

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL

September 1st, 2020

broadcast.iu.edu

2:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M.

Members Present: Jim Ansaldo, Rachel Aranyi, Hussein Banai, Karen Banks, Jozie Barton, Alan Bender, Jonathan Brauer, Dan Bullock, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, John Carini, Barbara Cherry, Dakota Coates, Paul Coats, Rachael Cohen, David Daleke, Allen Davis, Dee Degner, Constantine Deliyannis, J Duncan, Ann Elsner, Kelly Eskew, Pnina Fichman, Jackie Fleming, Lessie Frazier, Brian Gill, Anthony Giordano, Jason Gold, Lucia Guerra-Reyes, Nandini Gupta, Diane Henshel, Israel Herrera, Justin Hodgson, Larissa Jennings Mayo-Wilson, Colin Johnson, Kari Johnson, Peter Kloosterman, Ben Kravitz, Shanker Krishnan, Rob Kunzman, Jessica Lester, Sally Letsinger, Bradley Levinson, Scott Libson, Margaret Lion, Annette Loring, Heather Milam, Theodore Miller, Jill Nicholson-Crotty, Sameer Patil, Eliza Pavalko, Chuck Peters, Angie Raymond, Catherine Reck, Lauren Robel, Elizabeth Shea, Marietta Simpson, Paul Sokol, Ruhan Syed, Lisa Thomassen, Samantha Tirey, John Walbridge, Erik Willis, Stephen Wryczynski, Jeffrey Zaleski, Kurt Zorn

Members Absent: Karen Allen, Jonathan Brauer, Linda Gales, Pedro Machado, Miriam Northcutt Bohmert, Courtney Olcott, Linda Pisano, Lauren Richerme, Steve Sanders

Guests: Blair Johnston, David O'Guinn, Libby Spotts, Emily Springston

AGENDA:

1. Approval of the [Minutes of April 7, 2020](#)
2. [Memorial Resolution for Eliot Hearst](#)
3. **Executive Committee Business** (10 minutes)
John Walbridge, Faculty President

[B1-2020 Bloomington Faculty Council Members 2020-2021](#)
[B2-2020 Bloomington Faculty Council Committees 2020-2021](#)
[B3-2020 Summary of Actions Taken 2019-2020](#)

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

5. Question/Comment Period

Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to Provost Robel or President Walbridge by emailing bfcoff@indiana.edu

6. Proposed Resolution of the Bloomington Faculty Council in Support of the Rights and Protections for Graduate Student Academic Appointees during the COVID-19 Pandemic (5 minutes)

Dakota Coates, President of the Graduate and Professional Student Government

David Daleke, Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Health Sciences

Colin Johnson, Member of the resolution working group

[Action Item]

[B5-2021: Proposed Resolution of the Bloomington Faculty Council in Support of the Rights and Protections for Graduate Student Academic Appointees during the COVID-19 Pandemic](#)

7. Questions/Comments on the proposed Resolution of the Bloomington Faculty Council in Support of the Rights and Protections for Graduate Student Academic Appointees during the COVID-19 Pandemic (20 minutes)

8. Proposed Interim Suspension policy (10 minutes)

Cate Reck, Co-chair of the Student Affairs Committee

Paul Sokol, Co-chair of the Student Affairs Committee

David O'Guinn, Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students

Libby Spotts, Associate Dean of Students and Director, Office of Student Conduct

Emily Springston, University Director of Institutional Equity and University Sexual Misconduct and Title IX Coordinator

[Action Item]

[B6-2021: Proposed Interim Suspension policy](#)

[B7-2021: Additional background regarding the Interim Suspension policy](#)

9. Questions/Comments on the proposed Interim Suspension policy (20 minutes)

10. Open discussion on Bloomington Faculty Council strategic priorities for the year (35 minutes)

John Walbridge, Faculty President

Members of the Executive Committee

[Discussion Item]

TRANSCRIPT:

ROBEL: Well let's get started everyone and welcome to the school year in the strangest of possible ways.

AGENDA ITEM ONE: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF APRIL 7TH, 2020

ROBEL: And we'll start, if I could with the motion for approval of the minutes of April 7th.

HENSHEL: So, moved.

ROBEL: Thank you. And a second.

CHERRY: I'll second. This is Barb.

ROBEL: And this will be the point, Elizabeth Pear, if you'd like to explain to everyone how they vote.

PEAR: That's a great question. So, I think for something like this is just a voice vote. If it's something a little bit more contentious, we can use the chat and that is recorded, and we can count it a little bit easier.

ROBEL: Okay, well, let's do it by voice vote than everyone unmuted. Could I hear approval?

EVERYONE: Aye.

ROBEL: That's fantastic. Any opposed?

All right. Thank you everybody.

AGENDA ITEM TWO: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR ELIOT HEARST

ROBEL: I'll turn now to Vice Provost, Eliza for a memorial resolution for Eliot Hearst. Eliza?

PAVALKO: Yep. Thank you.

Eliot Hearst spent his life pursuing his twin intellectual loves—chess and psychology—and was a remarkable contributor to both. He was a devoted father, raising three children.

Born in New York City, Eliot Hearst spent his childhood, adolescence, and youth gaining experience in that urban mecca, sampling a wealth of cultural opportunities. He became interested in chess at an early age, joining the Marshall Chess Club at age 12, and pursued it seriously throughout the 1950s and early 1960s. Among his tournament successes were victories in the Eastern Open, New York State, New Jersey, and Washington, D.C. championships, and several top-5 finishes in U.S. Open tourneys. He had a well-known tournament win over Bobby Fischer, another chess prodigy from New York. Hearst gained the titles of senior master and life master from the U.S. Chess Federation. In addition, he was the captain of the U. S. Olympic Chess team (1962), a vice-president of the U.S.C.F., an organizer and director of many tournaments, and a featured columnist for Chess Life in the 1960s. He once remarked that he devoted more time to serious chess than to academic psychology until he was about 30 years old.

Hearst became a psychology major at Columbia University and received his B.A. summa cum laude in 1953. He began the graduate program in experimental psychology as a Harry J. Carman Fellow in 1953-54, served as teaching assistant for Fred S. Keller in the introductory laboratory course, and received his M.A. in 1954. For the next two years, he continued his doctoral training under William N. "Nat" Schoenfeld as a teaching and research assistant. "His vast knowledge of the sciences and humanities was impressive," Hearst recalled, "and he was the best teacher I ever had." Hearst's dissertation investigated effects of time-correlated reward schedules in the pigeon, and was awarded in 1956, only three years beyond his baccalaureate degree. He spent the next two years on active duty in the U.S. Army, stationed at Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington, DC, where he worked in the departments of experimental psychology and of neurophysiology.

Staying in the District of Columbia until 1964, Hearst was a senior experimental psychologist at the Clinical Neuropharmacology Research Center, a joint unit of the National Institute of Mental Health and Saint Elizabeth's Hospital. His experimental work expanded to include pharmacological, neuroanatomical, genetic, and biochemical correlates of behavior as well as classical and instrumental conditioning. In 1964-65, Hearst took up a NIMH fellowship at the Royal College of Surgeons in London, under John R. Vane (a future Nobel Prize winner) in the Department of Pharmacology. On one occasion, after dinner at Vane's residence, Hearst played blindfold chess with Vane as well as his two daughters simultaneously. Returning to the U.S., he was recruited by the University of Missouri, where he was appointed a full professor of psychology. In 1966, he was awarded his first NIMH grant, to study "Basic Processes in Learning and Behavior Change." His still-ardent interest in chess was on display in the second issue of *Psychology Today* in 1967, where he contributed a thoughtful review (and the journal cover motif), "Psychology Across the Chessboard." After five years at Missouri, where he supervised four Ph.D. dissertation students and published over a dozen research papers, he moved to Indiana University in 1970.

At Indiana's Department of Psychology, he continued his experimentation on conditioning in pigeons, and taught both graduate and undergraduate courses on animal behavior, learning theory, and history and systems of psychology. An approachable yet demanding mentor, he patiently guided hundreds of students, teaching them scientific methods and effective writing techniques. Augmenting his experimental work, Hearst's reputation for scholarly synthesis and integration was growing, and he published several review essays. In 1974, Hearst co-authored a monograph with Herbert Jenkins that reviewed behavioral studies on the relations between stimulus and reinforcement.

As the centennial of the founding of the first laboratory of experimental psychology—in 1879 at Leipzig by Wilhelm Wundt—approached, the Psychonomic Society commissioned Hearst to organize and edit a major volume containing historical assessments of the major subfields of psychology, written by research scientists. The nearly 700-page book, *The First Century of Experimental Psychology*, was published in 1979, and contained an introductory essay by Hearst. Garnering positive reviews, the book was reprinted multiple times, including a paperback edition.

Hearst's expertise in psychology was avidly sought, and he served on several editorial boards from 1963 to 1985 and served as a reviewer for many other publications, while successfully resisting offers to become the editor of other journals in favor of his own writing projects.

Elected to the governing board of the Psychonomic Society, he served from 1977-82. During his Indiana years, Hearst was awarded prestigious fellowships from the Guggenheim Foundation (1974-75) and the James McKeen Cattell Foundation (1981-82) and was elected to the Society of Experimental Psychologists in 1981. He was a fellow of five divisions of the American Psychological Association: Experimental Psychology, Physiological and Comparative Psychology, Experimental Analysis of Behavior, History of Psychology, and Psychopharmacology.

