

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
Presidents Hall – Franklin Hall
November 19, 2019
2:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M.

Members Present: Heather Akou, Iman Alramadan, Alan Bender, Jonathan Brauer, Daniel Bullock, Barbara Cherry, Paul Coats, Judah Cohen, Rachel Cohen, David Daleke, Erika Dowell, Denvil Duncan, J Duncan, Jane Dutton, Ann Elsner, Anthony Giordano, Stacy Giroux, Dennis Groth, Nandini Gupta, Diane Henshel, Brandon Howell, Kari Johnson, Peter Kloosterman, Shanker Krishnan, Bradley Levinson, Moira Marsh, Jane McLeod, Isabel Mishkin, Meg Meiman, Heather Milam, Eliza Pavalko, Linda Pisano, Catherine Reck, Lauren Richerme, Lauren Robel, Micol Siegel, Jim Sherman, Marietta Simpson, Paul Sokol, Geoffrey Sprinkle, Matt Stein, Lisa Thomassen, Aaron Travers, Jonathan Trinidad, John Walbridge, Christie Walton

Members Absent: Karen Allen, Roxie Barnes, Kenneth Dau-Schmidt, Allen Davis, Lori Dekydtspotter, Constantine Deliyannis, Linda Gales, Lynn Gilman, Lucia Reyes-Guerra, Colin Johnson, Sam Obeng, Daniel O'Donnell, Courtney Olcott, Leslie Rutkowski, Thomas Schoenenmann

Guests: David Johnson, Montserrat Rodriguez-Bahena, Rebecca Spang

AGENDA:

1. **Approval of [Minutes of November 5, 2019](#)**
2. **[Memorial Resolution for Robert E. Pollock](#)**
3. **Executive Committee Business** (30 minutes)
Diane Henshel, Faculty President
4. **Question/comment Period**
Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to President Henshel by emailing bfcoff@indiana.edu.
5. **Proposed revisions to evaluative criteria for promotion and tenure** (15 minutes)
Jane McLeod, Co-chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee
Israel Herrera, Co-chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee
[Second reading - action item]

[B14-2020 Updated proposed revisions to evaluative criteria for promotion and tenure](#)

6. **Questions/Comments On Proposed revisions to evaluative criteria for promotion and tenure (30 minutes)**
7. **Proposed recommendation to the University Faculty Council regarding procedures in the event of financial exigency (10 minutes)**
Elizabeth Boling, Co-chair of the Creation, Reorganization, Elimination and Merger Committee
Jon Trinidad, Co-chair of the Creation, Reorganization, Elimination and Merger Committee
[First reading - discussion item]

[B15-2020 Proposed recommendation to the University Faculty Council regarding procedures in the event of financial exigency](#)
8. **Questions/Comments on the proposed recommendation to the University Faculty Council regarding procedures in the event of financial exigency (20 minutes)**

TRANSCRIPT

HENSHEL: Hi, good afternoon.

It really does feel like a busy day, doesn't it? Everybody's still moving.

I'd like to welcome everybody to the November 19th meeting at the Bloomington Faculty Council. I am not Lauren, but I am replacing her for at least duration of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM ONE: APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 5, 2019

HENSHEL: I'd like to start with the approval of the minutes from November 5th, 2019.

Do I have any comments or changes for the minutes at this point? All right.

Could I have someone—thank you. Dennis, and do we have a second?

Thank you, Heather.

Okay, can we all vote? Any nays, any abstentions?

Okay. We have an abstention or nay?

Abstention. Thank you.

Okay. Got him. All right.

AGENDA ITEM TWO: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR ROBERT E POLLACK

HENSHEL: I would like to do something a little bit different for a memorial resolution.

At this time, Hans Otto Meyer, Professor of Physics, will be reading the memorial resolution for Robert Pollack, his friend and colleague. Thank you.

MEYER: Robert Elwood Pollock was born on March 2, 1936 in Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada. He spent the majority of his professional career in the Physics Department of Indiana University, implementing innovative concepts for accelerators and nuclear physics experiments as the guiding spirit behind the successes of the Indiana University Cyclotron Facility (IUCF). After a period of decline, Pollock died peacefully at a retirement facility in Bloomington, Indiana on August 28, 2018, survived by Jean, his wife of 59 years, four children and two grandchildren.

When he was twelve, Pollock's family moved to Winnipeg, Manitoba. After his undergraduate education at the University of Manitoba, Pollock went to Princeton University, earning his PhD in Nuclear Physics in 1963, using the old 18 MeV cyclotron in the basement of Palmer Hall. After a postdoctoral stay at AERE Harwell in England, Bob returned to Princeton in 1964 to join a small group building a new 50 MeV cyclotron, similar to one nearing completion at Michigan State University. The new cyclotron produced its first beam on New Year's Eve, 1968.

Since the late 1960s, Indiana University had been working toward an ambitious project to replace the cyclotron in Swain Hall with a larger one of an innovative design by Professor Martin Rickey that would enable IU to compete in the emerging field of intermediate-energy nuclear physics. Pollock, with his growing reputation as a cyclotron expert, was asked to come and complete the realization of the new machine. Bob arrived with his wife and four small children in the summer of 1970 ... and stayed the rest of his life in Bloomington.

Pollock not only successfully oversaw the construction of the new cyclotron, producing the first 200 MeV beam for experiments in 1976, but also served as the first Director of IUCF from 1972 to 1979. During that period, with feedback from the Program Advisory Committee, Bob was responsible for directing the scientific output of the facility. He was instrumental in establishing the new facility as a premier NSF-funded laboratory that attracted researchers from around the world and brought a first-rate international reputation to the IU nuclear physics research group. He was promoted to Professor in 1973.

Pollock alternated periods of accelerator development with the application of the produced beams to research topics in nuclear physics. He worked with students and colleagues on some of the most elegant early experiments with the new accelerator, studying the creation of pions – the particles that mediate the longest-range part of the nuclear force – in nuclear reactions near the threshold where this becomes energetically allowed. With that work, he set forth an intellectual theme – particle production near threshold – that played a major role in all of the laboratory's subsequent development.

Keeping abreast of new advances in accelerator physics, Pollock was well aware of ‘electron cooling’ of stored beams, a technique that had been invented and tested at low energies in Novosibirsk, USSR. In this process, a proton beam, orbiting in a magnetic storage ring, is partly immersed in an electron beam of the same velocity. The interaction between the two beams results in a vast improvement of the lifetime of the stored proton beam and its momentum spread, allowing it to survive even after billions of passes through a thin internal target. Pollock had the vision that this would yield a completely new, high-resolution and low-background, environment for nuclear physics experiments. When the feasibility of electron cooling was demonstrated at 200 MeV in 1980 at Fermilab, Illinois, Pollock decided to resign as IUCF director in order to devote himself to the task of creating a facility to exploit electron cooling.

After initial planning, a proposal was accepted by the NSF in 1981 and construction of the ‘Indiana Cooler’ began in the spring of 1983, with Indiana University contributing a new building adjacent to IUCF. In the following years, Pollock was at the helm of a team of about 30 physicists, engineers and technicians. Their work culminated in 1988 with the first-ever cooled beam interacting with an internal target. Since the storage ring could also act as an accelerating synchrotron, the range of proton beam energies was extended to 500 MeV.

The Indiana Cooler demonstrated, for the first time, how nuclear physics research can benefit from stored, cooled beams. Pollock himself took part in the exploitation of the new technology to address open questions in nuclear physics by participating in about half a dozen active experiments. His creativity and innovations provided a stimulating atmosphere at IUCF in which his colleagues might come up with some of their best ideas, adding to a string of ‘world’s firsts’ that marked research with the Cooler, up until its shutdown in 2002.

The new facility in Indiana caught the attention of the world-wide scientific community and sparked the construction of a number of similar small rings at laboratories in Europe and Japan, stimulating a vigorous interchange of ideas and results between IU and the world. The ongoing professional exchange and many invitations to speak at national and international conferences led Bob Pollock on numerous trips in the US and to countries such as Germany, Japan, South Africa, the USSR, Sweden and Switzerland, for him a welcome side effect since he cherished travel to foreign places.

Pollock’s work was widely recognized. He was awarded a Humboldt Research Award from the German Alexander von Humboldt Foundation in 1985 and he is the co-recipient of the 1992 Tom W. Bonner prize, the highest American Physical Society honor in nuclear physics. The citation for the Bonner prize reads: “For pioneering development of innovative accelerator configurations which have allowed new levels of precision and flexibility for nuclear physics research.” At home, Indiana University recognized Pollock’s contributions with a Distinguished Professorship (1984), an invitation as the Distinguished Research Lecturer (1991) and the award of the President’s Medal (2011).

