

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
November 3, 2020
broadcast.iu.edu
2:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M.

Members Present: Jim Ansaldo, Rachel Aranyi, Karen Banks, Jozie Barton, Alan Bender, Jon Brauer, Dan Bullock, Carolyn Calloway Thomas, John Carini, Barb Chery, Paul Coates, Rachael Cohen, David Dalecke, Allen Davis, Dee Degner, Constantine Deliyannis, J Duncan, Ann Elsner, Kelly Eskew, Pnina Fichman, Jackie Fleming, Lessie Frazier, Linda Gales, Brian Gill, Tony Giordano, Jason Gold, Lucia Guerra-Reyes, Nandini Gupta, Diane Henshel, Israel Herrera, Justin Hodgson, Cheryl Hughes, Larissa Jennings Mayo-Wilson, Colin Johnson, Kari Johnson, Blair Johnston, Peter Kloosterman, Ben Kravitz, Shanker Krishnan, Rob Kunzman, Jessica Lester, Sally Letsinger, Bradley Levinson, Margaret Lion, Scott Lisbon, Annette Loring, Pedro Machado, Heather Milam, Ted Miller, Jill Nicholson-Crotty, Mim Northcutt Bohmert, Neliya Nyirenda, Sameer Patil, Chuck Peters, Linda Pisano, Angie Raymond, Cate Reck, Lauren Robel, Elizabeth Shea, Marietta Simpson, Ruhan Syed, Lisa Thomassen, Samantha Tirey, John Walbridge, Erik Willis, Stephen Wyrzynski, Kurt Zorn

Members Absent: Karen Allen, Rachel Aranyi, Hussein Banai, Dakota Coates, Courtney Olcott, Lauren Richerme

Guests: Catherine Dyar, Mark McConahay

AGENDA

1. Approval of the [minutes of October 6, 2020](#)
2. [Memorial Resolution for Maryellen Bieder](#)
3. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)
John Walbridge, Faculty President
4. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)
Lauren Robel, Provost
5. Question/Comment Period
Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to Provost Robel or President Walbridge by emailing bfcoff@indiana.edu
6. Proposed amendments to BL-ACA-D9 Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of Indiana University regarding the nominations process (5 minutes)
Rachael Cohen, Parliamentarian and Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee
Alex Tanford, former BFC president and member of the Constitution and Rules Committee

[First Reading – Discussion Item]

[Current BL-ACA-D9 Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council](#)
[B13-2021: Proposed amendments to BL-ACA-D9 Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of Indiana University regarding the nominations process - clean version](#)
[B14-2021: Proposed amendments to BL-ACA-D9 Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of Indiana University regarding the nominations process - redline version](#)

7. Questions/comments on the proposed amendments to BL-ACA-D9 Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of Indiana University regarding the nominations process (10 minutes)
8. Proposed policy amendment to extend the auto-W Deadline during the COVID-19 pandemic (5 minutes)
J Duncan, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
David Rutkowski, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
[Action Item]

[B15-2021 Proposed policy amendment to extend the auto-W deadline during the COVID-19 pandemic](#)

9. Questions/comments on the proposed extension of auto-W deadline during the COVID-19 pandemic (20 minutes)
10. Proposed policy regarding withdrawal from all subjects during the COVID-19 pandemic (5 minutes)
J Duncan, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
David Rutkowski, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
[Action Item]

[B16-2021 Proposed policy regarding withdrawal from all subjects during the COVID-19 pandemic](#)

11. Questions/comments on the proposed policy regarding withdrawal from all subjects during the COVID-19 pandemic (20 minutes)

TRANSCRIPT:

Lauren Robel: It is so beautiful here today. Just gorgeous. Gorgeous weather.

Yeah, hi. Carolyn.

Carolyn Calloway-Thomas: Good afternoon, everyone.

Lauren Robel: Good to see you.

Carolyn Calloway-Thomas: Nice to see everybody. A beautiful day. I see a blue sky and there's not a cloud in the sky.

Lauren Robel: Just so nice out there. Lots, lots of people are here.

Well, Elizabeth. Do you have a sense of how many folks are here?

