBEL: Jay?

J. DUNCAN: So I've already had this answer to me, but I am asking it because a lot of people have had questions about it and I just like it on the record. How does this committee interact in terms of positive cases coming up from the department versus negative cases coming up from the department?

PAVALKO: Well, I would probably defer to others who've been on the committee.

It's always a multistage process of review. So to say positive cases going through versus negative, by the time the cases get to us and of course, it depends on the school structure. But if you're in a school that has departments and then the school, there's a school level assessment, Department Chairs Assessment, and then a School Level Committee Assessment, and a Dean's assessment, and then the Campus Committee.

So they would have multiple levels of review—one of the main thing point to that committee, they typically don't go back in and question the substance of the early evaluations, but they look very closely at the criteria that the department or school have, and whether in their view there's evidence in the dossier for the criteria.

They make sure that other criteria haven't been added in that aren't part of the stated criteria. So they carefully review the process and whether the process has been done correctly, and whether the criteria have been followed in. They make their own independent assessment of whether they think the criteria are met, but they don't go in and say, “Well, they said this course is really good, but I look at it I'm not sure if it.”

That's not so much or the re-questioning the judgments earlier, but rather have the criteria have been met and have they been followed.

ROBEL: Other questions?

HERRERA: Yeah. So two clinical professors will be the ones assessing the teaching professor for 2021, right?

Is there any criteria for choosing those two clinical professors, any specific school, or what would be the process for choosing them to evaluate senior lecturers if there might be difference between the two appointments?

PAVALKO: Well, one of the things we would look for with any of them is we work hard to make sure that we have breadth in terms of representation. So we would look as much as we can to make sure that we have people representing from different parts of the campus. So that's how is important.

But the committee, I will say as with many committees, we start with a long list of people to fill out committees. But we certainly look very closely for breadth.

In this case, both in terms of representation across the campus, but also representation with types of work that people do or their disciplinary differences.

ROBEL: Other questions?

Okay. Well, thank you so much Eliza. That was helpful.

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

ROBEL: We're moving on now to the proposal to amend the electoral subunits in the College of Arts and Sciences and John and Heather, are you presenting this?

AKOU: Okay. All right. So we have some revisions to this proposal.

To start out, I want to reemphasize the rationale behind this proposal. Spring 2018 there was a discussion about sub-units in the College of Arts and Sciences. I remember at the time I wasn't an electoral representative, I was just serving as a liaison to the College Policy Committee.

I remember there was some discussion, or a remark, wasn't it odd that the College of Arts and Sciences is the only unit where the BFC determines what the subunits are, and I'm not saying that's inappropriate. I mean the College represents about half of all tenure-track faculty on this campus. So maybe that's completely appropriate and that's not really part of discussion right now but the Constitution does specify that the college policy should weigh in on these subunits.

The BFC nomination committee should also weigh in on these subunits, and then if there is a proposed change, that should be ratified by the council, which is what we're here to do today.

I do want to say that the college policy community did discuss this proposal to change the subunits.

The nomination community discussed the proposal. The BFC was reflecting on, so there had been a shift a couple of years before I joined the College policy committee to realign the election units to reflect the new internal schools.

So the way the subunits exist on the college policy committee is that there are two representatives for each quarter vision; Arts and Humanities, Social and Historical, Natural, Mathematical.

So there's two for each of those.

Then there are our three at-large seats and this is a change that was voted on by all college faculty. Basically, the idea is that those at-large seats should be filled by people from the internal schools, but it's not absolutely required.

So really anyone from the entire College could fill those, one of those three at-large seats and in fact one of our current at-large representatives is not a member of the internal schools. So when we considered how to realign the subunits for the BFC, that's where the idea of at-large seats came from.

We thought let's have the BFC follow the same subunits that the college policy committee has. It'll be more transparent for everyone to have the two bodies aligned.

In the meantime, there was a vote last year that as part of having more non-tenure track faculty on the BFC, that we would eliminate the two at-large seats from the college. So I'm going to defer to Emily as the parliamentarian on that issue, but let me come back to this reconfiguration of subunits.

So one other quick thing I want to emphasize from this policy is that regardless of whether we change or don't change the division of subunits, all members of the college get to vote for all members of all subunits.