Around 1990 Pollock embarked on his new venture of constructing a charged particle trap. The objective was to use intricate electric fields inside a strong magnetic solenoid field to accumulate electrons into a small region (in a vacuum) despite their mutual repulsion. Such a device could be placed in the Cooler beam to provide an internal electron ‘plasma’ target. To

pursue this development effort, Pollock started a small research group with a few students and independent funding. Successful exposure of an electron plasma to the Cooler beam (another first) took place in 1996. Subsequent activity involved plasmas of *positively* charged nuclei and the commissioning of a superconducting solenoid. Work with traps continued for the rest of Pollock's research career.

Pollock's thoughtful insights, conveyed quietly and collegially, were highly valued by his peers in the field. He served, for example, on the Nuclear Science Advisory Committee (NSAC) when it was first formed in 1977 and on a number of NSAC subcommittees since that time. His expertise has also been utilized, in the US and abroad, by funding agencies at facility reviews, on program committees selecting experiments for accelerators and on conference program committees.

Pollock was a man of many talents, who at once excelled in nuclear physics, in the physics of beams and in electrical engineering, but he derived perhaps his greatest pleasure from sitting in his office or laboratory, sometimes with a student at his side, building a new electronics circuit or improvising a small tabletop-scale device to confront his science with the material world.

As a person, Bob Pollock had a friendly and calm demeanor and an understated, but ever-present sense of humor. We all remember, for instance, how he, eyes twinkling, would complete a calculation with his well-worn slide rule while we were still entering numbers on our calculators. Bob will be fondly remembered by his colleagues. He leaves behind a legacy of intellectual integrity, creativity, attention to detail and completed ambitious undertakings.

We request that this memorial resolution be presented to a meeting of the Bloomington Faculty Council, and be preserved in its minutes and archive. We also request that after its presentation, copies be sent to members of Prof. Pollock's family.

Hans-Otto Meyer
Professor Emeritus
Department of Physics
Indiana University Bloomington

Steven E. Vigdor
Professor Emeritus
Physics Department
Indiana University Bloomington

HENSHEL: All right, and thank you, Professor Meyer.

AGENDA ITEM THREE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

HENSHEL: For the executive committee business, I am turning over my time and some additional time as well to some of our colleagues and former colleagues, and in addition to some of our, I guess people that have benefited from our beneficence.

So Rebecca Spang, Jim Sherman, Montserrat Rodriguez-Bahena and David Johnson will be talking to us about the McDonald's Scholars Program which is partially funded by the Bloomington Faculty Council Scholarship Program.

Before I turn it over to Rebecca, I would like to point out that everybody has an envelope and a card that if you put a check in here and send it in by campus mail or by regular mail, will get to the Foundation and help fund this program.

So we're going to start I believe with Rebecca Spang, our former president.

Thank you.

SPANG: Thank you. Thank you so much, Diane, for allowing me to be here and to speak. Thank you to Jim Sherman for the invitation.

It's very nice to be back here. My role as so often in this body is just to offer a brief history lesson. It's not a very distant history but so much has happened in the last few years. So if we can remember back just three years to November 2016, you recall, of course, that in late 2016, early 2017, we began to see really quite intensified threats being made to suspend the deferred action for childhood arrivals, the DACA Program and anti-immigrant, anti-refugee rhetoric was really intensifying.

This was a time when nearly everyone on this campus, and when I say everyone, I mean, students, faculty, and administrators, was concerned that shifts in the national political climate were actually going to interfere with the campus being able to fulfill its mission, and that's really the mission of every public university which is to provide education for all students regardless of race, class, ethnicity whether they have a passport or not that is the purpose of a public university.

It seemed that the rhetoric was suggesting we were not going to be able to do that.

There was some discussion about the best way to respond. Setting up the scholarship fund, what is now called the BFC Scholarship wasn't a particularly high profile headline grabbing response. In fact, it was a fairly quiet response.

It was one that took a lot of maneuvering. But thanks especially to the help of Paula Jenkins at the foundation, to Ron McFall in the Office of Scholarships and Financial Aid.

Thanks again to Jim Sherman for facilitating, and thanks to the generosity of faculty administrators, and especially over this summer of College alumnus Scott McDonald.

We've been able not simply to create a pool of money that helps DACA students to be funded and to continue their studies, but has actually already paid out to two of them, and we're very excited that we've raised enough money not just to have it sitting there but that it's starting to earn enough income so that it's really been able to support some students.

So I encourage you as you think about it, to realize that \$25, \$100, \$500, whatever you can give this is meaningful, and it will help somebody.

So it's an important reminder. I think that in our era of banner headlines, scandals and tweet storms sometimes the best way to react is quietly, patiently, and with purpose, and even those sorts of gestures can really have an impact.

So personally, I've given before, I will be giving some more and I hope you will consider doing so as well.

I hear from Jim Sherman that Scott McDonald is actually going to be on campus. I think the date was December 13th and there'll be a reception with him, and I'm certainly looking forward to meeting him and thanking him in person for his generosity.

Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Rebecca.

I'm David Johnson and I've been before this body before on other matters. But I'm especially proud to be here today talking with you in support of students. I think that my work every single day in enrollment management and in then the Office of Scholarships that reports to me, the Office of Admissions, the registrar, those offices of student services.

I think about my job and I think about our work within enrollment management and to me it is a pleasure to work at this institution and to support students in providing opportunity to change students' lives.

We know that's what education does, in whatever trajectory, in whatever way, it can change your life. We all have benefited from that in some form or fashion and we are here today and our students are here today engaging in that.

We have a student here with us today who will share her story.

So I think this is about opportunity for our students and I just appreciate the opportunity to share a little bit with you today. So it is my honor to introduce some phenomenal McDonald's scholars who will share their experiences with you today.

I want to give a quick side commentary that the BFC supported our student in '17/18 school year on a small award. Another small award in the '18/19 year for a student. Then now with the more formalized approach of the matching funds with the Scott McDonald Scholarship

Program we're able to have two students in the '19/20 year with substantial awards on their accounts to support them.

So I appreciate Scott and I appreciate all of you who have contributed and who will continue to contribute.

Unfortunately, DACA students are still ineligible for federal financial aid as Rebecca was referring to over the last few years.

Those issues have become more concerning thanks to the generosity of the Bloomington Faculty Council and IU along Scott McDonald.

We are providing an opportunity for two freshmen DACA students to attend Indiana University and for these freshmen this scholarship has truly opened the doors to their continued educational success.

I want to thank you for your advocacy and support.

Now, they would each like to share their story and gratitude with you. One student is being studious and is in class and he wanted to have his quick story shared. So he has that here for us for me to read to you.

Alan Montoya, and I will turn to his quick remarks:

"Dear members of the Bloomington Faculty Council, I would first of all like to take some time and apologize for not being able to be here and personally share my story and thanks to you all. As a student I have learned that academics always comes first and that sometimes you have to make some sacrifices for the better.

"Regardless, thanks for allowing me to still share a little bit about myself and the impact of all of this has had on me.

"My name is Alan Montoya and I am a DACA student. I came from and essentially grew up in a small northeast Indiana town called Angola. Growing up I didn't realize that I was different from my fellow peers but once I found out I didn't let that stop me because when it comes down to it, I consider myself to be just like them.

"I have the same dreams, and aspirations, share the same hobbies and ultimately want to succeed in life fast-forward. I am currently in the process of studying Business Management and working my way into the Kelly School of Business.

"It's hard and competitive path but no challenge has stopped me from achieving what I want. As street poet Kyle Harvey Thomas once said, 'Ain't no elevator to success, I had to take the stairs.'"

That's a good quote.

"All of my life I've had supportive people with me whether it be my family, friends, teachers, or fellow members of my community.

"When I came down to IU, I had to start from the very beginning. However, I feel as if I have found my new home and the place in which I belong and I'm proud to call myself a Hoosier.

I have met countless people that I am proud to call my friends and I've immersed myself in a loving and caring community at St. Paul's Catholic Center.

"All this has led me to be involved in more ways than I can imagine.

"Since arriving at IU, I have had the chance to integrate myself into the community and be a part of something greater than myself at all times. Not only has this made me a better person but also it has opened my eyes to the bigger world around me.

"In addition to that, I am honored and thrilled to be given the opportunity to be a McDonald's scholar. Money has always been an issue that I have had to deal with and knowing that I had received a scholarship that would cover some of my costs literally melted my heart. It is very difficult for someone with my status to get aid when it comes to these matters and knowing that there are people out there that care and would like to help me succeed in life just gives me an even greater motivation to reach for the stars.

"That is why I'm very thankful to Scott McDonald and IU Bloomington Faculty Council for providing me with such an amazing opportunity to not only succeed but prove myself and show that as a student, I am capable of so much more. IU is the place where I belong and I wouldn't trade being here for anything in the world.

"This entire experience is literally a dream come true and I look forward to what I will be able to achieve.