Elizabeth Pear: Yeah, we have almost 60 people but that includes some staff so

Lauren Robel: Okay. Well, it sounds like it looks like it's time to begin.

Welcome everybody. It's a beautiful day, it's election day there's a lot to be happy for today that I thought we could start by asking, Elizabeth, just to walk us through procedurally how we are going to be casting votes today so that everybody is on the same page right from the get-go. So, Elizabeth, could you do that?

Elizabeth Pear: Yeah, and so we are going to be using the polls feature in zoom to do votes on we have them set up in advance for everything we anticipate will be an action item, including today's Minutes. Please ignore that them.

Including the minutes if we want to practice. First thing here in the meeting. I don't know if we'll continue with that. That's just to get us warmed up.

So, we will be able to add votes on the fly as well. So I guess I'm just asking. Everybody's patience, while we use this the first time and it'll pop up a little screen will pop up.

For you, you'll be able to vote. Yay or nay. We'll leave it open until we see that hopefully everybody has voted.

And then we'll close it and then we'll be able to display the results as well. So for those of you that are familiar, it's a pretty seamless process, and I appreciate, like I said, everyone's patience as we as we use this for the first time.

Lauren Robel: Thank you so much. Elizabeth and I think Diane and Marietta are monitoring the chat and raised hands and they'll as, as we did last time. The two of them will let me know if there's somebody I have missed

AGENDA ITEM ONE: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 6, 2020

Lauren Robel: And I think that's all we really need to get started. So I will ask for a motion for approval of the minutes of October 6 20 20

Lisa Thomassen: So moved.

Lauren Robel: Second? Fantastic.

Any discussion?

Elizabeth? Fantastic. That was quite painless. Thank you.

I'm assuming that all went well with that. And there it is. It looks good.

AGENDA ITEM TWO: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR MARYELLEN BIEDER

Lauren Robel: I will turn to Vice Provost Eliza Pavalko for a memorial resolution allies.

Eliza Pavalko: Yes. Wonderful. Thank you, Lauren. This is a memorial resolution for Maryellen Bader.

Professor emerita Maryellen Bieder was an established and prolific scholar of international stature in the field of Spanish literature and culture of the nineteenth century. Her more recent research also explored the works of twentieth century and contemporary peninsular writers. An indefatigable scholar known for her keen intelligence and clear writing, Maryellen was recognized on both sides of the Atlantic as a pioneer in feminist approaches to canonical writer Emilia Pardo Bazán, and she single-handedly resurrected critical knowledge of Carmen de Burgos. She also brought other women writers—such as Concepción Gimeno de Flaquer, Carme Riera, Mercè Rodoreda and Marina Mayoral—to international attention.

Maryellen devoted 38 years of her professional life to the department, and lived more than four decades in Bloomington with her husband, Robert Bieder, Ph.D., an expert on native American cultural history. However, her connection to Indiana University did not begin with her accepting a position as assistant professor in 1976. After Maryellen was awarded her A.B. degree from Lawrence University, she and Robert each received their M.A.s from IU Bloomington before ultimately earning Ph.D.'s in their respective fields at the University of Minnesota. Before joining our department, Maryellen held assistant professorship positions at Syracuse University (1973-1974) and at the State University of New York at Albany (1974-1976).

If some of the best indications of professional activities in the humanities are students and publications, Maryellen's career was a remarkable one. Eighteen students earned their doctoral degrees writing dissertations under her careful attention, and she served on the doctoral committees of eighteen more. She also enjoyed working with undergraduate students and one of her most gratifying experiences was to serve as resident director of the Madrid Program (2004-2005). She authored *Narrative Perspective in the Post-Civil War Novels of Francisco Ayala* (1979), and edited volumes such as *La novela en español, hoy* (*Revista Iberoamericana*, 1981) and *Writing Against the Current* (*Indiana Journal of Hispanic Literatures*, 1993). More recently, she collaborated with Roberta Johnson to co-edit *Spanish Women Writers and Spain's Civil War* (2017). Maryellen published nearly 60 book chapters and journal articles and remained an active scholar up until the end her life. She was working on a book-length manuscript entitled "Women in the Public Eye: Images of Spanish Women Authors in the