In 1984, IU honored him with the title of distinguished professor of psychology. The citation noted Hearst's wide range of topics, including the nature of reinforcement and punishment, discrimination and generalization, learning, cognition, memory, and biological constraints on behavior. "His modus operandi is to enter an area under dispute, identify the critical issues, and, with a few deftly crafted experiments, resolve the principal controversies," an admiring colleague stated, adding, "this is all the more amazing when one considers the diversity of the topics he has researched." His penchant for synthetic review was on display again in 1988, when he contributed "Fundamentals of Learning and Conditioning" to the second edition of Steven's Handbook of Experimental Psychology, an authoritative classic first published in 1951.

Regular renewals of his NIMH grants continued until 1988, until he decided to devote more time to library research and writing, although he continued to have an active lab until retirement. Hearst supervised 10 doctoral dissertations at Indiana and served as committee member for 20 other Ph.D. candidates. In 1988, he spearheaded the organization of the centennial celebration of the IU psychological laboratory and co-edited a centennial monograph containing data on every graduate degree in psychology, lists of faculty and department administrators, and a narrative history.

After 26 years, Hearst retired from Indiana University in 1996, and the department hosted a "Hearst Fest" with a dinner reception that included his former students. Returning to New York, he served as an adjunct professor at Columbia University, his alma mater. He received a grant in 1998-99 from the Harvard University McMaster Fund to study blindfold chess. Moving to Tucson in 1999, where his sister was on the faculty of the University of Arizona, Hearst obtained another courtesy appointment there in the psychology department, where he continued to advise students.

Along with a co-author, John Knott, he published his chess magnum opus in 2009: Blindfold Chess: History, Psychology, Techniques, Champions, World Records, and Important Games. The book was well received in the chess world, and Hearst wrote occasional blog postings on blindfold chess into his 80's. In 2013, he returned to Bloomington to attend the 125th anniversary (quasiquicentennial) of the IU psychological laboratory. After a brief illness, Eliot Hearst died in Tucson on January 30, 2018, at 85 years of age.

The contributions of Eliot Hearst to Indiana University and to scientific psychology will be commemorated through an endowed professorship in the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, generously funded by Hearst and given in memory of his daughter, Nicola Jane Hearst (1971-1999). Former students, colleagues, and friends have endowed the Eliot Hearst Lectureship, inaugurated in 2019.

Thank you.

ROBEL: Thank you so much, Eliza. And we would typically at this point, take a moment of silence. And so, let's take a very close moment of silence. Quick moment of silence in honor of an extraordinary life. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM THREE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

ROBEL: Alright. I will turn to our president, John Walbridge, for Executive Committee Business. Thank you.

WALBRIDGE: Alright. Thank you, everyone. Welcome to the first meeting of the 2020-2021 Indiana University, I guess 3.0, academic year. And particularly I'd like to welcome new members to the Faculty Council. I have to say it's pretty obvious already that it's not going to be a normal year and I will miss the in-person meetings. But to judge what has happened in the last few months, it's going to be an interesting year. So let me, you have a document with the agenda, with the accomplishments of the Faculty Council last year. And I will just sort of skip very quickly over that.

As all of you, I hope, know the system at Indiana University is a shared governance, which means that on anything academic, the faculty, mainly through the Faculty Council, set policies and administrators administer them. So last year we had a variety of housekeeping issues. Updating College of Arts and Sciences voting sub-units, some revisions of language for promotion. And for things to implement the motion procedures for the new teaching professors. Renaming the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee to Diversity Equity and Inclusion Committee. Some student matters such as test free admissions. Sustainability resolution that basically originated at IU East, we adopted, the University Faculty Council has adopted in a slightly different form. And as all of you probably remember with some degree of disbelief or horror, in March, we went into overdrive. So, the Faculty Council, particularly the Executive Committee, moved on to be spend a lot of time acting as advisors to the Provost and other administrators, administrators. For this, I would like to give special thanks to the committees that stayed on duty through the summer instead of getting our usual break from bureaucracy. So, first of all, my fellow co-presidents, Diane Henshel, the past president to whom I owe a great deal of understanding what's going on. Moira Marsh the now past president and now Marietta Simpson, the now president-elect. And then more generally, the members of the executive committee, who met quite regularly critically in the early parts of the summer. And then many, many people are involved in the campus restart committees. And Lauren, no doubt could tell you more about that.

It tells you something about how the Faculty Council works that on February 4th, we adopted a policy on financial exigency. This one might have been excused for believing, was because the Committee on Creation, Reorganization, Elimination, and Merger, or familiarly known as CREM, didn't have enough to do. However, it soon became apparent that this was indeed relevant and a version of it was adopted by the University Faculty Council Executive Committee on an emergency basis early in the summer. We also had adopted a resolution for shared governance principles and expectations of the campus pandemic response. Basically, reaffirming that even though the University is in crisis, the faculty expected to be involved in the decisions. There's something I want to say more generally before we get to our regular business and occasionally come to disagreements with our administrative superiors. But a year and a half ago I went to a panel on the neo-liberal university at my professional, main professional organizations annual meeting. This consisted mainly of horror stories of one sort or another. Administrators that don't work with faculty. Trustees who considered the faculty to be unnecessary nuisances.

Just generally all the kind of problems that you read about if you say read the publications of the AUP. I don't want to say that there are no problems at Indiana University with regard to relations between administrators and faculty. So, the great Sir Humphrey Appleby said, "there's policy administration and the administration of policy." And it's sometimes hard to tell which is which. But we are certainly better off than we might be far better off. And there's some things I think we have going for us here. First of all, we have a functioning set of faculty governance institutions, which you all are one. And the senior administrators faithfully participate in these administrations. So, it's not simply us talking to the walls. Lauren is here for every meeting she can make. President McRobbie regularly attends the University Faculty Council meetings. Second, we have a core of people who are committed to faculty governance. A lot of our colleagues' sort of go happily along. Excuse me, more or less unaware of this process. But you will find there are probably a 100 to 200 people on campus who are committed to making the University work well. And finally, there is a tremendous amount of loyalty to the University among the key players. All but one of the trustees are alumni, as near as I can figure. The remaining one, lives in Bloomington. The senior administrators, for the most part, have been at the University for much or all of their careers. This is true for much of the faculty. We're very fortunate in our staff who rumble sometimes with justification usually but are proud of working for the University. We had extremely loyal or perhaps fanatically loyal alumni. And we have in general good relations with the local and state politicians. So, before we get into quarrels with each other and with the administrators for the year, I think we should be grateful for how well, in fact, we have things. So, with that, I will turn the floor over to the next stage, which is the question and answer, period.

ROBEL: I think actually it's my report, John. And before we get to that, I'll just say in anticipation of the question-and-answer period and the rest of the meeting, that you can raise questions in chat, and you can also raise your hand. Both of those ways of getting attention in this meeting are being monitored and we'll get you in a queue. So let me, let me give my remarks and let me just again, with the enormous gratitude I feel for the Council, for the Executive Committee, which has met off and, on all summer long and for the student leadership, both the immediate past student leadership at both the undergraduate and graduate level and the current and new student leadership who are lobbying, particularly back in the spring, were making themselves available at off hours of all kinds. And overwhelming gratitude to my colleagues on the faculty for the work that they've done over the summer. Getting ready to have our students back to that, to get our labs and our research reopened and for our staff.

But there's really not enough thanks I can give for the staff of this University. And I'll talk a little bit more about that when I get to the part of my remarks that have to do with the with testing and getting students back into the residence halls. But they if you see someone on our staff, whether that person is in student affairs or in events or in research or in facilities. Please take a moment to say thank you. They have worked so hard all summer long and they are working as hard as it is possible to work right now.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

ROBEL: So, let me start just by giving you a little context for the new year. We're welcoming 202 new faculty members and 64 of them are tenure track faculty members, enough that that number of tenure track faculty members, thirty-six percent, are members of underrepresented minority groups. Overall, 45% are a faculty of color. And that is the, that is really the most

diverse class we have ever had in our history. And you'll hear me say that in a minute again when I get to the entering class of students. But let me walk through the rest of our cohort of new colleagues. 16 of our new colleagues are lecturers or clinical faculty members. 81 are researchers of one kind or another, research scientists or postdocs, and 41 are visiting faculty. 52% of our new colleagues are women, 48% men. Oh, and our new colleagues come from every continent that is inhabited. So, we have a wonderful, diverse, exciting group of new colleagues with us. And I will add to that brave because this is a, it takes courage right now to be moving from one place to another, or even whether it's your first position in a university or a year you've picked up sticks to go to a new university. So welcome to all of you.

To all of our new friends and colleagues, our entering class is the fourth largest in our history. It is just shy of 8,000 students, 7,928. It has an average GPA of 3.87. So, an enormously talented group as well. 2,900 of them about are non-residents. 275 are international. Our non-resident students are from 47 states. Our international students are from 33 countries. And 20% of our entering class of 1,507 students at the undergraduate level are under-represented minority members, and that is the largest number of under-represented minority students in IU's history. So, at a time when our country is struggling desperately really, with issues of inclusion and equity and fairness and justice, our University has and will continue to take a very strong stand in favor of all of those values. So, my great thanks first, to David Johnson and his staff for the tremendous work on the entering class. To Dave Daleke and everyone involved in was office for the work they are doing with our graduate students. And to Eliza Pavalko for all she has already done to, including, hosting our welcome party online to welcome our new colleagues on the faculty.