"Once again, I'm very grateful for being provided with such an extraordinary opportunity, one which will not only help me financially but also help me become a better person as I give back to the community which has welcomed me with open arms."

That is a fantastic letter. We will submit that to you for your records.

Alan Montoya, freshmen at Indiana University. I also should quickly add that this student and our student here Montserrat who's with us today, when asked chose to tell their stories, chose to be here, chose to bring forward their stories to you today and I'm so appreciative of that because we are protective of students rights to be anonymous when it becomes to FERPA rights and we appreciate them stepping forward.

So please help me in welcoming Montserrat Rodriguez-Bahena.

Montserrat.

RODRIGUEZ-BAHENA: Thank you, Vice Provost Johnson.

Good afternoon Bloomington faculty council.

My name is Montserrat Rodriguez Vijena. I am a first-generation college student attending Indiana University majoring in Biology. I came here despite knowing the cost it would take for me to attend. I came here because from the first moment I came to this campus I just felt like this was the right place for me.

I visited other campuses and colleges but it never felt right. It always felt like something was missing. I was worried about the costs but I do not regret my decision.

I am a DACA student. I was born in Morelos, Mexico but I have been raised in the US since the age of one. I am what people refer to as a dreamer or a child brought illegally to the US that is currently protected under the Deferred Action for Childhood arrival. When I was little I wonder why people referred to us as dreamers because in my mind everyone dreams.

The first time I found out that not all dreams are possible was in fifth grade during the career week at my school.

As a child, I really wanted to be in the US Air Force but I found out that because I'm not a US citizen I am not able to. So for a couple of years I looked for something that would make my shattered dream come alive. Then I learned about medical careers and that to be a doctor your citizenship status does not matter. So I decided that I wanted to study medicine and I started reading books and everything.

But before I could actually achieve my dream there now existed a bridge that I must cross.

I need to finish college, but as a DACA student I am not eligible to receive federal financial aid. Not only am I not able to receive federal financial aid, I come from a family with five children which I am the oldest. My parents are very supportive and they always encouraged me to look for other ways and that as a family we could find a way.

I love my family support but during my senior year of high school I was really frustrated and devastated because I saw so many of my peers who had the opportunity to further their education just let it slip through their hands. I am one of the few lucky dreamers who has gotten the opportunity to further their education.

I'm thankful for everyone who has donated money and has made it possible. During my senior year, I looked through multiple pages of scholarships and every single time I saw it must be a US citizen in the description. It always made me want to just give up and take a year off but everyone around me always brought up the statistics that if I was to take a year off, it was more likely that I would not return to go to college.

Now, why have I said all this? It is because I want everyone here to know that the money you have donated has done a big impact on me and I am sure it's not only me but many others and I would just like to give my thanks.

Thank you for your time.

JOHNSON: So I just wanted to have a couple of closing comments.

Thank you, Diane. Just to say that you know it takes courage to share your story. So I much appreciate you sharing your story, in person and also to Mr. Montoya for sharing his story as well.

It is a season of thanksgiving that we are moving into and so I appreciate your thanks but may we all give thanks for students like you and reach into our pockets to see how we can support students who need that support.

These hardworking students have demonstrated the enormous potential within our scholar community, especially within the community of DACA students and who often overcome great obstacles to be here.

I want to thank you again Bloomington Faculty Council, for really lifting up this cause and being so supportive of this to Gem, to Rebecca, to all of you, and in her absence today, I need to give honor to the Provost who stands behind this and supports this, and she says to me, and because I report to her she says, "Isn't it exciting when you can do something different for students to impact their lives, that's very specific?"

I say, "Yes it is very exciting." So thank you.

HENSHEL: Thank you to you David but especially thank you to Montserrat, and thank you to Rebecca for all you did in the beginning for getting this going because you did a lot, and I appreciate it.

I would like to encourage everybody again to consider taking this card and this envelope and using it, and putting a check in it.

Thanks. All right.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

HENSHEL: Well, we are up to the question and comment period and at the moment I don't have any that I've seen that can be addressed. Are there any questions that I can help answer?

Alright let's get onto business. Oh Israel sorry.

HERRERA: Right so the question is about, COMU, the Commission on Multicultural Affairs.

HENSHEL So, Lauren passed it on to get information and I have not heard anything. So this is still in her agenda. She'd said, last time I talked to her about it, that she did not have all the details yet.

But thank you for the question.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO EVALUTATIVE CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

HENSHEL: Well, we are up to the proposed revisions to evaluate the criteria for promotion and tenure for tenure track, and we turn the floor over to Jane and especially in Israel. Where is King?

MCLEOD: Thank you Diane. This is our second opportunity to discuss the proposed revisions to the evaluation criteria for tenure track faculty in anticipation of a vote.

As a reminder, consideration of these revisions began as a response to President McRobbie's directive for each campus to assess tenure and promotion criteria for teaching excellence.

A small committee of faculty who had recently been involved in promotion decisions, met to reflect on their experiences with tenure and promotion cases.

That committee concluded, the campus and school level criteria for excellence in any given single area, including teaching, were clear and rigorous but that neither campus nor school level criteria, provided guidance for evaluating categories other than excellence.

The lack of criteria for very good and teaching research and service, was identified as a concern among women faculty and a campus wide review of gender and faculty satisfaction, and is a more general concern when evaluating what have come to be known as balanced cases.

Based on that review, the office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, and the BFC Executive Committee jointly appointed a committee that was tasked with preparing the first draft of revisions for the campus criteria, with a directive to clarify past to excellence for teaching, research, and service with a particular focus on defining criteria for very good and satisfactory or effective in all three areas.

That committee met last summer and prepared an initial draft of the revisions that became the basis for the document that the faculty affairs committee presented on November 5th.

Several questions were raised in that discussion on November 5th, which I'll review as we walk through this section, followed by a description of how the Faculty Affairs Committee address them. But prior to entering the sections, there was a question that came up last time that I'd like to answer, which is the question of whether or not this is a policy.

We dithered a bit with the response to that last time, but have not clarified that yes, this is a policy, that proposed texts would replace pages 10 to 11 in the BFC principles and policies on tenure and promotion, which is a document that refers to itself repeatedly as a policy. That is a policy that was approved on April 15th, 2014.

So I'll walk through each section.

The first section that describes the performance areas, what I had referred to as the preamble last time, there were several good questions that were raised, but none led us to propose any further revisions to this section.

I should mention that of course there's too much text in any of these sections to put them on the slides.

So we intend only to capture the highlights in the slides that you see before you.

One question that came up, is what does exceptional mean?

And the reference is intended to signal that these cases are rare, that they happen in exceptional circumstances, and this is consistent with the phrasing in ACA 38, the university policy on promotions, referring to balanced cases.

With respect to cases based on balanced strings, prior to the last meeting, Herb Terry had commented earlier online, that what we now call a balanced case was initially proposed, as a way of allowing administrators to tenure and promote people who are valued and valuable, who make excellent overall contributions to the university but whose records do not map cleanly onto an expectation of excellence in any single area.

That early discussion happened in a time when criteria and procedures were looser than they are now.

The expectation of very good in all three performance areas for a balanced cases, is consistent with longstanding practice in evaluating these cases, and was codified in the 2014 policy, and that was approved by the Bloomington faculty council, and the criteria that we proposed do not alter that policy or practice.

AGENDA ITEM SIX: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON PROPOSED REVISIONS TO EVALUTATIVE CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

MCLEOD: So are there any further comments on this section regarding performance areas?
Herb.

TERRY I have a question based on the fourth paragraph below tenure promotion performance areas. It's basically, what is the relationship between the first sentence in that paragraph and the second?

Is it intended to say, that the only criteria for a balanced case is being very good in all three performance areas? Or is intended to say that, the criteria is an evidence of balanced strength and overall performance or comparable benefit to the university, and also require that you be very good in all carriers? What's the definition?

MCLEOD: I guess my reading of that is that those are not inconsistent, that the practice has been to consider a rating of very good in all three areas is equivalent to an overall excellent contribution to the institution.

TERRY: I'm probably the only one in this room who was a member of this council when that balanced case was first created. We had a long discussion about that. Our emphasis I believe, although there is no sense of the faculty council, you go by the word [inaudible] council adopts.

Our sense was that these cases might, in fact, be quite unbalanced.

It's sad that we used the phrase balanced strengths. When I think what we were talking about at that time was exceptional. Really, rather strange defined by our chancellor at the time as you know 'em when you see 'em kind of case.

I think there was a lot of discussion about the fact that it expressly was not intended at that time to create a default option. That this was what happened automatically for somebody who just were very good in everything. That it was more than that, that it was special, unique, and I simply wanted to make sure that the members of the council today knew what was in the minds of at least those of us on the executive committee at that time.

You can certainly change it.

Peter, has made a case to me for the idea that very good and everything should be enough to qualify. But I would point out that the sense of the council I think at the time of the adoption of the balanced cas was not that at all.