Periodical Press, 1880- 1920”, and had innumerable projects on the back burner. In true Maryellen fashion, she submitted her last article from the hospital on the day before she passed. Numerous awards and accolades recognized Maryellen’s achievements as a scholar and teacher. She was the recipient of a Fulbright grant, received funds from the Program for Cultural Cooperation between Spain and the US and from the Mellon Foundation, as well as countless travel and research grants. She won the Francis M. Kercheville Prize from the journal *Anales Galdosianos* in 1997, an IU Trustees Teaching Award (2004) and, in 2011, an award from the University of Minnesota’s College of Liberal Arts as an “Alumna of Notable Achievement.”

Professor Joseph Snow knew her since the 1970s, when she was his student working on her doctorate at the University of Minnesota. He remembers that “as time went on and through many conferences we became great friends, coinciding dozens of times in Madrid where she had many friends (and former students, too).” He describes her as “an outstanding scholar in her field.” Maryellen was held in high esteem amongst colleagues and was much-loved teacher and mentor. “Her sudden and unexpected death has meant a huge personal loss for me and a significant loss for the profession of Hispanism,” said Roberta Johnson, professor emerita at the University of Kansas and a leading scholar in twentieth-century Peninsular Spanish literature and culture. “Maryellen was a generous colleague, never reluctant to share her finds and materials with me and others. She introduced me to Carmen de Burgos, whose hard-to-find novelettes (her works were banned during the Franco regime) Maryellen had unearthed in the Bibliotheca Nacional in Madrid; she photocopied and sent me a number of these. Working with Maryellen in that capacity was a very great pleasure. I miss her terribly, and her death leaves a large hole in US Hispanism, especially in feminist studies.” Michael Schnepf and Jennifer Smith, Spanish literature professors at University of Alabama and Southern Illinois University, respectively, and former doctoral students of Maryellen, expressed the gratitude and admiration they felt for her. Schnepf remarked that Maryellen was not only “a giving and talented professor of Spanish literature, she was a great friend who went out of her way to help and guide students and colleagues whenever she could.” Smith adds that, “as my professor and mentor, she had a profound impact on my life and career. Her genuine interest in my ideas and work gave me confidence in myself and an enthusiasm for my work that is still with me today.”

Those who knew her agree in pointing out that one of Maryellen’s greatest loves was Spain, and that passion could be noticed even in the smallest details. In this regard, Antonio Parrilla Recuero recalls when he first met her in the fall semester of 2009. It was his first year at IU, and he was enrolled in her 19th Century Spanish Literature seminar. Maryellen had to cancel the first week of classes because she had broken her hip a few weeks before the semester began. On the second week, she showed up to class in a wheelchair pushed by her husband. She refused to teach from the wheelchair; she slowly stood up and to his amazement pulled out a cushion from a bag from El Corte Inglés and placed it on the desk chair. And Ballantine Hall felt like home to him.

We requested this memorial tribute to Mario and Bader be preserved in the BSC minutes and archive. Thank you.

Lauren Robel: Thank you very much. Let's take a moment of silence to remember our colleague

Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM THREE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Lauren Robel: I turn now to our president John Walbridge for executive committee business
John

John Walbridge: Okay, thank you. Thank you all for being here and an afternoon we better spent taking a walk on.

Basically, the executive committee has spent much of his time since the last meeting making plans for the rest of the semester and potentially into the end of the spring. There are some specific things that came to us that The Executive Committee was asked to address.

The first was a resolution from the Benefits Committee that would have allowed the academic appointee family leave policy to be used by people who are dealing with particular problems such as childcare and elder care during the Covid crisis. This we decided not to move to the floor, largely due to issues of jurisdiction and practicality it addresses. For one thing, that's a trustees policy.

We also received a set of queries and recommendations from Ellen Bender having to do with NTT issues. These include the question of whether there can be five year Rolling contracts for NTT instructional faculty, A campus level promotion advisory committee specifically for NTT instructional faculty made up of Non tenure track faculty and specification of governance rights for such faculty.