I'd like to turn to the elephant in the room, I guess. And that is we are trying to operate a university during a COVID panic pandemic. We're doing that by, among the most aggressive testing regimens in the country. And that includes both requiring pre-arrival testing for residential students and students who live in the Greek houses. Doing on-arrival testing for all of the students who were starting by the 24th when we began classes and doing a very aggressive mitigation testing process that began last week by looking directly at our two populations of students. Instead of starting by testing a representative sample of faculty, staff, and students. We started by way over testing Greek houses and residents' halls. The residence halls are doing okay. They were at a 1% positivity rate with arrival testing. The residence halls are a little above that now, but not much above that. Students in the residence halls who are identified as close contacts of somebody with a positive COVID test or having a positive test themselves, are moved to Ashton to quarantine facilities or isolation facilities, depending on what their situation is or invited to go home. And we've managed to keep that moving quickly. The residence halls were altered pretty significantly over the summer, both in terms of the percent that the number of students in the halls and the ways in which they interact. Most of the students are in rooms that have one person or two people if both of the roommates agree to be roommates with each other. There were tons of mitigation efforts put in around the residence halls to ensure that we could do this and we will continue to test oversample the residence halls to make sure that that if there is anything that looks like an outbreak, we are on it immediately.

The Greek houses, on the other hand, are not doing as well. I'll start just for those of you who are new, who haven't thought a lot about the Greek system, by giving you a bit of an overview. The Greek houses are not owned by IU. They're not operated by IU. And they cooperate with us fairly well most of the time, but it is a negotiation, let me put it that way. We negotiate

behavioral issues with the Greek houses. This mostly falls on the division of Student Affairs led by Dave O'Guinn and his incredible staff including Leslie Fasone, who I want to call out and thank for her heroic efforts. That staff had been working with the Greek house leadership since early June to try to get them to, to think through how they were going to deal with a housing situation, that was not set up at all for students to maintain the kinds of distance that they needed to maintain, in order to get through this period. The Greek houses all put plans in place. Those plans were a various levels of robustness, I guess I'll say. They don't have their own quarantine and isolation facilities. So, I think most of them plan to send people home if they were notified that they were positive or they were in close contact, or some of them also thought that they could quarantine within the house. We were concerned that those housing situations were not very suitable for students during a pandemic. And so, we tested all of the residents of the greek houses last week, and they had gone from a 1% positivity rate to something like an 8% positivity rate. Working quickly with the Monroe County Health Department, the health department put 20 of them in quarantine and we plan to test them all again next week. Next week we'll do another 18,000 mitigation tests. We will double sample the residence halls and off-campus and we will test all the Greeks. And we'll see where the Greek houses are at the end of that. And so, I guess I'll just stop there. I know people have questions. And why don't I just stop and open things up for questions.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD:

HENSHEL: Laura, Shanker has a question. Shanker is the first question. Do you want me to read it, Shanker? Do you want to say it yourself?

SIMPSON: Before we do that, Diane, can I just say for everyone else who has a question, so that we don't have a free for all. Can you please use the raise hand function under participants?

ROBEL: Okay, that's great.

HENSHEL: Our they can put it into Q&A, or I put it into chat.

SIMPSON: Yes. Thank you.

HENSHEL: Okay. So, we have one question so far in chat, and then I'm going to switch over to Marietta. And then if more shows up in chat, we'll switch back. So Shanker, do you want me to read it or do you want to say to yourself?

KRISHNAN: Oh, go ahead.

HENSHEL: Okay. In an HT article last week, it said that sports coaches and some administrators are getting salary raises. Is this true? If true, how is this justified in these times?

ROBEL: I haven't seen the articles, so I'm not sure, and I don't know anything about Athletics. So, let me just start there. I'll find out about the coaches. There is at least one person who went from one administrative position to a very different administrative position. Had been in a vice provost position and move to a dean position and had been, at least for the beginning of that period, if not a relatively significant piece of that period, was doing both of those jobs. And that person's salary was adjusted to recognize that the person is doing a completely different job. Let me ask Eliza. Do you know of anyone else I need to address here on that? Because I'm sorry, I didn't see the article.

PAVALKO: Yeah, and I also didn't see the article. I don't know of any other raises. I mean, we haven't had raises. I don't know. Other than people who have moved to different positions. I don't know of any other increases.

ROBEL: Great. Do you want me just to go with chat or Marietta, which would you like?

SIMPSON: I'd like to. Bradley Levinson has a question. Dakota has a question. And Colin has a question.

ROBEL: Okay. Let's start with Bradley then.

LEVINSON: Hey there folks, been trying not to subject you to my unkept visage, such as it is not a teaching day for me. But the one question that I want to raise, I have a couple, but the one that really want to raise because I suspect someone else will raise the other one, has to do really with our commitment to staff. Professional staff, staff of all sorts, in light of the resolution that we passed in which we stated that pay and benefit cuts shall be avoided at all costs. If such cuts are necessary, they shall be progressive and leveled on the greater share of highest paid staff, faculty, administrators. It's come to my attention that that a number of staff, in fact, are either furloughed or are being laid off. It makes perfect sense on the one hand, we were told in our school, of course, that the amount of cleaning of our offices was going to be greatly reduced, which makes perfect sense. But again, in the spirit of our resolution and the fact that staff are not represented on this body. I'm wondering what kind of transparency we might be able to receive from the administration about the state of staffing in general on campus and how much how many layoffs or furloughs are taking place and whether or not our body might be able to respond, per our resolution, with a way to avoid those layoffs by perhaps proposing voluntary pay cuts on ourselves and on administrators. Because of course, as especially those of us who are tenured were quite privileged.

ROBEL: So, Bradley, thank you for that question and I want to start with my utter and complete loyalty to and support of the staff of this campus. They have worked like mad. And we have avoided the layoffs with one exception, and I'll talk about where that is. We have avoided the layoffs. The kinds of layoffs, you've seen that other universities we have not been laying our staff off. And the only place that has that has contemplated or done layoffs is Athletics. And Athletics has done some layoffs because they have no season right now. And so, there are people who support the season who really have no work. We have been picking up those people as fast as we can and moving them into other positions as quickly as we are able to do it if they want to be picked up.

So, I know that most of you were aware that across higher ed right now, there have been really very large numbers of staff, people laid off at other universities. The last I saw in the Chronicle of Higher Education was over 50,000 people have lost their jobs in higher ed. That has not been the case of at Indiana University. I can't say I can guarantee that it will never be. But I will say that it has been a very, very, very important part of everything that I have been trying to do this summer to avoid having that kind of impact on the extraordinary human beings who have given their life, often for generations of their families, to Indiana University. I am unaware of layoffs. Anything that would count really as layoffs or furloughs at any scale at all in any part of the University with the, with the exception of Athletics. And we weren't working to pick those folks up.

LEVINSON: I can say that I might have some certainty about at least one or two positions in particular units. And of course, as you know, under Responsibility Centered Management, the deans feel quite a bit of pressure, obviously, if there are reduced enrollments, as there are in many places, to balance their budgets. So, I guess just moving forward, you know I'll need to, I'm thinking aloud about which committee of the BFC might be charged with making some kind of request of the administration to be keeping track.

ROBEL: We are keeping track of these. We're watching them very carefully. And there's nothing outside of Athletics that is outside the normal turnover that we would typically get with the ups and downs in various schools. And in fact, there is a piece of federal legislation called the Warn Act. It's been in place for some time. That requires that if we're going to do any kind of furloughs of 50 or more. Those people need to get notice ahead of time. So, there would be plenty of time for this body to weigh in. But I will just tell you, I have no firmer commitment than to the staff of this campus.

LEVINSON: Thank you Lauren.

ROBEL: No firmer commitment. Alright, I think Dakota is next.

SIMPSON: That's correct.

COATES: I just had one quick question. I had sent it into the discussion channel, but I think that you might have an out-of-town. So just wanted to quickly do it. I know during the retreat we touched a little bit on, kind of enforcement mechanisms that were associated with the health and safety provisions. Um, and so I was wondering if we could maybe get an update on how these sanctions are going and maybe how the identification process, how that's been looking.

ROBEL: We have done summarily suspensions of 20 students as a result of violations of our COVID policy. You probably recall, but I'll tell this body that the trustees passed two policies at their last meeting, just a couple of weeks ago. The policies are essentially identical. The policies make most immediately refusal to comply with public health requirements, essentially an offense for which some suspension will happen almost automatically. And so, of the twenty students who have been summarily suspended. None of them, I think at this point, have been suspended from the campus or from their classes. They've been suspended from the campus. They're all entitled to a hearing and they will get it. Some of the students who were suspended were associated with the large party that happened right before the semester started. That's almost half of them, I think. And the rest have been identified because they well, you know, they refuse to cooperate with contact tracers or they refused to move to quarantine and isolation facilitates, you know, one way or another. I would say right now we don't have much difficulty with people reporting violations of our policies. But the students who have actually been suspended at this point have been identified by somebody on staff who's responsible for ensuring that our public health measures are in place. So, Dave O'Guinn is probably on the call and may want to say more about that, but that's where we are.

COATES: And then just as a quick follow-up, I believe the two policies you're referencing, where UA-21 and STU-02. I was wondering if either you or someone on this call could clarify how STU policies are put into place and then if this body were to ever want to look at a review and STU policy, how that works?