These would be rare, extraordinary, and infrequent.

But what we wanted to do was put those cases, legitimate them as decisions that can be reached by the faculty rather than being something that administrators on their own confronted with a case that they particularly liked could favor. Thanks.

MCLEOD: Well, thank you. I very much appreciate that history, as I'm sure does everyone else here.

My sense is that in practice the balanced cases are what we have now come to call balanced cases are considered along the terms that you have described there. That there are unusual, they're rare, they tend to be people who bring an exceptional set of strengths that simply don't map easily onto a judgment of excellence in any single area.

Is that consistent Eliza with your understanding of how this has been applied?

PAVALKO: Yes it is. I think the bar and certainly I think it's codified in this. But the bar for balanced cases is really quite high, because for somebody to be very good in all three areas is really substantial.

There not only are they rare but they're also really quite impressive cases the more we see them.

MCLEOD: Are there any other comments or questions about this section of the criteria?

All right. I'll move on to this section for research. We did make one revision to this section.

There was objection to one of the examples that we had offered under the very good category, that is, the example of work that speaks to a narrow word disciplinary audience. She commented after the meeting that the intent was to signal work that spoke perhaps to a less academic audience or a narrower trade audience.

But we really couldn't think of a good way to describe that would be clear.

So simply struck to the text that was the source of the objection, and noted that units can adopt language that captures the spirit of the criteria as they apply within their specific discipline. Are there any other questions or comments about this section?

Okay. I'll move on to the section on teaching.

We did propose three revisions to this section.

The faculty affairs committee slightly revised just some of the text in the first paragraph.

Changing the word instruction to teaching and instructional to educational impact.

The justification for, or the rationale behind those changes were that in part that the previous wording suggested that the candidates impact as an instructor needed to extend beyond the campus.

But it seem that what we were really interested in was the candidates' impact on education more broadly defined.

So simply changed those few words here and there to clarify the intent of that paragraph.

That in fact, the candidate has demonstrated some impact on educational practice outside of the campus.

I should note that there was some discussion of the use of student evaluations in our last meeting.

We noted that the UFC task force is considering the role that student evaluations can and should play in the evaluation of teaching. The criteria emphasize the use of multiple independent measures collectively indicating sustained contributions among which evaluations could be one.

With respect to the other two changes that we made, we received a comment after the meeting regarding our statement under the full professor criteria that the candidate should demonstrate an ability to direct the studies of advanced graduate and undergraduate students.

It was noted that that's not an appropriate statement because not all units have both undergraduate and graduate students.

So we changed that to read "and or."

Finally, we received another helpful comment under the description of excellent teaching. We provided a list of examples of the kinds of things candidates could present as evidence.

Previously, the text said evidence of impacts through some or all of the modes of evidence listed above, which sounded more prescriptive than we intended.

So we added the "For instance" to highlight that this tool is a list of examples of the kinds of evidence someone might provide.

Questions or comments? Yes, sorry, Herb.

TERRY: I've got a question, I think ask to intend. The only performance category, in which you are required to be exceptional, in order to be excellent is teaching.

You don't have to be an exceptional researcher.

You don't have to be exceptional in service.

Is it your intent to make the criteria somehow for teaching higher than for research or service? Or would substituting a different word, superior, distinguished, or something like that for the word exceptional limit that? I'm concerned about how you would go about proving exceptional teaching.

MCLEOD: I don't think that we necessarily intended that it be a significantly higher standard.

But did I think intend that across all the evaluation criteria, that particularly when we're talking about promotion to full professor which is I believe the paragraph on which you're focused, that the candidate really should have established a national or international reputation in that area.

I believe that's a consistent expectation across research teaching and service in this set of proposed criteria.

So if your concern is simply about that single word, I would say I don't think that single word is intended to signal something different than what is represented in the rest of the paragraph.

Other questions or comments?

On to the final section on service for which we had no revisions.

There was some discussion at the BFC of how candidates divide research, teaching and service into bins when they're integrated, which was an important discussion to have but we thought a concern that we could not necessarily resolve in these criteria.

Questions or comments about the service section? Oh, sorry, Herb.

TERRY: Just one more. This is one I raised with the authors of this. Teaching and research are primarily or maybe exclusively measured in terms of impact on an academic field, the University, a discipline or something like that. Service, I think, historically at IU has been broader than that.

Let me give you a concrete example of my own career and then you can see what I mean. My academic area was Telecommunications, Law, and Policy. There used to be a Bloomington Telecommunications Council before the Congress took away the ability of local governments to regulate cable television.

Iris Kiesling, somebody you will remember, Iris or her husband and I served on that council. We negotiated, or behind the scenes, we helped negotiate a cable contract for the City of Bloomington with TCI, it's like negotiating with President Trump.

You think you've got something penned down and then they shift.

So we spent a lot of energy negotiating that contract with TCI. I listed that as service on my annual report, my department evaluated it, and accounted it. It made it clear that what I was doing was taking my area of academic expertise and applying it to the benefit of the outside community.

I have been concerned that the service thing here may not necessarily exclude that but doesn't highlight it enough. We're a state university, we have obligations to the state, we have obligations to the nation that not only involve creating new knowledge, they involve extending our reach and extending our knowledge to others.

You earlier made the category of very good important to balanced cases. I would suggest that in the third paragraph from the bottom of the section on service, the one that begins for both tenure and promotion to full professor, very good service, maybe demonstrated through sustained leadership roles that have a positive impact on the university or the discipline be amended to add the language from the first paragraph under service essentially stressing that service to public, private, institutional, or civic organizations and institutions also counts if you're trying to assess very good.

I think that would clarify my concern that this is one where the university is well served by reaching out to the state and other institutions, and by our faculty contributing their expertise and knowledge to those institutions in ways that benefit them and the public.

HENSHEL: Herb, is this a proposal?

TERRY: Yes.

HENSEHEL: All right, do we have a second for this proposal? We do.

We have several, Barb and Alan.

Is there any discussion specifically about this proposal?

CHERRY: I'd like to offer my own observations. I totally support what Herb said particularly there's certain areas. I happen to also be telecom, law, and policy. In fact in the Media School, we found it necessary in changing governance from telecom department to Media School. We were put into subunits. I'm in the one called communication science. We specifically found it necessary and we did amend our promotion and tenure criteria to specifically recognize contributions.

For example, with our research that happens in these or other for us which includes before the FCC in Washington DC, in Congress, and other activities there. So there are ways in which your expertise particularly applicable into law and policy can be in these other areas.

So I echo what Herbert said.

HENSHEL: Anne?

ELSNER: This may be an unpopular suggestion, but I think that our responsibility for our civic duty as it relates to promotion and tenure is very different in some ways from what we do in our personal lives.

So the wording is sort of there that you should be and what Herb said, you should be taking your expertise, your knowledge, your advances, etc. and applying that to help the good of all as opposed to just pursuing your hobbies and sticking it on your CV.

So there's a lot of fun activities that you can do with your family that are service but are they really using what you have learned or you've done with your colleagues and helped in a specific way the state of Indiana of the United States, your town, etc?

So if we can make that a little crisper in terms of, I mean this is how I feel, that you should be taking what you have here, you have the benefit of working here and you should be sharing that benefit as opposed to just pursuing some interests that you have.

HENSHEL: All right. Can I please understand one thing? So Herb has specific language that he's pulling from the previous paragraph not immediately, that he wants pulled down.

You want that language to change?

So your proposal is to change the language, if so do you have a specific recommendation so that we would vote on your change to his recommendation before we vote on his recommendation or what?

ELSNER: If Herb could do it, I am totally burnt out from revising a long review paper and I barely know my name.

But I thought about this two weeks ago and wondered how to bring it up and so I'm very glad that Herb brought it up because I think if he could just take his phrase and make sure it's going into the civic part or if it's clear enough, then that's okay.

But I tell you I've served on the annual review and people put down that they helped at the zoo.

Well, that's a really worthwhile thing but it has nothing to do with eyesight. It does say civic organizations. I guess but I mean that means that you teach science at the Girl Scouts. That doesn't mean you go to the Girl Scouts and run the cookie drive.

MCLEOD: As I hear your comment it sounds that what you would like is to have some indication that what we're looking for is the application of one's disciplinary knowledge or some such phrase to public, private, professional, and civic organizations and institutions. Is that correct?

ELSNER: Yes.

MCLEOD: I don't know if that phrasing would suffice.

Perhaps Herb has something catchier.

TERRY: I don't have anything catchier. But I think that is the spirit of what is currently in the first paragraph where it says, "Use of useful contributions to an academic unit, campus, or university that are relevant to the broad academic mission of the university and public, private, professional, civic organizations, and institutions."

I suppose it it's how you consider the word useful.

I would even add perhaps the word relevant.