He also inquired about the status of Changing titles of lecturers who system teaching Professor associate teaching professor and so forth. These are matters that the faculty Affairs Committee is addressing. And so we referred it back to them.

We also received a set of proposals from a committee dealing with Covert issues grading withdrawal two of these matters around the agenda for today.

The third matter that was proposed to us would have allowed a retroactive decision on pass fail we refer this back to the educational policy committee, we didn't think it was Ready for Broadway, as it were.

I'll just say a few things that are being dealt with on the level of the university faculty committee, the question of what the calendar will be Next year is being discussed as the registrar's are desperate to have decisions on this, preferably the month before last, I suspect, and I don't think an official decision has been made yet but I suspect that the calendar next year will be the same as this year with these odd 13 week and Three week, etc. Breaks.

This does not be asleep say whether instruction will be in person or an Online or to what degree. This will be divided up is for that, we obviously don't know what will be What will be possible.

There's also a committee that's been Organized to Try to make the diversity indicators and your annual report somewhat more useful that's happening at the UFC level under John advocates.
Jurisdiction

I think that's the main issues that are floating around. I have missed anything I would be happy to be corrected by my colleagues.

So, Lauren, will give the floor back to you.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

Lauren Robel: Thank you so much, John. Let me take a few minutes just to congratulate us all on getting to week 11. Here we are in the middle of the week.

I wanted to talk a bit about where we are as well with what the plan will be for the rest of the semester and then during the intercession with respect to our mitigation testing efforts so

I'll start just with some thanks, and I want to note that the Bloomington lab that has taken over doing the PCR testing for campus is up and running. It should eventually be able to do an astonishing number of tests and that is really quite sooner than we expect that. And the thanks for that need to go to Jeff Volesky in his role at the research office and Matt Han and colleagues. They have worked with a number of other people and Aaron Carol, in particular, Dr. Aaron Carol on the medical response team, to get the lab here and in Indianapolis up, with ours coming online first. We're doing that we've never done on this campus before and it will make it possible for us to really continue not only a robust testing regimen from here on out through as long as we need it, but also to increase the amount of testing that will be able to do

So I want to talk a little bit about that. We will do our mitigation testing through the last week of the semester, the week of the last residential week of the semester, the week of the 20th, I think, and that's the good news. Well, there's nothing but good news for the campus. Actually, the good news is that I've seen the preliminary reports for last week's testing that will be reported on the dashboard tomorrow. They look excellent. We've had three really wonderful weeks where it's accurate to say we look just a whole lot better than the state in which we're located looks so I know Dr. Carol's goal was to make the campuses safer and make it safer to be a member of our community than not to be. And I think we owe him a real debt of gratitude and his colleagues, Dr. Adrian Gardner and Dr. Ilana for really getting us through this semester.

During the last week of the semester we will switch to offering departure testing for anyone who wants it. So obviously, all of the students who are going home, many of them are going home to states that require either a Covid test within a day or two of showing up or a quarantine when they get back. And so we're providing those departure tests for all of our students who want them and any faculty and staff member who wants them during that week.

We will do arrival testing for all of our students again in the spring when they come back for Residential Education in the week that leads up to February 8. And in between we will continue

our mitigation testing during the intercession. So any faculty and staff and students who remain in town can expect that they will not only be called for mitigation testing, but probably will be called even more frequently than they've been called in the past because we won't be doing the testing we've been doing for the residential the students who were in the residence halls and we have a lot more capacity.

Faculty, staff, and students who want arrival and departure testing at times, other than the ones I've just outlined should use the optimum site, the optimum site is free. It's PCR testing. It's still in the armory, it will be there through the end of December.

The campus, the city, and the county are cooperating on putting together a replacement site for Optum we've already agreed to do that. Optum keeps being pushed out by a month at a time. And so we don't need to have that completely setup until the end of December, but it will be in place by then that the site is almost complete. So I encourage you if you need testing for, you know, for other reasons or travel or you're coming back and want testing, when you get back please use the optimum site if it's outside of our window of arrival and departure.