ROBEL: Well, this one was put in place by the Board of Trustees. And so, I'm not quite clear how that. It applies to all of the campuses, not just the Bloomington campus. So, my guess is that if you want to weigh in on that policy, the proper route would be the University Faculty Council. However, I will tell you that the University Faculty Council was consulted before both of these policies were put into place. And so, this was not something that came without the support of the relevant faculty governance body. And I think Colin is next.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: No Carolyn will.

SIMPSON: So sorry it's actually Colin.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: All right, you are running the show Marietta.

SIMPSON: I'm sorry. It's actually Colin. And Carolyn, I'm looking for your hand in the hand raised function and I didn't see it. So, I apologize for that.

ROBEL: Alright.

C. JOHNSON: Just a quick clarification. Lauren, you had said for minute taking purposes, among other things, you mentioned that you said 20 of them had been put in quarantine when you were talking about the Greek system. And I assume,

ROBEL: Right.

C. JOHNSON: And I assume that's 20 houses, not 20 paternalist or.

ROBEL: That is correct. 20 of the Greek houses are in quarantine right now.

C. JOHNSON: Okay. Thanks.

SIMPSON: Carolyn.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Lauren, in your report and discussing positive rates and the Greek system, you said anything that looks like an outbreak, we are on it. So, I want to know what numbers regarding positivity rates would mandate or necessitate resorting to online classes only. What's the threshold that you have in mind?

ROBEL: Wait, Carolyn and thank you for that question. And we do have it. It would be helpful for everyone to review Dr. Cole Beeler's video that it is on the website that comes with our dashboards. So, there isn't a threshold. There are a set of issues that we'd like to look at. Internal burden is one. External burden is another. Internal burden being, can we keep resources and then there is one other. Um, the basic idea here is, are we in a position where we cannot control community spread? If we're in that position, then we would consider going online and or if we're in a position where we don't have the ability to contact trace at the rate we need to, to be able to control community spread. Or if we are seeing rates of hospitalization and use of ICU facilities at a rate that seems concerning.

Positivity rate in and of itself, is not the be all and end all of this inquiry. And there are lots of reasons for that. Not the least of which is we're testing a lot of people. And so, you know, as President Trump has told us, if you want to keep your positivity rates low and not have them, then don't test people. We are taking a different approach than the national government. We're testing a lot of people. And the goal of that is to identify places where there is spread. I will tell

you; we will not hesitate if the medical response team recommends that we go online for all or part of the semester. We will do that. And what will tip us into that position will be, we don't think that we have the ability at that moment to control community spread.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you.

SIMPSON: Diane.

HENSHEL: Alright, we have two right now in the list. First Dan Bullock and then Larissa Jennings Mayo-Wilson.

BULLOCK: I was just wondering two things.

ROBEL: I just said hi.

BULLOCK: Oh hi. To what extent were the Greek life participants, presumably the students, expected to create or put into action a viable public health plan. Given that these are 18 to 22-year-olds? That seems like a.

ROBEL: No, no, no. Not the students.

BULLOCK: Okay.

ROBEL: Not the students. The houses are owned by a housing corporation. And the housing corporations are run by boards of alumni and alumni of the houses for the most part. There's also a National Director for each of the Greek communities and there's also an executive director of the house. And so, we did not ask 18 to 20-year old's to put in place public health requirements. We asked the people who run these houses and own them and are responsible for them to put those the place. They were all required to file something with us, just so we had some sense of what they thought they were going to do. But no, that is not something we put on them.

BULLOCK: Thank you.

ROBEL: Yep. You're welcome.

HENSHEL: Okay. The next question is Larissa, and then I would like to make a comment about a previous question.

ROBEL: Alright. Larissa?

JENNINGS MAYO-WILSON: Hi. Yes. Thank you. I don't have a separate question. It's just a follow-up to the question about the positivity rate. I think what faculty are asking for is technically, for example, if you had a clinical trial or a randomized trial around testing a drug, or looking at an infectious disease outbreak, you would have what's called a stopping rule. It's a metric with a specified, prespecified value that says, if we reached this level, we will then stop the trial. Or even the World Health Organization defines an epidemic that's concentrated or general, based on a prevalence level being above or below 5%. There are other definitions around prevalence levels below or above 1%. So, this idea that we use data and have a number for making decisions about if at community spread is controlled, what number will tell us it is being controlled or it isn't being controlled. Does the committee have that?

ROBEL: Yes. Well, it's not one number. It's a lot of numbers. The medical response team meets multiple times a day. They do case conferences around the cases that have been reported. They

look for evidence of transmission within any given setting. They look at any evidence of community spread transition. There are a lot of metrics that they are following. The metrics add up to sort of a stoplight system for the campus. I bet you're pretty familiar with all of this. So, they're following positivity rates on three- and seven-day rolling averages. They're following percentage of success on contact tracing. They're following the epidemiology for the county in which each of the campuses are located. They're watching the numbers around all of the hospital admissions. They're watching the numbers around ICU utilization, PPE use, and availability. It's a fairly comprehensive set of numbers which ultimately are there to tell us, allowed them to advise us on whether there is an action we need to take as policymakers.

And so, I will say that positivity by itself is not what we're looking at. We're looking at all of those things and whether we have a reason to be concerned. Right now, I am quite concerned about the Greek houses. It's not as if we didn't anticipate this. That's why Dave's office has been working all summer with those groups. I'm not clear that their housing situations are compatible with a pandemic. And so, all I can say is that there's a point every day where we do review all of these numbers with the medical response team. Alright.

HENSHEL: Can I just add one more comment from the previous comment about the suspension. I'd like to give the history from the faculty perspective. By the beginning of May, the Faculty Council and especially the Executive Committee was receiving a lot of input from faculty who were not sure they ever wanted to step on campus again until this was all over. And we then went to Lauren and said, we need and a way to make sure that the faculty feel safe. And there were two things that we asked for and both of which I think I've pretty much come true.

The first was that we asked that all faculty would be allowed to say if they were willing to come on to campus or not. That it was not to be imposed upon them at all. That it was to come from each individual faculty member to make a decision about their own personal health and family situation. That has come true. And even though there was some question for a while, what was going to happen in some of the units? Pretty much every unit has followed that rule.

The second was, what do we do if students aren't responding to us? What do we do if we feel unsafe in our classrooms? And we wanted to be able to come down hard enough, with enough backing of the University that we felt that we could say to a student we're not comfortable, we need you out of here. And administration came back with something that we were very happy with and felt like it supported the faculty very well. And so, I can understand how students might feel like these are harsh. The faculty in a large part, were feeling like we weren't even sure we wanted to be there. So, it was a matter of as far as we were concerned, public health for us. Thanks Lauren.

ROBEL: Alright.

SIMPSON: Excuse me, Lauren? This is Marietta. We have one more question from Constantine.

ROBEL: Okay. This is our last one.

SIMPSON: Thank you so much.

ROBEL: You bet.

DELIYANNIS: Thank you so much. I have a few questions regarding suspensions which you were discussing earlier. And I don't know if you covered this because my computer cut out for

about five minutes. So hopefully, I'm not asking something that was already addressed. But three different faculty came to me with the same question, so I thought I'd better ask them. So, are instructors being informed that one or more of their students is or are temporarily suspended? And is there a uniform University policy about how instructors are to deal with students work missed during the period of suspension? For example, are suspended students allowed to submit work or take exams during that period? Or perhaps do they automatically fail such work or so is there any policy?

ROBEL: I'm sure there is, Con. Hold on. Dave O'Guinn, are you on this call?

O'GUINN: Yes ma'am. I'm here.

ROBEL: Okay. Could I ask you to take this one?

O'GUINN: Yes. Hi. Thanks for having me today. So really, if you take out a COVID suspension, which is a really a brand-new thing we put in place this year, a student that is suspended from IU after all the due process that class would normally end for them. And in the end, whatever they worked out with that particular professor, they absolutely could receive withdraw with failing grades and the like. That has been the case for 20, 30, 40 years. That's how that works. And what we've been doing in very unique situations with our COVID suspensions which, and I'm sorry I was not on earlier when Lauren was talking about this, we've had very few compared to other significant size universities. We've been allowing students to switch their classes online, but they are not allowed to be at IU. And so those students would then continue on their class online. If they happen to be an in-person class, they would lose the privilege of being in that class and would have to withdraw.

ROBEL: I think I would just say if an instructor has a question about individual students, please don't hesitate to have that personal contact, The Vice Provost for Student Affairs, Dave O'Guinn and his office and we can help.

O'GUINN: Absolutely.

ROBEL: Alright. I want to make sure that we move on our agenda because I believe that this proposed resolution of the council in support of the rights and protections for graduate students' academic appointees is one that actually is more or less pending from the beginning of the summer. So, I think that Dakota Coates, President of the Graduate Professional Student Government Association, David Daleke, who is our Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Health Sciences. And Colin Johnson, who is a member of the council who was on the resolution working group, are presenting this and you have it in your minutes.

AGENDA ITEM SIX: PROPOSED RESOLUTION OF THE BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL IN SUPPORT OF THE RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS FOR GRADUATE STUDENT ACADEMIC APPOINTEES DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

ROBEL: So, who is actually going to say a few words about this among those three folks. Dakota, is that you?

COATES: I believe so.

ROBEL: Great.