So just because I'm an Eskenazi School doesn't mean that only Eskenazi School people vote for me, everyone in the college votes for me and vice versa. So that's not going to change.

This is the current configuration that we have.

So these are the units that we use for Spring 2019 elections.

H, I, and J are for Media School, HLS and Eskenazi school. A through G are varying assemblages of different departments. So here's what unit B looks like, for example, so there are quite a number of different units, altogether under arts and sciences category B.

What's really extra confusing is that some of them are arts and humanities and some of them are social and historical sciences.

So people who in the College who don't keep up with what's happening on the CPC, don't always know who their representative is and even sometimes apparently people who are elected as representatives don't always know or remember who they're representing. So it's confusing.

So that's our current system.

What the college policy committee recommended, let's make this the same way as the college policy committee.

The nominations committee thought, okay, well, it's fine that you want to have the core divisions instead of A through G, but let's have one seat for HLS, one for Eskenazi, one for Media School, and then, okay, the other two can be at-large representatives.

I did discover so I went through all of the departments using the number of tenure-track faculty that were ratified by the BFC for the Spring 2019 elections and I discovered that there actually

are more natural mathematical tenure-track faculty than I thought I had been hearing on the CBC the whole time I've been there.

All of the three core divisions are roughly the same size and maybe that's true if we include all faculty. But if you're only looking at tenure track faculty, it's not quite true, the natural and mathematical area is larger with tenure-track faculty.

So in my revised proposal, I said, okay, well really, if we want to follow the one to 50 ratio, there should be four for arts and humanities, four for social and historical, five for natural and mathematical, one for each of the schools is fine, and then we're left with one seat.

This is where I'm going to turn it over to Emily because I realize now that BSE did vote last year to get rid of the at-large seats.

DOWELL: Right—Erika, but it's okay. It's nerves, I'm sure.

Right, So Allen Bender sent a message to I think everybody and then we followed up with exec and I apologize for not noting this further, but I do believe that the current constitution does not allow the CPC to work with the nominations committee to do anything except for assign sub-election units.

So I do think that the creation of an at-large seat as part of this proposal is not allowed by the constitution, and I'd like to make a motion to strike the last bullet point in the current proposal on today's agenda that starts with, at-large I believe.

ROBEL: Is there a second?

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

ROBEL: Discussion on the motion?

John?

DOWELL: The bullet point at-large, parentheses, anyone in the college including the internal schools, closed parenthesis, one representative. So essentially the last bullet point in the list of the new sub units.

ROBEL: Okay. Discussion on this proposed amendment? Heather?

AKOU: I just have one quick point to add. So I understand the difficulty here of we said there wouldn't be any more at large seats. So if we want to strike that in order to vote on this proposal that's completely fine with me.

Perhaps then as a separate discussion, I think it's important to consider what happens to that one other seat, because essentially if we just strike that we're putting the college from 17 seats to 16 seats which is not a huge change but it is a loss of one seat.

If we keep that seat then there's a question of where does it go? Does it go on one of those other units? Do we create an at large seat again? I don't know and is a separate discussion.

ROBEL: Okay. Further discussion on the motion?

All right all in favor of the motion?

Okay. Opposed? Okay. So there are two.

All right the motion carries.

Now, back to the proposal as amended. Yes.

SEIGEL: So what are we going to do with the extra seats?

ROBEL: How are seats allocated? Are they by—?

DOWELL: Well, seats are allocated according to the basis of representation language in the Constitution and I think that taking that 803 and I mean there are different ways to build this up, right?

We can divide it by the sub units first and then see how many seats should be assigned according to that, right. Which is the...you reach the 50 faculty members or a large proportion thereof, right? So that a section of 50 definitely gets one and if you had a sub election unit with 80 then they would have two, things like that. But there's another way to look at it, there's another way to say okay, the college has 803 faculty, you divide that by 50 you get 16.06 and so there's 16 faculty members or 16 representatives to then allocate amongst the existing sub election units which actually works out pretty well for dropping an at large seat.

ROBEL: Further discussion. Yeah?

SEIGEL: I wonder whether everybody in the vote we just took knew that they were voting to eliminate one seat from the College? I don't think people understood that that's what they were doing and I wonder if we could re vote I don't know how to do that in parliamentary procedure.