My concern is that the third paragraph very specifically currently excludes that. It says, "Very good is to be demonstrated by positive impact of the University, of the discipline."

MCLEOD: Am I allowed to just take that as a friendly amendment or do we have to do the whole motion and voting thing?

HENSHEL: I'm sorry. We have to vote.

MCLEOD: Okay.

Because this is the final before the final vote.

MCLEOD: Yes because I think that it would certainly be fine to say in that third paragraph that have a positive impact on the university, the discipline or public, private, professional, and civic organizations, and institutions which is I believe what you intend. Is that correct, Herb?

TERRY: I seem to have failed here. Yes.

HENSHEL: So are there any other comments about that phrasing, which I think is agreeable between Jane and Herb? Anne, you're okay with this now.

ELSNER: Yes.

HENSHEL: Then, let's call the vote on this amendment.

At this point, all in favor?

All opposed?

Any abstentions? The call, is that an abstention or an opposed?

Thank you. All right, it passes.

Any other changes?

No? Okay, Brad?

LEVINSON: I apologize that I didn't raise this earlier. If you'll indulge me to go back to the first section on tenure promotion performance.

I didn't get a chance to review these materials, so I've been processing this as the discussions moved along.

On the question of the balanced case, in particular.

The truth is that in my unit, the School of Education, the balanced cases are not all that rare. In fact, I'd be really interested in finding out what the actual numbers are, but I know I sat on our promotion tenure committee from, probably 13-16 and we had at least one case each year.

Occasionally for promotion, as well as for tenure and promotion.

Therefore, I went and looked at our School of Education criteria, and conveniently the phrase in exceptional circumstances, which by the way one thing that I would note is that there's a slight discrepancy between the language of this document that we're deliberating right now and A-38 University policy which uses the phrase in exceptional cases. I don't know if that matters if we want to change the word circumstances to cases, but that's the language that exists officially in policy and exceptional cases.

In the School of Education we have, for whatever reason, excluded that phrase in our own criteria. So it just simply says what follows from that, which is a balanced case can be presented. I think I may be the only one here of the official, BFC representatives from my unit today.

But, I think there is something perhaps unique to our unit that accounts for a higher rate of balanced cases. It has to do with the uniqueness of the endeavor, especially those who are very involved in the teacher education program in a way that teaching and service requirements are particularly heavy.

So my concern is that in practice, this language has already existed apparently, unbeknownst to me, in exceptional cases. But in practice, in at least the last 10 years or so, we have been advancing balanced cases arguably in more than quote, "exceptional cases" or "exceptional circumstances".

So I just wanted to reflect on that.

I'm stopping short of saying, I will not vote for this unless the term exceptional is eliminated. I'd feel more comfortable with it being softened to certain circumstances, but I understand the rationale for the word exceptional being there.

I think that in practice, a unit is still going to still adopt its own criteria that concern.

Then of course, is that moving up the chain to the campus committee.

A balanced case that does not appear to be exceptional circumstances is going to be viewed much less favorably than it was viewed at the unit level.

HENSHEL: Brad, just could I ask, has there been any problem with any of the cases that were advanced from the perspective of the VPFAA?

LEVINSON: I would defer to Eliza.

PAVALKO: Well, I'm not going to comment on any specific cases but, certainly the case as we've seen in.

You're right, I would say there more balanced cases coming from the School of Education than other schools. But those cases, in general, I think are certainly meet the criteria.

LEVINSON: Does it matter then that there is a discrepancy between, and I wanted to just raise whatever small point and that is, does it matter that the term exceptional is used in this document, and exceptional circumstances, excuse me, and cases?

Does that change the meaning in any significant way or ought we to make this precisely parallel?

The other slight discomfort is the fact that the term, presenting a balanced case, it should be based on a balance of distinguished contributions across all three areas.

Rather than saying the more accurate but admittedly awkward phrase, a balance of very good contributions across all three years.

Because the term distinguished to me, implies excellence.

So there's seems to be a bit of a contradiction between that language of distinguished contributions, and what we are in effect saying is, are the criteria for balanced case.

HENSHEL: Okay. Jane?

MCLEOD: Yeah. Well, I would hesitate to remove the reference to exceptional circumstances here, because that is consistent with the, I believe, it's a UFC policy.

I think we have to remain consistent with that.

I believe that also the reference to the, sorry, I'm trying to add the other phrase that you were just referring to, is also consistent with the other policies with the UFC policy.

So I would hesitate to change that as well.

On the question of whether cases versus circumstances is different, I believe the intent is the same.

I personally find circumstances clarifying because these questions have come up about whether, by saying exceptional cases, we mean somehow it has to be an extraordinarily exceptional person versus, that is, unusual case that we don't always see that often although perhaps more in some units than others.

TERRY: I'm substituting for Peter Kloosterman and we've corresponded a bit before I accepted substituting for him. He made the same point, actually, about the School of Education although extending it to others.

Suggesting that some other professional schools that might have constituencies for whom they do things or to whom they are responsible.

That may be different than, for example, the College of Arts and Sciences, may tend to have more of a, find the balanced case as to find more important to their overall mission.

HENSHEL: All right. So we're, oh, Moira.

MARSH: Just to speak again, I do agree with Jane on this. I don't think we can remove the language about exceptional from our policy without being in violation of the University policy. But I don't think that's an issue because I think what the School of Ed is doing here, is what every unit does for all aspects of this policy, is that they are interpreting it according to the ways that makes the best sense for their unit.

So, I do not see the practice in the School of Ed or anywhere else here, being in violation of this policy or any other one.

HENSHEL Sandra, where's John? There you are.

WALBRIDGE: Yes. I had a couple of things that I was a little bit uneasy about with this.

First of all, I sympathize with the education schools' situation. In my unit, where we do language, somebody who's involved in pedagogy will have a case that has no clear lines between the three categories.

On the other hand, most of the time that I've heard a balanced case discussed in the context of tenure, well, we might be able to get him through with the balance case, which is I think not the original idea of this.

The other thing is that from what Herb says, and I'll be at somewhat old was not here then.

What he seems to be saying is, that this should cover cases like the guy who is the world's specialist on something important, but should never be allowed near an undergraduate and refuses to go to faculty meetings.

The university can't survive a whole university full of such people, although the Ivy League sometimes tries but, sometimes I suppose there ought to be a place for such people.

HENSHEL: Brad.

LEVINSON: I'm certainly not going to dig in my heels on the language of exceptionality.

There was really just a question of whether cases and circumstances differ.

I would note that the language in the university policy does not have that phrase of distinguished there.

In fact, it says, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university, which seems to be the spirit of the discussion we've had here.

Again, I'm a little bit uncomfortable with the language here saying that a person must present balance of "distinguished contributions" across all three areas, and we would rather see that articulated consistently with the rest of the document, which would say a balance of very good contributions. Then you could even add that together demonstrate excellence of comparable benefit.

You could actually bring in some of that language from the UFC document perhaps.

HENSHEL: So can you put a specific proposal?

LEVINSON: Sure. If you consider this as a friendly amendment, I would say instead of say presenting a case of overall excellence based on a balance of distinguished contributions across all three areas, I would cross out distinguished contribution and say, very good contributions that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university.

MCLEOD: Well, that language appears two paragraphs below or three paragraphs below, so we could include it twice.

But I wonder whether it would satisfy your concerns if we just struck the word distinguished.

But then I would want to know if Eliza or Kim have any concerns about that. But if we just struck the word distinguished, since we are talking about a balance of contributions, that we define more specifically below as contributions that are of comparable benefit, as excellent performance in a single evaluation area.

PAVALKO: I don't have a problem with striking distinguished. I can see that creating confusion in other places. What do we mean by distinguished versus very good? So I think that might be a clarifying change.

LEVINSON: Well then, I modify my amendment to simply strike the term distinguished from this text.

HENSHEL: Now, that's pretty clear.

We've got a second on it.

Can we have a vote please?

Do we have any more discussion on this point before we do anything else?

All right. Can we have a vote?

All those in favor of striking distinguished?

All those opposed?

Abstentions? Wait, we had one opposed.

Yeah. OK. It passes. Next point of discussion.

MCLEOD: Are we ready to vote on the entire policy then?

HENSHEL: If there's no other discussion, let's see.

Any other issues to bring up before we vote on the policy?

All those in favor of passing as amended. Please raise your hand.

All those opposed.

Any abstentions?

Congratulations.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: PROPOSED RECOMMENDATION TO THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL REGARDING PROCEDURES IN THE EVENT OF FINANCIAL EXIGENCY

HENSHEL: We can move on to a reading now.

It's our first reading on it. Proposed recommendation to the university faculty council.

So this is going from us, and recommendations from us are going to move towards the university faculty council. Regarding procedures in the event of financial exigency.

This has been evaluated and it has been put together by the Creation Reorganization Elimination and Merger Committee, i.e. CREMC.