COATES: I'm going to quickly share my screen. I have the document of the resolution pulled up in case there are amendments or questions to look at language. As you can see, I've already included a highlight from, one of Alan's suggestions from the chain. So just for a little bit, a quick context for this resolution. As many of you are aware, the faculty passed a similar resolution over the summer. During the process of hearing and amending that resolution, there was discussion about whether or not to include student academic appointees, particularly those involved in an instructional capacity in that resolution. It was decided by the BFC at the time that it would be more suited to have a separate resolution for the student academic appointees. And that's kind of where this came to fruition. So, we developed a small sub drafting group that involved, like the Provost mentioned myself, Dean Daleke, other students, a few faculty members on the board for this was that resulting resolution. The general whereas clauses mirrored a lot of language and the faculty provisions, and they addressed kind of general sentiments surrounding the student conditions here on campus. So, for those ones, I'll just kinda skip more down to therefore clauses so that the majority of the purpose of this resolution is to reaffirm the universities and the BFC's, commitment to the student academic appointees critical role here on campus. And I know that both Dean Daleke and myself, hold many of the students up in very high regard for the commitment and duties that they provide to this campus. And so, this resolution serves to recognize what the student appointees provide to IU and to reaffirm our commitment to supporting them during their tenure here.

So first one is that it prioritizes an SAAs ability to continue making document progress. Secondly, is that dealing with extra costs associated to transitioning to between online and in person that those aren't externalized on graduate student instructors. That went to the concern from a couple of SAAs during the spring semester who were given an additional workload to help transition courses online. The edition was protections and personal health considerations offered to faculty. I responded to Alan's comment on this question, noting that a couple of these were involved in decisions related to being in person versus online, and how to interact with the students that they are responsible for. The fourth one is similar to the faculty resolution, that reductions in the SAA workforce shall be avoided. And similarly, section five goes specifically to the pay and benefits of student academic appointees. Again, for both of those, it was meant to protect the financial stability of graduate students who are experiencing during the pandemic, a heightened challenge with financial and personal challenges. The other provisions moving into number six was towards student academic appointee contracts. I know that Eliza had mentioned a general form contract that's often associated with student academic appointees, this aimed a little bit further at the additional duties documents that are typically go along student academic appointees. Um, and so we're just looking for greater clarity, especially during how we all know to be the hectic time of coronavirus. The seventh was looking towards the onboards Ombuds-process and the appeals process for student academic appointees who may have conflict with faculty in their departments. And so, it's a reaffirmation of BL-ACA-D23, which specifies what the current Bloomington Faculty Council involvement is on that. And then calls for the university to be and support an expansion of the Ombuds-process here. The eighth revision is, as we all know, the federal government has created a turbulent time for our international students. Particularly those international students who are meant to be here as student academic appointees this year. Due to tax international law restrictions, many of these students have had issues maintaining their student academic appointee position, as well as even making it to the United States. To this the revision calls for the University to assist with visa and travel-related restrictions to the greatest existence as possible. And the last one is, again, kind of smart too. Our

faculty resolution is more of a sense of camaraderie between the student academic appointees and the faculty. That we continue to recommit ourselves to the University purpose and to support one another. So that's kind of a, a quick general overview of what the resolution is. I wanted to kind of get that through as quickly as we could so we would have ample time for questions.

ROBEL: Thank you so much, Dakota. I just want to take a moment to thank all of the student academic appointees who like the faculty and the staff and the students who are all struggling with it, the new normal we're facing, and doing the best they can to continue to work with their assigned academic duties with the kind of professionalism and responsibility that we really, we all appreciate in our graduate students. So, with that, I'll open this up to discussion.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION OF THE BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL IN SUPPORT OF THE RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS FOR GRADUATE STUDENT ACADEMIC APPOINTEES DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

SIMPSON: Both John Walbridge and Dave Daleke have their hands up.

ROBEL: Okay. And John, would you like to begin.

WALBRIDGE: Sure, and just to clear, this resolution, in fact I arranged for him to be on the first meeting's agenda. I do want to just comment with utmost praise, the work that the Office of International Services has done. started setting. My graduate students are almost, two: a man and woman, from countries where there are visa problems. And I cannot think of a messy problem that OIS hasn't been able to solve for us. And so, while I'm all for affirming this, nothing in this and from my point of view should be taken as criticism of the support that the University gives for dealing with students with visa problems.

ROBEL: Thank you so much, John, and I meant to mention the Office of International Services in my opening remarks. And thank you for reminding me because we've had any number of unnecessary crises imposed on our international students over the last several months. And the Office of International Students and the Vice President for International Affairs, Hannah Buxbaum, have been extraordinary in the care and work they have done to ensure that this part of our mission, which is just has always been definitional for our university, is protected as much as we can possibly protect it during this period. Alright, Dave Daleke.

DALEKE: Thank you and good afternoon, everyone. Everything that Lauren and John just said was on my notes of things to point out. And so, I will just be very brief in saying that I think that the work that our SAAs due, especially our academic instructors is tremendous, and they have allowed us to be able to, they have adapted as quickly as faculty have and have allowed us to transition to the format of the instruction that we have now. And I can't be prouder of graduate students in that regard. I also want to point out is referring to SAAs we're also referring to our researchers and other graduate assistants who contribute tremendously to the University in so many ways. I try not to exaggerate but I will because it has to do with graduate students. But really the research enterprise of our institution is driven in many ways by all of the work of the graduate students and laboratories and collections and in other ways. But I'll just stop there because I really wanted to make just a minor clarification points to the documented in case it comes up. BL-ACA-D23, for those who don't have all the policies memorized is actually the

SAA Mediation Committee policy. And I would suggest if it's okay, Dakota, if we insert that into item number seven so that it's clear what that refers to. And that's all I had. Thank you.

COATES: I was going to say I'd be perfectly okay with amending that as a friendly amendment pursuant to Robert's Rules Of Order, since it's a non-material change, unless anyone has any particular thoughts on adding the title of that resolution.

ROBEL: So, all you're doing is just putting in parentheses after the name of the policy. Okay. That sounds that sounds fine. Without objection, let's proceed.

SIMPSON: Ben Kravitz has his hand raised.

ROBEL: Okay. Ben?

KRAVITZ: I don't have any objections. I had a question.

ROBEL: Go right ahead Ben.

KRAVITZ: Thanks. Um, so first I want to agree with everyone who's said great things about our SAA's before I could not do what I do without them. This is more of a newbie question. I haven't been on the Bloomington Faculty Council before. So, I guess it's a question about resolutions. So, in points number four and five, there's the language avoided at all costs. And I totally agree with the sentiment that we need to protect our SAAs. I wanted to know how binding that language is and whether that sort of absolutism, it's going to cause a problem.

HENSHEL: And I'd point out that we switched that language in the faculty to, avoided if at all possible. I believe.

ROBEL: Well, that's a great question. Resolutions are typically, I view resolutions as an expression of the strong sentiment of the faculty. And they're not policies. And I think the question you're asking Ben, is if we were at the point where we were having to balance significant reductions in our budget, would this mean that we would be prioritizing the graduate student SAAs above other possible other people who might also be considered for reductions in budget? Is that the concern that you have?

KRAVITZ: Yes.

ROBEL: Okay. And I will say that my one question about number four, at the reductions in the SAA supported portion of the IU Bloomington workforce shall be avoided at all costs, was I am assuming that Dakota and the committee, your sense was the existing SAAs. In other words, this is an instruction to avoid laying off or furloughing SAAs. It's modern instruction that in the grand scheme of things, as deans are looking forward and department chairs, they might decide that this is a year in which fewer, they would hire fewer SAAS. Do I have that correct?

COATES: Yes, that is correct, Provost Robel.

ROBEL: Okay. Thank you.

COATES: So just to quickly draw attention to the document, I've included the suggested edit to the SAA Mediation Committee policy reference. And it now also links to the reference policy on the official university policy page. With regards to the avoided at all costs language, as Diane kind of reference, that was an initial mirroring of the image and the faculty council resolutions.

So, if this group believes that that language should similarly be altered to mirror the faculty resolution, we could do that too.

HENSHEL: Would that be acceptable then? So, it would say instead, if at all costs, if at all possible.

KRAVITZ: That'd be fine with me.

HENSHEL: Dakota is that a friendly amendment? That is just editing.

COATES: In my opinion. That's a non-material edit. I'm not sure if we have a designated parliamentarian on the group who needs to make that call, but I would deem it as an equivalency.

ROBEL: Then I think unless there's an objection, let's make that change.

COHEN: Yeah, that's fine with me.

ROBEL: Okay. Is there other discussion of this item before we're ready to vote?

COATES: There was one more piece which was submitted by Alan in advance of the meeting. It's in section four and I have it highlighted on my screen. It was supported portion of the Indiana University Bloomington aspect to that sentence. Alan had suggested that it be removed. It's just an additional language, so it's not really material provision. I told him that I was fine with its removal to it, which it would read that reductions in the SAA workforce shall be avoided. Again, I would say sufficiently that it's a friendly amendment unless anyone has opposition to that change.

ROBEL: Do I hear any opposition? If not, we'll take that as a friendly amendment as well. And I think with that we're ready to vote. Let's try voice vote for this one. All in favor?

EVERYONE: Aye.

ROBEL: Alright. All opposed? The ayes have it. And thank you all so much for the work on the of the resolution. I think it will be a great comfort to our graduate students and our student academic appointees among the graduate students.