DOWELL: Maybe I could just interject, I don't think we are definitely removing a seat, right? I think it's up to the Nominations Committee to assign the number of representatives to the individual election units and to make that judgment about how they're calculate like I'm saying you could calculate from large group to the small but you could also divide first and then assign.

I'm saying that the Constitution is not just because we got rid of at large seats. The Constitution says that the Nominations Committee and the CPC can work together and agree on the assignment of sub election units—doesn't say and at large seats.

I don't think you can say that an at large is the in equivalent of a sub election units. So I think we've written our documents into a space where I just don't think this is something the at large seat can remain.

HENSHEL: Can I ask a question, Erika? Why is at large not essentially a sub election unit?

ROBEL: Jon?

TRINIDAD: So along those lines, I mean there's—per your comment Diane—there's no faculty associated with the at large. So why couldn't they make 400 at large seats?

Right, that wouldn't violate the ratio. Well, they're just assigning some to the at large but maybe I'm not explaining that well, right—so what's the rationale for the at large yet rationality at large seems to be that they're trying to keep the 17th seat but the 17th seat is somewhat arbitrary.

There's not 50 faculty leftover that they're giving an at large seat to there just giving an at large seat. So that by that logic they could have given two at large seats or three at large seats because there's no 50 faculty associated with it.

But where's the at large seat coming from? It's to keep 17, right?

ROBEL: Okay. I think Ann was next and then Nicole.

ELSNER: Thanks. We had a lot of discussion last year about the number of seats we wanted to have in total. The number of seats that would be good to assign to TT only representatives, and the number of seats to the other sets of representatives keeping the total and there were several different equations flying around.

So does 16 versus 17 seats in the College of Arts and Sciences have any impact? Is that one seat pushing us the wrong direction on our ratios of seats or are we good?

HENSHEL: I'd actually have to go back and look at the calculations, Ann, but I will say that one of the things that's going to come up, I assume later this year, is going to be trying to address that question of the ratio of tenure track to non-tenure track by making the at-large be variable for tenure track to make sure that the ratio stays 60-40.

So effectively what that would do, if it flips, to the number where we need more tenure track it would essentially flip it to a general at large if that's what happens. Okay?

ROBEL: All right, Micole?

SEIGEL: I could speak to the purpose of an at-large seat but I think that point is moved. Am I right?

ROBEL: Owing to the amendment that just passed its not on the floor now.

SEIGEL: Right. It seems to me that the allocation of 17 seats was a part of all of our earlier calculations.

The numbers never work out perfectly, so the at-large is kind of a way to mop it up. And we could if we cannot have an at-large. We should probably simply assign that seat to social and historical because it's the one that is slightly underrepresented in terms of the 50 to one. But what I think we shouldn't do is diminish the number of overall seats because that alters not only the relationship of the college to other units in the BFC, but also the relationship of tenure track to non-tenure track, and it will send us back to the drawing board and a number of calculations that have already been made and balanced.

ROBEL: Right, John?

WALBRIDGE: To Erica is it within our ambit as the Faculty Council to simply vote to keep an at-large seat?

DOWELL: I do have to admit that we do not have a definition of what a sub-election unit means. So my common sense definition is that a unit is not a person or one seat.

ROBEL: Could I ask a question then of the Committee?

The reason the College, I believe, has this sub election unit structure—it's different from the other schools. Has the committee done an analysis around the number of representatives in all the other schools to make sure that that 50-to-1 ratio was being met?

PEAR: We actually go through that process every year when we get the list from the VPFAA, and then we bring, I, as election supervisor, look at if there should be any changes in the number of seats based on the number of representatives and bring that to their nomination committee for them to review.

ROBEL: Is the problem here that the Committee is trying to address, and I apologize for asking the question but I'm not sure I really understand it, that when the Committee decided that it made sense to line this up with the College's internal structure it caused the number to drop?

It's something that was caused by that move because otherwise I assume what would happen is you just divide things—in other words in an effort to get to this they the committee align things in the way they're aligned within the College of Arts and Sciences and that caused the drop.

Any other discussion on this?

Is this an action item at this point? It is.

HENSHEL: So is it possible at this point—Erika, I'm going to repeat that question, can we make an amendment to put that thing back on?