I give it over to Elizabeth Bowling and Jonathan Trinidad.

TRINIDAD: Thank you. I think I'll start, and Elizabeth may chime in as necessary.

As Diane said, this is coming to you from CREM or Creation Reorganization Elimination Merger. So just as quick background, as the name implies, those are the main tasks with which our committee is charged with being involved. But as part of the CREM documentation, there's a section dealing with financial exigency.

Well, stepping back. The CREM policy outlines when the exact role of faculty involvement in things such as creation, re-organization, or merger of units. But the financial exigency clause basically states that, when there's severe financial difficulties, all the rest of the policy gets overwritten, and that the administration has somewhat broader authority or the Board of Trustees has very broad authority.

So what we wanted to do was better define the role of faculty in this process.

As Diane mentioned, this would be a UFC policy because financial exigency events would occur more at the university level, with broad implications across many campuses.

So we had some discussion about how you actually pronounce this word, and the answer is you're all right.

If my pronunciations are correct, exigency, exigency, and exigency.

Yes. It's one of those words, like...uhm, I can't think of a word.

You've never heard this word without financial in front of it. So most of us have no reason to say it. But I'm saying exigency.

So I should also say, in various discussions that we've had with interested parties, it's very clear when we're making this policy there's no immediate concern about financial exigency at Indiana University.

So there's no ulterior motives here, except that we want to do our due diligence.

There's many, as I've listed here, university policies, or Bloomington policies that mentioned financial exigency.

For the most part, dealing with cases of faculty with tenure losing their positions as a result of financial exigency.

But aside from the CREM policy, which talks about it in the context of CREM, there wasn't a stand-alone documentation certainly at the university level.

That's what we're trying to put forward. So that basically, those policies are in place in the future, if it were ever to come to that.

Again, nobody's immediately concerned, but if one looks forward, it's always hard to say where the university or universities may find themselves in 10 or 15 years.

So basically, yes, we're putting this proposal forward, we want it to be voted on at the second reading.

Basically, a support of the policy at the BFC level to then be brought forward, and discussed, and hopefully approved at the UFC level.

So in this PowerPoint, I've underlined some key points that wouldn't be underlined in the actual documentation itself but, to get at the issues as we see them.

So one issue that became very clear upfront is, the Board of Trustees has ultimate authority on declaring financial exigency.

So as faculty members, we don't necessarily have a direct input in that process but because it's going to affect the research and teaching mission of the university, that is our wedge so to sneak into becoming involved in the process.

So I'm not sure I'll read the entire policy statement in detail, you have it here, you have it in your email.

But Section A basically states that, the Board of Trustees is involved or basically calls the shots on whether financial exigency gets declared.

But because it's going to likely resulting in elimination of tenure appointments or academic units, it's going to affect the teaching and research mission of the university as such the rights and progress of the faculty entitle them to consultation to the process.

In section B, there's a lot of thought behind a simple sentence.

But financial exigency can clearly occur in many many different flavors with various warnings upfront or not depending on larger scale financial issues at the state level or at the national level.

So we didn't feel like we could put two strongest statement here in terms of how much upfront prior warning the faculty will need.

So we say as soon as is feasible given the situation we want the UFC to be involved, and then at that stage because the exact campus that is being affected or the proposed units within a campus that are going to possibly be eliminated, can vary quite widely. We propose that the UFC would then appoint a committee to look out for faculty interests and that committee composition will of course be tailored to the exact financial exigency situation in which we find ourselves.

I should also mention that a lot of this is modeled on AAUP, so the American Association of University Professors has extensive documentation on these issues.

So they put together a so-called best practices or guidelines on these, and this was one of an issue taken from them.

Again, my personal view on how this might play out and again hopefully it will never play out. But we're in managing crisis mode and so what could we as faculty best hope to direct this crisis to minimize impact?

So the committee that would be established by the UFC will hope to provide some guidance to the Board of Trustees about the scholarly value of the various units on the effect of campus, and hopefully that can impact the Board of Trustees decisions one way or the other.

Then E, the motive of E here has to do with what's going to happen if units get closed down.

Again, we felt like we needed to paint a somewhat broad brush in terms of we can't tell the Board of Trustees what to do but we can strongly advocate for certain positions.

That would be that as many faculty as possible at the affected campuses, we would look for other existing units in which to slot them either at that campus or possibly at other campuses in the system.

Then finally in F here, we're just talking about the time frame.

We don't expect this to be an open-ended declaration, but we put it's expected that it would take about a year, and if the conditions were still dire enough then there would be a formal extension.

Then the other useful bit here is the definition.

Again, while we can't tell the board of trustees whether to declare or not declare, we're all faculty so we can certainly argue about the definitions of words not just from a purely academic point of view but because words have meaning.

So what we're trying to get across here and the definitions, are a couple of key points.

One is that a financial exigency is not a self-imposed issue with one unit or the other because of decisions that were made to shift resources around, and that really it can only be the worst type of financial crisis.

Right, so there have to be an existential threat to the integrity of either the university or of a regional campus that can't be alleviated anything short of tenure elimination.

Do try to frame the argument as it were when the board of trustees might be thinking about doing such a declaration.

**AGENDA ITEM EIGHT: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON PROPOSED
RECOMMENDATION TO THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL REGARDING
PROCEDURES IN THE EVENT OF FINANCIAL EXIGENCY**

HENSHEL Questions or comments?

I think I saw Jim first and then Barb.

SHERMAN: Can you put back D. As I look at D, I think it assumes that what this committee will be doing is developing arguments for why certain areas or schools or departments should not be eliminated.

It says they're going to do one analysis that establishes the value of these units threatened with elimination. So if the faculty committee's role is to argue against elimination but not provide any solution to a financial crisis, then where are we?

We're telling the board of trustees, look somewhere else because these departments or schools are really important for these reasons.

So I'm not sure that it has a kind of purpose that let's really deal with the financial crisis here. Could it not be possible that the committee could say, "Yeah, this area, this department has, given the crisis, should be up for elimination?"

I'm just raising the question.

TRINIDAD: Yeah. So it seems like there's two points.

One is, would this committee be in a position to evaluate the budgetary issues faced on the campus?

It wasn't clear to us that that would be a very easy committee to put together.

So as written, my view on the intent of this again is damage control.

If the board of trustees decides a school has to go, we would rather have some input on what school that was. However, unpleasant task would be than to leave it entirely up to them, and that's what the goal of is this isn't, and that would be a very messy process admittedly.

BOLING: I'm not sure the subtext here is that the argument would always be for retention of a particular unit.

That is if this committee looked at the place in the larger landscape of intellectual and professional endeavors and said, the era of this domain is passed.

This doesn't say that that committee couldn't make that recommendation.

SHERMAN: It's just the wording seems to tilt it toward a particular goal.

BOLING: So value or lack of value? Is that what you're recommending?

HENSHEL: Barb and then Linda.

CHERRY: Yes. Interesting. I came with a question which I saw also was raised by Alan Bender, and then I noticed in the comments you gave John. You actually said something that's not in the writing, not in the text, and actually answers my question.

So on your definition of financial exigency, the language currently says "which would threatened the survival of Indiana University as a whole" and then you verbally said, "or regional campus."

But that's not in the text.

In fact, I came to this meeting with a question, and I saw Alan had flagged the same thing.

But what if it's not IU as a whole, but it's a campus?

You said it perfectly, but it's not in the text.

So what I'd like to clarify is I think, the word campus, or regional campus should be in the text.

And if that was your intent, then let's get it in there. But I just know that you actually verbally said it, but it wasn't here.

So I didn't know if that was an oversight that it wasn't written in here or what.

TRINIDAD: I would chalk it up to oversight.

CHERRY: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. It's Linda, then Brad, Herb, and Ian, and Dave after Ian.

PISANO: I am not sure if this is a comment or a question.

But I'm looking at this in B, situation on provided access to any documentation and supporting evidence used to guide decisions.

On a smaller scale, having recently, two years ago, gone through seeing, and I hesitate to use the word shutdown, but a shutdown of our PhD program.

I think that one of the things that, on the larger scale, talking about an institution or an entire academic unit for other reasons, one of the things that we experienced was difficulty getting accuracy on the documentation that was used to guide that decision.

Now that decision was in the purview, and we understood who that was in the purview of.

But what I want to say here is that it seems to me that is pertinent, this idea that a committee be able to have access to that accuracy and be able to have time in which to make that decision.

So if we're talking about a committee that is either defending a unit or maybe helping reassess, okay maybe this unit could be shut down,

I think that it would be good if an important charge of that committee was to determine the accuracy of what is guiding that decision.

So again, I'm talking about something an experience on a much smaller scale.

But I do think that if the decision of that magnitude is made, there has to be a real concentration on that.