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER EIGHT: PROPOSED INTERIM SUSPENSION POLICY

ROBEL: Alright. The next thing on our agenda is proposed Interim Suspension policy. And you may ask, what is the difference between this Interim Suspension policy and the Suspension policy we were talking about not that long ago? And the answer to that, I believe is that this is something that is required by the changes to the guidance we have received on the implementation on Title IX from the federal government. So, with that, I'd like to turn this over to Cate Reck and Paul Sokol and Dave O'Guinn and Libby Spotts and Emily Springston. I'll bet anything that Emily, you want to try to give us a bit of an overview here.

SPRINGSTON: I'd be happy to, but I know we're going to start with some others.

ROBEL: Ok. However, the committee would like to go would be fine.

SOKOL: I think Lauren, I'm going to present at least the initial bit of the policy and then hand this over to David O'Guinn and people from Student Affairs.

ROBEL: Okay. Thank you, Paul.

SOKOL: The basic motivation from the policy is to provide the Student Affairs offices requested an interim suspension policy, which provides a method of quickly reacting to situations of Student Conduct and Disciplinary procedures. And I'll just start by just reading the policy. It says when the Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students or their designee have reasonable cause to believe that a student's presence poses a continuing danger to a person or property or ongoing threat of disrupting the academic process. The student may be immediately trespassed from any and all portions of university campuses. And suspended from university related classes, services, activities, or registered student organizational activities. Notice of this measure will be provided to the student in writing as soon as practicable. And the interim suspension will remain in effect until the conclusion of the disciplinary process or upon modification by the designated reviewer.

Second point is upon the issue of a notice of interim suspension, the Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students or their designee will initiate the disciplinary procedures, as outlined in the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct, without undue delay. The student may within three business days of the imposition of the interim suspension, petition the Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, or their designee to have the interim suspension modified or removed. This petition does not replace the disciplinary process. The petition must be made in writing by the student and include why the interim suspension should be modified or removed and must demonstrate that the student does not pose a continuing danger to person or property or ongoing threat of disrupting the academic process. The designated reviewer will render a decision without undue delay.

And then finally, these Interim Suspension procedures will be applied in accordance with the applicable Title IX policy. Now, there's a flowchart that sort of summarizes this process and the Dean of Students and the Vice Provost for Student Affairs or their designee, can institute the suspension. And then there's two things that can happen. Either the student can except that in which case it runs the standard course through misconduct investigation and either the person or sexual misconduct carrying an appeals process conclude is usual or within three days, the student can petition for review of the interim suspension. And then depending on what the designated reviewer decides, either the process continues along, or the interim suspension can be rescinded. And probably the best way to illustrate why this is necessary in the summary suspension policy that starts of very large mechanism move of procedures in place. Here for example, if a student was accused of being a danger to someone on campus by being say, at a particular place, at a particular time. The student could then provide proof that they were somewhere else. They may have been at a doctor's appointment or something like that this was a mistake that doesn't require that the process run its course, the designated reviewer could simply say, okay, this is incorrect and the whole process ends.

So, the Interim Suspension policy, which was requested by the Vice Provost office is an interim measure and it's an interim measure like no contact orders or temporary housing moves or interim measures to remove a student from their educational opportunity. And the important thing about this is it provides a process for the student to appeal this process, and so it formalizes that process. And finally, there is the question of how it how it meshes with the summary suspension process. And summary suspension tool is a process in its own merit, and it's not an interim measure. I mean, once the Provost makes a decision for summary suspension, there's a right to appeal, but it follows, the evidence has to be in place to require and then it requires an immediate or expedited period. By contrast, this Interim Suspension policy is used when a

student presents a continuing danger and the investigation into the matter is ongoing. And finally, the summary suspension may result in an ongoing suspension. But the important thing here, it provides an opportunity for the student to petition to return to campus. And so, at this point, I think I'll turn it over to Vice Provost O'Guinn to comment on the rationale for this. So, Dave?

O'GUINN: Thank you so much Paul you did a great job with that. I'll stress a couple things here, as Lauren mentioned right from the beginning, the combined factors are really the new Title IX regulations from the Trump administration and also COVID-19 has really precipitated us trying to get this interim suspension, really, we could have used it for the first day of school. But I wanted you all to know that this is not a new type of measure. All 13 other Big Ten schools have an Interim Suspension policy. IUPUI has an Interim Suspension policy very, very similar to what we're proposing today. And over five years ago when I was counsel, I was meeting with the Vice Provost for Student Affairs IU Bloomington and IUPUI, and we discussed the need for this policy. And it's been something that I knew I wanted to get to at some point. It's just now we have some urgency behind it because the Trump administration regulations don't allow for summary suspension on these type of cases. Domestic violence, domestic violence battery, sexual assault and rape, stalking, sexual harassment, and sexual exploitation. So, we could not we don't have an opportunity to do a summary suspension on those by, specifically the regulations.

As Paul talked about the big difference here between a summary to interim, there might be an ongoing investigation going on. IU now has knowledge that we may have somebody very dangerous on-campus going to class and alike. And we need to make a move on it. But we're in the middle of an investigation. We're not positive, but that this is the case. But we are very, very concerned about this particular individual. Now I have two real specific examples to give on that. And then when you put an interim suspension, the person gets an instant really, that they can email that that moment and say, "I'm sorry, Vice Provost of when or whoever the person will be that will hear this. I'm not the person. I'm not a continuing threat at all to IU. And let me explain why." And it's not a long hearing. It's not, our summary suspension has a hearing. It's two faculty members and the student. And it's whether or not the person did this or didn't. In the interim suspension case, the person just says, "I'm not a threat to be on campus. I'm fine. I'll go through the usual process." And they will still have to do that. But it gives us an opportunity to look at that right away as, as Paul mentioned. So, I think that's a really important part.

Let me give you two real specific examples of this. The first, actually, Dr. Reck knows all too well. Last year we didn't know at the time, but somebody was starting fires on our campus. And so, we're they we very concerning fires and they were continuing, and they were also becoming more and more dangerous. And the police thought it may be a particular student, but they weren't sure. And at that juncture, we really weren't in a position to do a summary suspension our normal due process mechanisms take a long time. And it would've been wonderful to have this interim suspension policy in place. But we didn't and the student did set another fire that Dr. Reck was involved in, and it was a very scary situation. And really, we should have probably had an interim suspension already in place. That person that did end up getting summarily suspended. So, one very specific example, and then the other specific example was this very large fight that happened in December of last year. It was on video, it made international news. A massive fight. Well, that investigation from that fight, the parse through the video, took a very, very long time. And we don't summarily suspend somebody without knowing actual facts and we don't do it on

hunches it's a very significant measure. And in this case, to have the interim suspension where you could say, we think it's these ten students and then we can interim suspend them there in December. They can get and make sure that they're not involved in any others. But the repercussions of that fight were concerning other fall out, retaliation and the like. And then a student could say being Dave, but I know that kinda looks like me, but the investigation will show I'm not a part of this. I wasn't a part of this fight. Here I was at home not feeling well that night or however the case may be, and that interim suspension would be lifted immediately.

The other aspect of this to stress, I know, and Paul talked about this is no matter what the student goes through our normal process our normal due process. And we have three layers of due process. It's not just to notice an opportunity to be heard at IU Bloomington. There's a double appeal and we have a rule that you are allowed no matter what the situation may be, you're allowed to stay on campus while you're going through the due process. And that can put us in a very sticky and dangerous situation. I know Libby can certainly who is our Associate Dean and Director of Student Conduct, she can talk about very specifics and Emily, I can talk about anything Title IX related if there's any questions along those lines.

SPOTTS: Thanks Dean O'Guinn. And Dr. Sokol I think if we can go to the last slide, I'll just wrap it back up into why we're asking and looking at this from a perspective of the Student Code of Conduct instead of Title IX procedures. And the reason is because we think that it is a tool that can be incredibly useful for the health and safety of students, faculty, and staff on campus. As it relates to not only Title IX procedures, those six categories that Dean Dave listed off related to sexual misconduct, stalking situations that might arise after a complainant comes forward if retaliation or threats of harm occur afterward, we otherwise would not be able to take quick action for that student and for the community being impacted if we did not have something like this in place. And further, as all of these examples that Dean O'Guinn mapped out, kind of bring to light, there are other situations that fall under personal misconduct where this tool could be incredibly useful for the safety of campus and COVID may also be another one wherein we want to consider using a tool like this for a quick review of whether a student should be excluded from their educational opportunity. I'll turn over to Emily in case you'd like to add anything else there about Title IX or sexual misconduct.

SPRINGSTON: I think you guys have covered very well. I'll just say that what we need to approach it because we need to speak to all campuses under our policy and the Title IX components come in through our Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Misconduct policy as it's been renamed as an Interim policy this year. We reference in there that if we're going to consider interim, we will follow the campus space procedures. And if it's a Title IX case, we have to apply the standard of the Department Education. So, we've built in those buffers where Title IX is at hand. But just to reiterate what everyone's saying is if we do have a Title IX case, we have a robust process we do for our sexual misconduct university cases. Both of those and those take a long time. And so, this is very important for those where we feel that there's an added layer of potential danger that we're seeing, and we need to manage that while the full robust processes happenings. That's all I'd like to say. I'd be happy to answer questions.

ROBEL: Alright. Anything else from the committee at his point.

RECK: No. I think everyone has said everything that was needed to be said.

ROBEL: Well, let's open this up for discussion.

SIMPSON: Can we go with Diane first?