DOWELL: It is possible to move to resend or to reconsider a previous motion.

May I do so?

ROBEL: Well sure if you have a second.

HENSHEL: I put up to vote for rescinding the previous motion.

ROBEL: You move to rescind the previous motion okay, is there a second?

John is second.

CHERRY: I think we have a problem here in the sense that if I recall correctly the motion we just voted on, was a recognition that there was an inconsistency between the structure of this proposal and what the existing BFC constitution slash bylaws now provide.

You can't undo an inconsistency by just—I mean it's actually an acknowledgment that we need to clean up what we've done, and rescinding the motion that we just voted on is actually reactivating the inconsistency which I think is not the right way to go about this.

You're just undoing the fact that we just recognize we had an inconsistency and we need to clean it up.

So, I think first of all we have to be true to what the constitution currently provide for which already went through a process last year of what it takes to amend, the by-laws and constitution, and we eliminated the at-large in that, that's a done deal.

So now you can't have something like this that comes up and is inconsistent with it.

We also have another product constitution that requires that the allocate that 50, that proportion rule of 50. That's a done deal too.

So you can't now all of sudden just by a motion, do something that's inconsistent with our words and governance structure.

It means now as the constitution that as mended which eliminated that large—it means that the proper number from a separate provision about the 50 proportionality means we should only have 16 seats period.

So the question is how does this 16 get allocated?

But I believe that we cannot—rescinding the motion is not the right way to go because it would actually re-institute inconsistency which we have no right to proceed with in the first place. That's what I'd like to say.

ROBEL: Are those numbers written in stone? In other words, if you add up the increments of 50 you have several units there who have additional tenure track faculty over the 50, right?

Sometimes significantly as in with Arts and Humanities. So...Arts and Humanities is actually not, but Natural and Mathematical.

Couple of places, first we've got a motion on the floor to rescind, so we probably should clean that up. Is there additional discussion on the motion to rescind the earlier motion?

SEIGEL: I just suggest we rescind it and clean it up some other way.

ROBEL: Okay, so let's vote on that motion to rescind—was there any other discussion on that?

John, you had additional—

WALBRIDGE: I just wanted an answer to the question that I asked Erica, how much authority do we have to do things like this? Can we, for example, vote to have an at-large seat representing the College?

DOWELL: Since we don't have a definition of what a sub-election unit is, if you can somehow say that the College itself is a sub-election unit—I think you have to twist yourself around pretty good to do this and I think that this is an example of how the numbers might be applied to this new division, and that I think we're getting maybe a little bit too hung up on how the numbers are actually allocated.

But I understand that. I'm not part of the College, so I can understand why that would be of great importance to people in the College. So I don't know that we could really do that...

ROBEL: The College is the only group described within the Constitution as having sub-election units. So one would think that that would be a portion of a smaller unit than the unit of the entire college.

MARSH: I guess, three things on that.

I don't see it logically how anybody can be a sub-unit of itself. I feel that way someday, but I don't think it works in elections.

The second point is that the faculty as a whole didn't vote last year because we amended the constitution to strike the part that gave the College at large seats. So that seems to be pretty clear that that was the faculty will and that was the will of this body over the last two years to strike that.

So we would be flying in the face of that expression of the faculty will.

Thirdly, I might just point out that whether it's 16 seats or 17 seats the college is still the single largest body on the BFC and if they could get their act together to work in concert, they would carry the show every day.

At the moment, I don't see how anyone can represent that—well, 16 seats or 17 seats, you're still the biggest block in the BFC.

ROBEL: Heather is this to the motion that's on the floor to rescind the previous amendment?

AKOU: Yes, so one quick thing to add, I do see the inconsistency here and the procedural difficulty of adopting an at-large seats. So I can be on board with that.

I think the advantage of moving to this configuration is that there will be greater transparency understanding of who's representing whom, and so the loss of that 17th seat is worth it because not all of our units are currently filled.

ROBEL: Okay, so what's on the floor right now is a motion to rescind our previous amendment that would have, oh, Lord [LAUGHTER] I struck the final bullet point.

All in favor of the motion to rescind that previous point?

Okay, I think—all opposed?

That fails. Now, back to the configuration as amended which would be presumably everything but the at-large seat.