So again, I don't know if it's a question or a comment. But this really struck me because that was something that would have really helped at least give us more confidence and helped us through that transition had we had access to support determining the accuracy of why that decision was being made.

HENSHEL: Okay. It's Brad.

LEVINSON: I wanted to say that, although we all know that it is not under our purview to determine exigency, I rather appreciate the definition that's provided here as just simply a measure of faculty input to be able to point to that.

With point D, in response to Jim's concern, I also think that it's good to leave that in there.

I would suggest changing the word, "established" because, my goodness, I would hope that all of our units have already established their scholarly value. But we might substitute for establish a word like detail or specify or emphasize, something else there, besides simply establishing.

That would simply be, as point D does in fact state, to bring to the consideration.

Perhaps give them pause in a moment in which they might otherwise be inclined to take an action.

So I think as a kind of counterweight measure, I agree with the spirit of point D. I would just change the term established to some other language.

CHERRY: Diane, I have a suggestion. I should check with Jim, to the wording.

HENSHEL: Yes.

CHERRY: Adjusting, just changing the word established to be assess, and that way the assessment can go either way.

It's not presuming which way it goes.

So just suggestion on point.

HENSHEL: Okay, taken into account.

So what I have right now is Herb and David, John Wallbridge, Israel.

I thought Paul, did you want to say something or not?

No. Okay. So then after that was Micol.

SEIGEL: Herb is next

HENSHEL: I just wanted to go through to make sure people know that I saw them.

So it's Herb right now.

TERRY: That's probably one of the only internal discussions at this university of financial exigency. It was number of years ago, and it concerned original campus so that suffered precipitous enrollment declines. There were trustees who wanted to close the campus. The leaders of the UFC at that time took the position that the AAUP definition of financial exigency is severe financial crisis fundamentally compromises the academic integrity of the institution as a whole and cannot be alleviated by less drastic means should prevail.

That campus is today doing fine, partly through changes in the way it generates credit hours but it's doing okay.

I think it's important that you limit financial exigency to the institution as a whole.

There are many other policies including those today AAUP recommends that govern the closure of a specific program that has outlived its academic usefulness or something like that.

But financial exigency is related to finances and that sort of thing. I want to emphasize here a recommendation to the BFC. I was never able to accomplish it in my own terms as the core secretary of the UFC.

Should we ever find ourselves in a situation of real financial exigency, it's not going to be easy to address through the creation of some ad hoc committee trying to understand the finances of the university. This campus has been blessed for years and years and years with a pretty effective budgetary affairs committee.

I tried very hard and failed to get to UFC to take the idea that we needed a university level budgetary affairs committee that could work with the administration, work with the University CFO, and would help us see things coming that might be related to this and would have the trust of the administration, maybe even the trust of the trustees, and wouldn't be starting from ground zero.

I do not think we would see or know about financial exigency on this campus.

The budgetary affairs committee here would be aware of it.

They would see it coming.

I've seen some major change in federal health policies since basically, in case you don't know it, Indiana University is primarily a health care system. Trustees many numbers, a few years ago and discovered that if you add up all the health-related stuff and share an IU Health, the majority of our funds are health-related. Everything else is sort of tacked onto that.

That might bring us down.

But other than that, we would see things coming.

But we don't see it at the moment at the university level. We don't have a committee to work with the administration and to work with the trustees should this ever arise.

So my recommendation to the members of this council and the UFC would be try again. It's not easy to create a UFC level budgetary affairs committee that can help and have the trust of everyone, should we ever find ourselves in this situation.

HENSHEL: So we have one. It was established a year and a half ago. Yeah, a year and a half ago. Bob Kravchuk is our representative from our campus. There's people from other campuses.

TERRY: In that case, build that into this policy.

HENSHEL: Good point.

TERRY: Don't just create an ad hoc committee. Build them into this, rather than say we'll create a committee.

Thank you.

TRINIDAD: We'd be happy, I think, to make that change.

In defense of the current language, there's still flexibility for the UFC to just take the role of the membership of the university budgetary affairs committee and move them over.

That would give them the flexibility of adding more people.

I mean, we could maybe split the difference and say make a reference to members, including members of the university budgetary affairs committee.

HENSHEL: Anne was next?

ELSNER: I might consider on D. There was discussion about "may establish".

What about “may elucidate?”

That may be too scientific.

Anyway the other thing is the first time we heard about this policy, I was actually shocked that we were even considering it, and I'm not sure where it came from.

But to me, the part about, "what about one campus?" is important because of war, climate change, floods, fire, F5 tornado. If somebody wiped out the Gary Campus, could the university actually afford to rebuild it from nothing, or the southeast one floods, or something like that.

I mean, these things could happen, and what would we do?

Can the university take a hit that large and still survive?

I don't know, but I think if we could put that into this, what would we do?

HENSHEL: Who is next? Sorry, I think it was David.

DALEKE: Could you go back to C for just a second? I have a simple request and that is on item C.

The committee composition specifies faculty. Could we also include students? As you know, graduate students, many of them are academic appointees and the dissolution of a program, or department, or any unit would affect them quite profoundly.

HENSHEL: John.

WALBRIDGE: I sat through a panel on the neoliberal university at a professional conference I was at it last weekend. What struck me was that that basically ended up being horror stories of mostly having to do with money.

What seemed to happen was that what the places where financial exigency came up as an issue was cited by administrators generally on faulty grounds. But what they had in common was that on one hand there was a financial crisis of some sort which certainly we could encounter someday, and the other was that lines of communication between the faculty and the administration had broken down.

I breathe a sigh of gratitude that we don't actually have that here, but the fact that faculty are built into this policy and it's done it at a time when the people handling the money are not paying very much attention to it, I think this is an important thing.

The cases that I heard about in a lot of AUP committee A case studies I've read have all shared this that financial exigency, however defined was used by administrators so that in a situation where they were at war with faculty.

So having us in this long before there's any foreseeable need for this I think really important.

HERRERA: Right. So thank you for working in this unit.

Yeah, I have a question regarding B and C because what I see is if something happens here in Bloomington, I wonder why the BFC, the governance body should know first about what is happening in each campus or any campus because the first plays within a university faculty council but should be informed with the intention of showing documentation.

But besides showing documentation, I think the information like letting faculty know would be very relevant before any access to documents or any reasons for any kind of a thought of closing or like eliminating the program.

The other thing is something related with this is a faculty in collection, and I wonder about the entities or the lecturers' participation in this because we are the more vulnerable—that's a difficult word for me as exigency but at least I have three possibilities with that word.

So when Jon Simmons and also Ilana Gershon participated in CREM, I was part of that committee and one of the thing is having the participation of entities because even though the policy says if that is a financial exigency, so our position might be lost or we will be eliminated from the appointment.

So have you also considered the participation in any kind of group or committee with the feedback or at least the participation of?

TRINIDAD 01:34:50,160 --> 01:34:54,505

Yes. That's a great comment. We hadn't. We had assumed under C that mix of faculty would include NTT but you know in retrospect, that's probably a poor assumption that we should more formally put in.

So yeah, adding a clause in there.

Yeah, a mix of faculty, both various ranks of tenure track but also the non-tenure track.

HERRERA: I am wondering these because in A it says the thing for elimination seems just tenure appointments or academic units but we don't have, as entities, we don't have tenure.

But we can have some kind of protection with the new teaching professor appointment.

So if we have this kind of protection, we should also be participants in this conversation.

HENSEL:

Okay, so it's Micol and then Moira.

SEIGEL Thanks. I want to speak also to the composition of the committee and the process of its selection.

I don't have specific recommendations. I need help from the Council. But this is an appointed committee and saying that the UFC will appoint it, I think it sets up the potential for it to be appointed by administrators because even though the UFC is a faculty council, the nominations process is often controlled by administrators or by select faculty who have the ear of the administrators and may not know the interests of the department or unit threatened with elimination.

So I wonder how to deal with this.

I think one thing is to take out that "or", that "slash or" in number C so that it says that there will definitely be faculty faced with potential termination of employment.

The other way would be to allow volunteers.

I think often there are people willing to volunteer for committees who aren't considered by the nominations committees of the UFC or BFC.

The third way might be to risk of elimination submit its own candidate so that it could choose somebody who would be an advocate and somebody that it thought would be effective in that advocacy.

So that's the thing I don't have wording for. Maybe some of you guys can help. But I think it's super important not to just assume that because a committee has faculty on it, that it represents the interests of the unit threatened with elimination.

MARSH: Thank you Diane, and so three things.

First of all, the most important. Thank you to the committee for doing this work, it's a very important thing, it's one of those important things, it's kind of like a long-term disability policy that you hope you never need but we do need it.

The reason that we're here and answer to Diane's question, why we're doing this is because we realized that we didn't have anything in policy about this, although we do have other places and policy that explicitly say one of the few occasions when it tend to track where a faculty member may be dismissed is in cases of financial exigency, so that's why we're here.