HENSHEL: So, first of all, I really appreciate the very clear presentation by everybody. Paul, that was great. And then the clarifications that came on top were I think helpful. I have a concern that's being raised by Herb Terry, and I think I agree with him. I had to think about it for a while since he presented it earlier today, but I do think I agree with him. In the first paragraph, the language refers to all portions of university campuses and suspended from the University related classes. And this is the BFC. We are doing this as a protection for IUB and not for the rest of IU at this point. If it needs to go to the rest of IU, it needs to go to the UFC. So, the request is to change that language to make it specific to the Bloomington campus and to Bloomington related classes. And I think that would probably be just an edit. It's in that first paragraph. It's the end of the first sentence, which is a very long sentence.

SOKOL: It could be the student would be immediately trespassed from any portions of the Bloomington campus rather than of university campuses?

HENSHEL: Correct. And then suspended from IU Bloomington related classes.

SOKOL: That would seem to be non-substantial change.

ROBEL: And probably implicit since we can't typically make policy for the other campuses. But I take it there's no objection to that since this would be limited to our campus under any reading of it. Alright. Any other comments or questions?

SIMPSON: Yes, the queue is now Dakota, Colin and then John Walbridge.

ROBEL: Okay. Dakota. Thank you.

COATES: I just have two quick clarifying questions. With regards to Section A of the Interim Suspension policy, when it comes to defining what continuing danger is or ongoing threat of disruption, is that decided on a case-by-case basis from the Student Conduct Office or is there additional policy that we reference in regard to defining those?

And then Dean O'Guinn, I know you referenced the typical multi-layered appeal process that we have. My question for that is, with regards to Section C, if students want to appeal the decision made from that three-day petition, are they able to?

O'GUINN: Dakota, let me answer the latter question first. No there would not be an appeal of the three-day interim, there would be no second bite at that apple. Dakota, remind me of the first question.

COATES: Just when it comes to defining continuing danger or ongoing threat of disruption, who defines that and if it's defined in an official policy, what policy?

O'GUINN: No. There's not an official policy for that. We've had a long process that really over my 14 years, where the Dean, the person that would be in Libby Spotts is position council. And we have an AVP with the four of us, meet and discuss each case on a completely a case-by-case basis, looking at the individual facts of each situation. And if there's any way we don't have to do a suspension, we try to do the least restrictive means necessary for our students.

ROBEL: Alright. Are there other questions or comments before we take this to a vote?

SIMPSON: Yes Colin.

ROBEL: Oh, Colin and then John Walbridge.

C.JOHNSON: Yeah. So, my question has to do with the, I understand that it's the move to institute this is being precipitated by change in Title IX procedures. And I understand the utility of it to some degree the necessity of it. The policy itself is agnostic to contexts though, right? Which is to say, the scope of it quite intentionally could be applied to a broad range of things. You've spoken about that, and I guess my question is hypothetical because it really is quite expensive in terms of reminding authority to, to you, to the Vice Provost for Student Affairs. Would this, for example, in your estimation, be applicable in the case of student protests?

O'GUINN: Colin, good points in terms of the broadness of it. And that's one of the reasons why I really want to make clear my opening comments and get that straight is Title IX is giving it some urgency. We really should have done it this years ago as our other 13 colleagues have because it's better for our students. Getting summarily suspended is a tough way to go when you only really have had that tool. And then the regular process where you have some very dangerous persons still stay on campus. And it's one of my comments I didn't talk about is many times the investigations are manipulated by the parties. And then they go, so let's say you get in trouble, so you're involved in a violent act or drug act in drug dealing in October, the way our normal due process goes, that could drag out through the semester and you end up taking finals with the different help investigations and processes. And so, the interim suspension, we need it for a long time and is now has some urgencies. Colin, I think the second part of your question had to do with a protest and I'm just not really sure how to answer that. This is my 14th year at IU and been advising Student Affairs during that time. We've not had an instance where we are discussing suspensions and protest, so I'm not I don't I'm not sure how I could answer that if there's a specific you're thinking of in that regard.

C.JOHNSON: That's a hypothetical. I mean, I guess as more than anything, I'm curious. I would like to get this on the legislative history with regard to the making of this policy, which is you, as Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Lauren, you might want to comment here as well as the Provost would not see this as the appropriate tool to deal with inconvenient student disruptions of the academic process related to political objections, for example.

ROBEL: Oh heavens no.

C.JOHNSON: Rights would supersede.

ROBEL: That First Amendment rights. I guess I would say the only thing I could imagine superseding this was violence and a continuing threat of violence from that student.

O'GUINN: Thank you Lauren. And that's a yes. And again, Colin, one of what I was trying to, we've had plenty of protest in these years. And I know we'll see plenty more. And we never considered suspension at any sort of protest. In fact, I'm not aware of a student being part of any of our misconduct processes from any kind of protest. Lauren makes a good point, as things are evolving in terms of violence and the like and we will be certainly only looking at the environment aspect of it, but we did not. That's just not a thing that has even come on our radar is suspending or frankly, going through any sort of our conduct process for any type of protest.

C.JOHNSON: I appreciate that clarification. And having it on the record. Thanks.

O'GUINN: Thank you, Colin.

ROBEL: Are we ready? Let's see. John Walbridge, which I think is the last in the queue right now.

SIMPSON: Yes. Dakota, raise his hand again, just so you know.

WALBRIDGE: Okay here I am. So this is a process concern, this a policy that gives additional powers to the Vice Provost for Student Affairs and the Dean of Students to remove students from campus. And the policy has just been presented to the faculty council. I think through no fault of her own, Elizabeth, I think just got it out yesterday. Those of us on the Executive Committee had seen it earlier, but I guess I should address point of order perhaps, to the parliamentarian, is this something that we can justify dispensing with a second reading?

COHEN: The bylaws from what I can tell say that we are allowed to dispense for emergency actions. So, if we decide that this is especially needed for especially Title IX cases, we can do so. Yeah.

ROBEL: Does the bylaw refer just to emergencies or does it do you happen to have bylaw?

PEAR: I do.

COHEN: Not just emergency.

PEAR: Yeah. In number one of the bylaws, it says that ordinarily major policy proposals should have first second readings. Doesn't say we have to. It just says that ordinarily policy proposals do. In recent history, we have exempted resolutions from sitting under the meeting to begin. Since this policy, I was going that we normally do for emergencies, but again, it's not required under our bylaws. So, I would say with the somewhat urgent matter of this, that we are totally allowed to do this.

WALBRIDGE: Okay. Then can I ask the committee to give a justification why this is needed and the 14 days between now and our next meeting?

O'GUINN: John are you including me in that or is that just Cate and Paul?

WALBRIDGE: It's to the people who are presenting the resolution to the faculty council.

SOKOL: I think Dave can speak to this best. But if there were any situations that required the students to be removed from campus, say for Title IX reasons. Right now, under the Title IX policies, I assume that the only solution would be to really drastic one of summary suspension.

O'GUINN: But Paul the Trump regulations are specifically going to allow a summary suspension on that. Emily can talk about that.

SPRINGSTON: Yeah. The example I give is, if we get a dating violence report come in in the next 14 days where someone physically harmed another person with a weapon and that happened on our campus, that'll be Title IX. We will not have a way to do anything other in the interim while we're investigating. The student could continue, for the up to several months process that is required with all the built-in timeframes into those processes and those require about Title IX, while that person could remain campus. Even if we have footage of a weapon or things like that,

in that environment, we are hamstrung. So that's kind of the pressure that we're in under those sort of Title IX situations. But again, it could be very rare and anticipated, but it happens that's the situation we are in.

ROBEL: And just to be clear, the reason for that is because the regulations that came down from the Trump administration forbid us from using our existing policy.

O'GUINN: That's correct. One other concern for me as more days go by on this is, if we have a student come forward, male or female student comes forward and says, I've been sexually assaulted and makes report. And then we contact the other side and then they threat physical violence to the importer, which unfortunately does happen. We really don't have a mechanism to protect the person immediately. Again, I want to stress, our protection is a way of not allowing the student on our campus as if we don't get to put people in jail or anything on that. But it is a, there's some scary scenarios here. And then the final thing I'll say is there are some COVID situations where an interim suspension would be much better for a student in a summary that, that this would be really, can be very helpful for our students. And again, it's a policy. We really should have worked on years ago and you know, we're always putting out fires as you must have been talking about several of those fired before I got on the call. So that would be my feeling on continuing weight on it.

SIMPSON: Lauren we have two questions, one from Dakota and one from Angie Raymond.

ROBEL: Alright. Dakota?

COATES: So my question is going to overlap a little bit with Angie. So hopefully I don't steal her thunder too much. But so, my first question was, I know a lot of this discussion has been centered around the continuing danger to person or property element of the policy. I do still have a little bit of concern of the or ongoing threat of disrupting the academic process. I'm a little concerned as to the breadth of which that could be applied. I'm just because again, a lot of the language has been, you know, students threatening other students, that there's violence, that there's an attack or existing prior assault against the student, which would go to that first element. I'm a little concerned about the potential breadth application for the second one. My other concern is that three-day period, especially since it requires petition and writing, I would assume that that would hopefully be some sort of form submission that we have in an online capacity. But I deal with it on a couple of the committees I've been on where we've looked at suspension policies. There's often been commentary that too short of a period can be a little inhibitive towards students, especially if it happens during close to a transition period or when students may be, for example, near finals when emails might fall off. So I would potentially encourage the group to maybe think of making that five business days instead of three business days. So that way it's essentially a full business week to be able to appeal it. But I just wanted to put for those two things. And Angie, I'm sorry if I stole your thunder.