Can I ask one more procedural question? I guess this goes to Erica. Do we typically vote? It's the change in the configuration that we're voting on and that's not something that can be done simply by the Nomination Committee, it has to go to the floor?

DOWELL: As currently described, yes.

Okay, all right, John?

WALBRIDGE: My experience of anything BFC deals with involving numbers tends to be, well, you wouldn't want to report it to your fourth grade math teacher, but I would like to move that we simply move this remaining seat to Natural and Mathematical sciences because that is the one that is most over its 50 heads per seat quota.

DOWELL: Point of order. Essentially, those numbers are there as examples.

We're just approving what the sub election units are, so the divisions. Then the nominations committee in concert with our election supervisor assigns the numbers to those.

ROBEL: So it's really not those numbers we're voting on. It's the configuration minus the at-large. Right?

Okay.

WALBRIDGE: Then I'll withdraw the motion.

ROBEL: Okay. Thank you, John.

Someone over here has had a hand up, do you have a point to make, Rachel?

R. COHEN: I think it's a moot point since you just said we're not voting on numbers, sort of.

ROBEL: Okay, great. Jon.

TRINIDAD: Okay, so these are all going to be sub election units but there will not be sub groupings within them. There will be four people from each sub election unit.

Four or five or one.

ROBEL: Depending on the number of faculty within them. Yes.

R. COHEN: Okay, maybe to clarify the question then, so are we voting on same 16 or 17 seats?

ROBEL: No.

R. COHEN: Okay.

ROBEL: We're voting on the configuration alone.

All right. Yes.

DELIYANNIS: So I'm a little confused.

If we're not voting on numbers and only the configuration, doesn't that mean that we've eliminated the at-large category but the number remains 17?

ROBEL: It could be 17.

The way in which the Nominations Committee has typically or Elizabeth does, the Constitution says 50 or I forget the exact language...

PEAR: So the bylaws actually say that, the representatives will be apportioned on a 1-to-50 or major fraction thereof basis. So those numbers can change in any unit that is dictated by the

constitutional bylaws. So 16, 17 is going to be fluctuating depending on the number of faculty in the College overall.

ROBEL: Yeah?

HENSHEL: Just to clarify. We had a huge discussion and I believe it came to the floor, about how to interpret “a majority thereof,” and the majority thereof by definition is 26 or more.

ROBEL: Are we ready to vote on this proposed configuration change?

All in favor?

Opposed? Great. Good work.

AGENDA ITEM TEN: PROPOSED CREDIT FOR PIOROR LEARNING POLICY

ROBEL: Now, we move on to a discussion of a proposed credit for prior learning policy, and it is Jay and Meg, and I've asked Dennis, because Dennis was the proponent of this primarily because of accreditation standards to help explain what it is.

J. DUNCAN: All right. So first of all, the reason you don't have slides up in front of you is that this is extremely short, and so hopefully those will not be needed, but we'll see.

If you want to refer to the language that I'm using here, it was linked in the email that you received. So I'm going to read a couple of things from here.

The first one is essentially, why we're doing this. So the Higher Learning Commission has something called the Assumed Practices. So I'm going to read a short snippet from their Assumed Practices:

"The institution has a clear policy on the maximum allowable credit for prior learning as a reasonable proportion of the credits required to complete the units program. Credits awarded for prior learning are documented, evaluated, and appropriate to the level of degree awarded. Note that this requirement does not apply to courses transferred from other institutions."

So with that in mind, let me read you the text of the policy.

"The unit or department faculty shall have a policy clearly defining the criteria, procedures, and maximum credit awarded for prior learning experience."

Since it was relevant several times in the discussion that we had, both at executive committee and on the EPC as well, we also provide a definition, which is at the end of the document we gave you.

So definition: prior learning experience is any learning experience outside the university, for which no transferable credit from other institutions can be awarded.

I'm going to turn this over to Meg, to give you a little bit of context about the discussion we had.

MEIMAN: Thank you. Very quick context—the idea behind this and, also ask Dennis when he's ready to weigh in as well, this was something that was originated with Dennis, is that it's important for each department or unit to have a policy on how they will assess credit, or how they will provide credit for prior learning.