Secondly, I think this is a good start but I think this policy can be and should be quite a bit stronger.

First in the terms of the definition and I think that we should consider adopting precisely the definition of financial exigency that it is in the AAUP recommended standards and Herbert mentioned a moment ago.

It's slightly different from what you have.

It says, and I've lost it. Hang on.

It says something like that—a conditional financial exit agency is something that threatens the academic integrity of the entire institution.

So it's that phrase, threatening the academic integrity of the institution not the survival of the institution.

The reason I think that's important to put in is because it puts the emphasis back. Because this is why our faculty, why we can claim that we should be involved in this process is because we are the guardians of the academic mission of the university, that is the teaching and research missions.

So we could conceive of a situation and there seemed to be small schools around the country that some cases are going this way, where the administration puts the survival of the institution ahead of everything else and the academic integrity is entitled as a result, obviously the institution survives but they're no longer academically sound as they were.

So that's one thing.

The other thing, the final thing and this I think is perhaps even more important, and this again is going back to the AAUP, and that is that, I think that we would want to say that the faculty through its appointed governance bodies in this case the UFC.

The faculty expects to be involved or should be involved in making the decision that a state of financial exigency exists or is even eminent, and if we're not involved in that decision in some form, then we are in a very weak defensive position.

So a lot of what's in this draft here is speaking to what happens after the trustees or someone have decided, "Well, we had this disaster, but how do we respond?"

Certainly the faculty need to be involved in those decisions but we should also be involved to the fullest extent possible in the even making that determination, that this is where we're at as a system, and the UFC budgetary affairs committee would seem to be a logical place to start as being the duly appointed and duly elected faculty representative body with the necessary knowledge and expertise to do that.

So that would be my strong recommendation, that we actually make this a little bit stronger and I know that at the end of the day, this is a Trustees' call.

The trustees are not going to make this decision without getting information from the administration.

So the administration is going to know this information well beforehand.

If they know it, then we should know it.

HENSHEL Erica was next, then J..

Anybody else after J? Judah, and then sooner or later I'll probably just finish with that closing comment too. So it's J and Ju-

DOWELL: I just wanted to talk a little about Section E. I think it could be tightened up a little bit.

I wonder that the second sentence which presumes to know that this future financial disaster will allow us to move faculty from one campus to another.

I think that's making a big assumption that we don't know if that's really true. So I think it might be worth just tightening that up as sort of, if this is allowed, the committee can make recommendations.

I also wonder a little bit about how that functions with our current system in which tenure is campus specific.

So that might be something to think about also.

J. DUNCAN: So, I also want to talk about Section E. I realized this is a faculty body and we are talking about faculty policies, and we're trying to safeguard our role in that.

In Section E I wonder if there could be some language about, if we're trying to move faculty from one campus to another to preserve their positions and their jobs.

Could we also do something for the students of that campus, who may be interrupted in the middle of a PhD program or very close to completing a degree program.

Could we say that one of our principles is to accommodate them as much as possible at other campuses just like we would for faculty?

HENSHEL: Dennis, you've a response?

GROTH: Yeah. It's not that I would not support this, but our accreditor has a certain number of set of regulations when institutions change clothes or things like that including actually in some cases mandating institutions except those institutions' students as well.

So I just want you to know there's another set of things that happens when an institution goes through with this. That we have seen in the state of Indiana already.

J. DUNCAN:

I figured you would know that. But mostly I want a statement of principle here, that to the best of our ability will also try to safeguard the completion of the students' programs.

HENSHEL: Judah.

J. COHEN: I'd like to just bring up or ask a question of procedure here.

I recognize that here we are in the Bloomington Faculty Council, talking about a policy in which in many ways we are speaking for the entire system of Indiana University.

I just want to get a sense of whether this is something that is also coming up through other campuses or if in fact what you would say or what would be said if the UFC looks at this and says, "This is great but why are you trying to do our business?"

HENSHEL: Well, I would say that given the oncoming student cliff that has been discussed quite a bit especially in the past year, that several campuses are very concerned and are trying to figure out what to do.

I do think that this will be a welcome discussion in the UFC and they do know it's coming.

J. COHEN: Okay. Thank you.

HENSHEL: Anybody else right now? There was a Jim and a Barb, and oh, and then me finally after maybe?

It's okay, Jim.

SHERMAN: Yes, I want to go back to something that Moira said that I think is important.

The role that the faculty can play in this is what our major goal ought to be and that's to maintain the academic integrity of the university and preserving academic units and programs is part of that.

There are other ways to deal with financial crisis other than getting rid of programs, or departments, or faculty and that's why I think Herb's suggestion that the budgetary affairs committee be involved is a really good one.

For example, if there are some sports that are bleeding money from the university, that could be considered.

If it's a better decision for academic integrity to stop putting money into retirement accounts for one year, that doesn't threaten academic integrity as much as getting rid of departments or faculty.

So I think it's important to have faculty do more than argue for why their department or school is very good but also to come up with other possible ways that the administration, that the Board of Trustees might consider in terms of dealing with a crisis.

So I like Herb's suggestion a lot.

HENSHEL: Yes, Barb and then Eliza.

CHERRY: Yes. Two quick points.

Judah's point about this is going to be for the university as a whole that's one of the reasons why earlier,

I raised the issue about, not just IU as a whole but regional campuses because we are talking about a policy that's going to affect the entire university not just this campus, and we can't speak just for the other campuses.

Then also I likewise like Herb's suggestion and what Jim just explained about tying in the budgetary affairs at the UFC level, getting that involved and that also ties in as well I think with Moira's point that that would facilitate the faculty having more of a role in determining that a financial exigency even exists and how we define it as such.

PAVALKO: Yes. I was just going to mention a cross reference to ACA-37 which is the university statement on tenure.

It does have an explicit statement about the geographic limitation of tenure.

Stating that, "The tenure of any faculty member specifically the campus in which he or she is serving."

But the next paragraph does say that, "If the position in faculty member has been eliminated, the university will make every reasonable effort to place faculty member, librarian in a comparable position elsewhere in the university."

So I think it's not contradictory to what you have but there's some language that I think could fit well.

HENSHEL: Okay. Let me just say one thing.

So I'm going to go back to I think it's B, can we go back to B a second, Elizabeth? We got it.

This is a recommendation to Jon and Elizabeth.

I think that "informed as early as feasible" is insufficient, and we need to say that this supporting what Moira said, "The university faculty council should be part of the decision."

I think that needs to be there and we need to get rid of that, "Should be informed as early as feasible." Because what that says is that the university faculty council is not a part of the decision and that's a problem.

The other thing is that the university faculty council, and the faculty and probably staff and students, should also be involved before any final decisions of any decisions are made about what would be eliminated.

So, then, I think, Israel?

HERRERA: Yes. So suggestion in C, with the appointment. I have one comment and one question.

One of the suggestion would be in the appointment that the chair [inaudible] but it's related to the creation or elimination should be in that specific committee.

The other thing is the relevant expertise to evaluate so that faculty would be related to the unit or what do we understand by the expertise to evaluate?

TRINIDAD: Yes. I mean the faculty wouldn't necessarily be in that particular unit at that campus, but in order to evaluate the School of Business that we would need some people with some faculty members with business education experience was why we were going there.

HENSHEL: Any other comments?

TRINIDAD: Yes, so just in closing that, these were excellent comments.

If you made word changes I wrote them all down, if you have actual sentences that you would like to see in here, if you could email Elizabeth and I, then that would make our jobs easier and better capture your intent.

HENSHEL: Any other points?

Otherwise thank you very much, and I think we get a few minutes back. Thank you.

TERRY: Now, I just like to suggest something you could look at related to comments here.

During the sort of no confidence meeting in the IU Auditorium years ago about Adam Herbert, there was a tornado warning. I found myself huddled in the [inaudible] with Neil Theobald and the CFO of IU. We calculated the likely replacement value of the Bloomington campus, and what to do about the third of the faculty or so who might go.

We concluded that it was unlikely the General Assembly could come up with that money.

Not long after that Neil negotiated the first insurance policy.

It was then a very high deductible policy, but the intent was to help avoid financial exigency in the event of a natural disaster.

I don't know if we still have that policy, or if the current CFO has looked at it recently.

After the flooding at the University of Iowa, many universities did look at what they would do.

The policy was only collected on once that I know of, and it was interestingly enough when Tamarack Hall was destroyed by flooding at IU Northeast, was largest classroom building there.

Finally, it saved IU Northwest because the policy required that we rebuild on site, and there were trustees who thought it was time to abandon Gary and wanted to use the damage to the campus as a possible reason for that.

The only way to collect on the policy was to rebuild a new building that is now in place at IU Northwest.

So you might want to see if we still have that protection against a severe natural calamity.

HENSHEL: Officially adjourned.