ROBEL: Alright.

RAYMOND: Yeah. My point was that it's actually saying I have a problem with an or ongoing threat of disruption. Mostly because I think what you envision is things like Zoom bombing and stuff maybe in there. I mean, it's an interesting conversation, if that's what you're talking about, we know we've had a couple of really bad events. And so, part of me supports that being in there for that reason. But I think I'm I am of the opinion that I find it hard to believe anyone could

disagree with the idea of an interim suspension when someone's a danger to another person. I mean, that'd be an interesting debate to have if anyone could find a reason to support that. With that said that ongoing threat of disruption, I think is very, very broad. And I wonder if, I don't know, I get the Zoom bombing thing. It's really caused some issues and it was, it's very unfair to the people who suffered through that. So, if that's peoples idea, I take that on board. But otherwise, it's awfully broad.

ROBEEL: Could I ask Dave, Emily, or Libby if they want to speak to that particular part

O'GUINN: Sure. Zoom bombing for today's world. Absolutely. Dr. Raymond, no doubt about that that language, and again, we didn't invent this. This is language from our colleagues, is really to protect in the classroom and our faculty members. That is that is what that language. So, drug dealing in the classroom, I'm not as worried about it. It is disruption in your class in a COVID situation, what we heard from multitude of faculty members, is mask and the like. Someone walks into your classroom without a mask, you're saying, please put a mask on, they tell you where to go and this would be a perfect situation for interim suspension as they, how many days can they disturb your class? People are are invested in their class. You've prepared for your class. And you don't have a class. That has been overwhelmingly what we've heard from faculty members, with getting school started was how are you going to protect me in my classroom? There are other ways faculty have made complaints about students in the classroom those rarely would go to an interim suspension. But it's certainly possible. We are big believers in the First Amendment, of course completely, but in your classroom, you could be discussing a topic that has nothing to do with what that disruption may come in. And again, we get all those complaints, and we see them. And so that, that aspect of this language is surely does to protect faculty members in the classroom.

SIMPSON: Lauren there are two more comments from Colin and Diane.

ROBEL: Okay. Colin?

C.JOHNSON: Yeah. I just wanted to say I mean; I think it's fine. I'm part of the reason I ask the question was I think the legislative history documenting that in terms of intent is really important here. And I personally am content with leaving the language as it is because I understand the need for a kind of broadly flexible policy that allows the people who are working on the front lines of trying to deal with the most kind of difficult and contentious situations that we face as an institution to be able to do so with speed. I would only say for myself and I think for other people who have concerns about the broad scope that it implies regardless of the intent. I think everyone who's in charge of sort of administering this policy would need to do what I assume you already do. And as what you have said to you that you do, which is to be very mindful of the space that this creates for potential abuse under enormously stressful circumstances. And if we ever got to a place where the institution, administratively, was abusively using sort of authority that's being afforded to people. I think you could assume that the faculty council would be fairly swift to come in and take that authority away. And rightfully so I would just say as long as that's in the background. And I don't mean to suggest anything because I think about it. I just want to put that on the record because I think this is really where the rubber meets the road in terms of how we use the authority that we grant ourselves. And I think we're in a very, very complicated moment historically, and can expect that there will be circumstances we're gonna face where certain kinds of avenues seem like they can resolve this situations quickly and perhaps more cleanly than others. And I think we need to be very, very careful about that.

ROBEL: I agree with that. Alright. And I think Diane, you're going to have the last word on this.

HENSHEL: Actually, I would like to question and revisit this issue of a single reading or two readings. Because honestly, we very, very, very rarely don't have the two readings. We have waited a semester for the second reading sometimes. I know I'm channeling Moira, but that's probably because I've had so much training and whatever from her. But I would like to know how often you think, especially under these situations where yes, it's high stress, but at the same time, people are being kept away from each other more, that there really will be a Title IX situation in the next two weeks that we couldn't really wait two weeks to both a, have a hearing and b hear back from our faculty across campus because there are concerns that were raised by faculty across campus when they saw this. We've gotten an e-mail or two. And if we just vote on it now without any fees, without allowing any time. I think we obviate the chance for our peers to provide input. So, could you guys address that question, please?

ROBEL: So, the question is, what are the odds that somebody will be sexually assaulted in a way that we wouldn't be able to deal with in the next two weeks? Gosh, I don't think anybody can answer that question, but I will say that there are sexual assaults on among our students with, with some regularity. Can we say that that won't happen in the next two weeks? I don't think we can.

COHEN: Lauren, I'm sorry to interrupt. But apparently Dakota had proposed a change to amendment. And so, we might have to go back to that also.

ROBEL: Well, maybe at the first meeting what I ought to just and especially in this format, if you are going to actually move an amendment, move an amendment. And then we'll get a second and we can get it on the record. I don't think suggesting that something might be changed without an amendment motion would be helpful for Colin, who's trying to keep all of this straight.

O'GUINN: I did not get a chance to address Dakota's three to five-day. I will say I'm not completely against that. I also think Dakota you can make the argument the other way, three days is way too long to run interim suspension, they get the really just has to be an email as they do it at IUPUI to say, "You got the wrong person here." Or "this isn't right." And explain it. And so, the idea of that is for it to be a very short period so you can get off your interim suspension. And that's the whole idea. We could make it 30 days, that's not positive for student. Three to five, so again, I'm not opposed to it up again, it's really for me about what's the best for our students. And I think if you're on an interim suspension, you have to miss class, you should get that in and within a few hours of hearing about it. If we got the wrong person or investigation, you know going in a different way. I would make that much faster, not longer.

ROBEL: Does that respond to your concern?

COATES: I think that I would still be in favor of having it be a just a five-day period for them to respond. I'm thinking.

ROBEL: Would you like to make an amendment to that. And see if you've got a second.

COATES: Yes, I would like to formally amend it to be within five business days.

ROBEL: Is there a second?

WALBRIDGE: I second.

ROBEL: Okay. So now the discussion is only on the motion. Is there discussion of the motion?

SIMPSON: Yes. John Walbridge has his hand raised.

WALBRIDGE: Yeah. I mean, I had a recent experience with a student discipline case, and I've seen others that I've been on the other side as well. And there is a period of numbness that can easily last past three days. So, given this is not the period that the Vice Provost has suspended the student, this is the period that the student has to respond after he's been suspended. So, the deadline is not particularly critical. In Frankly, I don't see why there needs to be much of a deadline anyway. And given that the student may not be familiar with the rules, may not have figured out what's going on. But at any rate, five days is better than three.

ROBEL: Alright. Is there any other discussion on the amendment?

SIMPSON: There are no hands.

ROBEL: Okay. Are we then we're ready to vote all in favor of the amendment? Please signal by saying aye.

EVERYONE: Aye.

ROBEL: All opposed?

The amendment carries. Is there further discussion on the policy? Then I'll take the policy to a vote. All in favor of the policy as amendment please indicate by saying aye.

EVERYONE: Aye.

ROBEL: All opposed?

WALBRIDGE: Neh.

ROBEL: Okay. I think the ayes have it. Thank you all for your work on this. I know that it was done with a national mandate sort of breathing down your neck. I appreciate the faculty for considering this when we're concerned about issues of sexual violence in particular and having a tool taken away from us, that would have protected our students otherwise. Alright, we are now really almost at the end of our meeting. And the next thing on the agenda is a broad discussion of strategic priorities. So, I suspect that that perhaps the best way to proceed here. John, if you would like to take just the last few moments to frame the kinds of things that you would like to have the faculty think about and we might be able to reschedule this for the beginning of the next the next the next agenda.

SIMPSON: John, you're muted.

AGENDA ITEM TEN: OPEN DISCUSSION ON BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL STRATEGIC PRIORITIES FOR THE YEAR

WALBRIDGE: Okay. This was a rather vague thing based on a sense that people had concerns that we didn't necessarily know about. And that there needed to be needed to be a chance for people to air them to raise questions to ask why we're doing this and that, that are not doing this. And doing that instead. I'm not quite sure having three minutes or so to deal with this. I guess

what I would say is that if there is something that you want, probably contact one of us on the executive committee. And we can sort of see if we can shape and a more coherent discussion. But I think one of the things that we've seen is that it's very likely that anything we're discussing under these rather peculiar conditions are going to take longer than we expected. So, apologies for not having the meeting go on schedule, but please contact us with issues that you raised. We also, as will have undoubtedly discovered, we have a discussion list that's it exclusively for the members of the faculty council that's been used quite a bit since we started a couple of months ago. So that's also a place to sort of hash out issues to see if other people are concerned with things that you're concerned with. To try out ideas before you put them to a formal proposal. As I said at the council retreat a week ago, while there's a sort of an official process by which proposals become policies or resolutions. And in fact, they go through a much more diffuse process and the kind of discussion that you can have in the faculty council discussion list is one way to get issues onto the agenda. If you have issues that concern one of the standing committees and the committees are membership are listed in the or late because on the agenda for today. You can also talk to the co-chairs of the committee, or you can talk to talk to other members of the faculty council, but we can try this again next time. So sorry about the time issues.

ROBEL: As am I. And thank you for your patience with all of that. And with that, I think I'll do I hear a motion to adjourn.

WALBRIDGE: So moved.

ROBEL: Okay. Then we'll adjourn and are not so usual way it simply leaving the meeting. Thank you all so much for your patients with this. Take care.