Just as there is an overarching policy for what constitutes test experience in every department and units on campus, and each department and unit on campus determines within itself, what constitutes test subject experience.

So the EPC agreed, that we saw a need for a similar policy for each department or unit to come up with. Of course, if each department or unit decides that they will not be awarding credit for prior learning, they don't have to do anything.

But if they would like to award credit for prior learning, that's what this policy mandates, is that they have criteria and measures in place for assessing what constitutes prior learning, and how and in what ways they would award credit.

Did I get that right?

ROBEL: Dennis, do you have anything to add to that?

GROTH: No. I think it's been well described.

This is just a little bit of bookkeeping on the accreditation, because the Assumed Practice says that you have such a policy, and we don't have such a policy.

It also under the Assumed Practice, talks about the appropriateness for the level of degree awarded, which points to distributing the authority to the academic units to determining that because they're the best equipped to evaluate anything, and also to determine whether it applies and is equivalent to the learning a student would receive within their degree.

ROBEL: Any discussion on the proposed policy? Yes, Peter?

KLOOSTERMAN: Just as I read this, I was trying to figure out, why was the Higher Learning Commission doing this? My best guess was because a number of some institutions, not IU, gave a lot of credit for just showing up and saying, life experience and you can get a degree for that.

So this really doesn't apply to most of what we're doing anyway, is that right?

GROTH: That's correct. Most of the credit that students receive when they arrive, if it is via transfer, and transfer already has a policy that mandates that we only allow transfer from regionally accredited institutions.

So there's a whole set of regulations that already control transfer.

This falls into another special little category, and there is something to say about the advances in higher education. It's not just about people giving a lot of credit for life experience, it is that there are cases where we perhaps would provide such credit as long as the faculty have considered it, and have a process in place.

This also submits these up through their current curriculum review process, which already exists, when we consider things like joint degrees. So it's already consistent with that particular process, and would be documented for students in the place where academic policies typically are, for example, the Academic Bulletin.

ROBEL: Yes?

LEVINSON: I'm just wondering if we know whether there are in fact any degree-granting units, here at IUB anyway, that are actually granting credit for prior learning experience. If so, what some examples would be?

GROTH: So when I initiated this process last spring, trying to get us to a sort of an infrastructure, where we could have a policy that mandated policies exist. It was precipitated by the discussions and the movement with edX micro credentials.

EdX is not an institution of higher education, and is not therefore a regionally accredited institution. Yet we have classes being offered there on a platform developed by IU faculty, overseen by IU faculties, this is an easy case to see that it's all on the up-and-up, and we would be able to control—so that would be one example.

I also understand, and I wouldn't be surprised that there's some other little pockets where this is happening. I understand that the O'Neill school for some of its Masters provides credit for students who have completed Peace Corps, for example. I think that you could see if I were a faculty member in the O'Neill School, the learning that happens via your Peace Corps, is certainly significant and could be mapped to equivalent learning at the campus.

But I don't think we have a lot of it, I think you're absolutely right. And Peter, as well, it's just there's not a ton of it, but I'm just trying to establish the framework so that we have a process moving forward to support this.

ROBEL: Jim and then Rachel?

SHERMAN: Would this be an example of something that would fall in the category? I can imagine for the psychology department, someone who worked in our laboratory, not for course

credit, but learned with someone, ran their lab, had several publications, could that count as three credits of research that we require in the department?

J. DUNCAN: I think one of the best things about what we're saying here, is that we're not mandating the answer to you, we're asking your department to have that discussion, where it will be most appropriate.

SHERMAN: I'm just asking if that as a reasonable example.

GROTH: You could draw the parallel between the tested experience.

We would say that, you're qualified to be a faculty member teaching at a particular level if you have a degree in that discipline at or above the level that you're teaching, or you have tested experience.

Tested experience example might be, working in a laboratory, doing all of the work that a scientist will do, and then coming to the University and teaching what you've done for 20 years.

So I think it's probably a reasonable analogy, but I'm not so sure that our faculty would grab onto it like that, IUB continues to be a residential campus, principally with beginners. We mostly have students who were in high school last year that are coming here.

We may see some more of this at the graduate level, but this actually put some structure there so that we have some coherency to what develops over time, if anything develops.

ROBEL: Rachel and then Anne.

R. COHEN: So when I heard this, I immediately thought of veterans, and the experience they get in the military and bringing that out, and being able to use some of that experience. Would something like that apply?

GROTH: Actually, there's a state regulation that controls that. So I wasn't worried about things that actually mandated—I don't know the act off the top of my head, but I know that it does mandate that public institutions provide credit.

So that's already covered.

ROBEL: Anne.

I was thinking about this more in lines of credit given to current graduate students for previous work that they did.

One example is a student who graduated from UC Berkeley and then for four years was a laboratory technician in a hospital that had several trainings in molecular biology. This student was far superior to basically anyone in molecular biology, and then went to optometry school

but was reluctant to sign up to be a Masters, an ODMS, because he thought he'd have to do a lot of coursework.

If someone could have tested his proficiency, I mean, he knew like everything there was to know, we could have assigned him some credits towards the didactic portion of that masters.

Another example is a student in another laboratory who's the second year graduate student. He worked at a very high end optics lab. I could see that his training was extensive, but not broad enough. But nevertheless, if someone had been interested in really examining what he knew vs didn't know, he had both some of the theoretical training needed and also a lot of hands-on work well above the level that I could provide for him in a course.

But yet we didn't really have a policy for giving him some credits, so he had to be searching around on campus, define a minor and all that sort of thing, which was really a lot of excess work whereas he already had this other knowledge and should have been credited with it.

ROBEL: So just to reiterate, I believe that the intention of this is to assure that the academic units have a policy in place that allows them to make a determination ahead of time of the situations in which they would grant this kind of credit, for prior learning.

All right. Judah?

J. COHEN: I was wondering how or what kind of ideas would be associated with how this credit would be distributed? That is to say, if it were accepted, if we were to look at other kinds of transfers, typically, there is some kind of a transfer database that would say this class counts or qualifies.

Is that the same kind of plan that you're thinking about when it comes to the prior experience credits?

GROTH: Again, I think that's going to be up to the unit that defines this for them. But because it comes through the curriculum committee, there would be some basic oversight that would typically not allow somebody to say, "We're going to grant credit for prior learning that you could have gotten over in that other department over there."

I would say that the unit itself has to define what they're going to do. Basically, you would be as you are describing then, how students would move ahead in their curriculum through that. If you decided it would just be six credits of general electives, then that's what you would say in your local policy.

J. DUNCAN: Two places where this is I think going to be very helpful.

Possibly getting students into your department who might not otherwise be interested in those programs, because they see they've gotten that first step or the first several steps. But now once your department has a policy, they will be able to get the information they need to then be able to enter your department, understanding what they'll have already completed.

The other place is, not putting yourself in a situation where somebody in your department might arbitrarily make a decision that isn't documented in policy, and then future student argues for the same situation is denied and now there's a big problem.

So clearly defining these things before problems occur and using it as an opportunity to have this discussion with your unit, of how we can bring students in who might not otherwise get the fullness of what they've done as prior learning.

This is a big opportunity, but each department is going to have to have that conversation.

ROBEL: All right. Are we ready to, up? There we go—

BULLOCK: Are there in practice any limits to the amount of credit that can be given in the session?

GROTH: Yes. In fact, there are some other guard rails in place that dictate how much credit is expected to be earned at the institution. So this would be credit *not* earned at the institution.

So typically for, and you could read this under also the assumed practices on the link that's in the policy document, you'll find the expectation, say for undergraduates is that, it uses even I believe the word typically, typically at least a quarter of the degree are earned at the institution.

That would be for undergraduates.

For graduates it's like at least half of the credits, for the degree are earned at the institution. Then there are some other rules that you can read there about the same masters programs and how much of the master's degree has to be credit at the graduate level.

J. DUNCAN: The other place where you're going to find that is that one of these things that the policy requires the units to clearly describe, is the maximum credit awarded.

So it is explicitly one of the things that has to be determined.

ROBEL: All right. Are we ready to vote?

All right.

Well, we're not ready to vote then—is there any other discussion?

Go back to your units, and raise this and see if there's any objection to it. It feels to me like just a framework for accreditation that we need to have in place.

All right then. We're at the end of our agenda.

Shall we adjourn in our usual way?

Thank you. Thank you all.