And I'd like to just say, because it's election day, a huge thank you to all of the groups on campus who work so hard. To register voters our students, first and foremost, but of course our staff and our faculty as well. And on this. I need, I need to give a big shout out to Lisa Marie Napoli in the PACE program who were responsible for running our big 10 voting challenge efforts, all of the Student Government groups, the IU SG the GPS G and a whole lot of other groups student groups on campus, including the Black Student Union for this real push to get students registered and to get them to the polling places I will note that all of the cultural centers are hosting listening sessions and support sessions for students on campus. The end. We have, of course, have an emergency operation center, just what we would ordinarily do during any national event of any scope and this is certainly one of those.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

Lauren Robel: So with that, I think I'll conclude my report, and I Think I answered the one question that we got in ahead of time, if there are other quick questions from the from members of the Council for me or for President Baldrige. This would be the time to ask them.

Okay, I see it's real.

Israel Herrera: Right, I have a question or you think you have a regarding the academic leadership program. So I'm just wondering who appoints the participants and also if the university is considering taking into account entities for this for this group that is part of the big 10 academic alliance in and I see entity representatives in other universities and University of Iowa, University of Maryland and also not Western so I wonder if you could also have entity representatives in the future.

Lauren Robel: Thank you for that question. For those of you who don't know about the academic leadership program or the ALP program. It's a program is one of the oldest and I think

the best things that the big 10 academic alliance does together and every year we take nominations from the deans

We typically have a wonderful cohort every year. There's a lot of leadership on this campus that has gone through the ALP program and Eliza is the person who shepherds that program in our campus, so I thought I might ask, Eliza if she knows whether this is something that we have done in the past are open to doing in the future.

Eliza Pavalko: Yes I you know I haven't looked back at the list. I don't think there's any reason why we wouldn't consider NTT faculty, usually the nominations

That we get are for the program are for people who've been in a chair. Other leadership position directorship or something of that type. And so, and even with that we get about 3030 nominations, a year for about the very right six slots so it is very competitive.

But certainly if we had non tenure track faculty and in you know nominated and in that category, who, who are in leadership positions, then we would certainly think about that as a possibility.

Lauren Robel: Thank you. Any other questions for either me or John

Great.

Thanks. Let's see.

Marietta Simpson: Anybody. I'm sorry to interrupt you, if anybody does have a question. It's difficult with three pages of people to see. So please feel free to either raise your hand in the participants list or enter it in chat. I know, Israel, it looks like you have another question, but on the other pages. It's sort of hard to monitor, so please feel free to raise your hand or enter it in chat.

Lauren Robel: I do see a question that was sent to me regarding what looks like mandatory testing for those returning to campus during the break. And my response suggested that optimum testing would be optional voluntary. That's correct. We're we will be doing mitigation testing during the intercession. But we won't be doing any mandatory arrival testing until the week right before school starts. And so I encourage you to go to the optimum. If you have any questions or concerns, we will be getting. I think a lot more requests. As faculty members and staff members to participate in Michigan mitigation testing. However, during the intercession because our capacity has just expanded pretty

A lot, frankly, and so I would expect. I would just caution everyone that's going to be happening. And if you plan to be on campus, you will be you're, you're likely to be asked to participate. Great.

Okay, let's see.

All right.

Israel. Did you have another question?

Israel Herrera: Yes, learning. So the other question is related to the H1 B visas for international scholars. So I wonder if we have a Southern University, any, any inconvenient with the international scholar with their new rules for H1 B. And also, if the university might be thinking about joining all the universities in the in the letter against these new regulations.

Robel: Thanks for the question. I know that the Office of International services is, in fact, working with everybody who might be affected by the new H1 B. requirements and that the university did in fact join in a letter.

I'm not sure whether it came through to you but I do know we joined in raising concerns about that change.

Okay.

AGENDA ITEM SIX: PROPOSED AMMENDMENTS TO BL-ACA-D9 BYLAWS OF THE BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY REGARDING THE NOMATIONS PROCESS

Lauren Robel: Alright. If there are no further questions, um, I'd like to welcome back. Alex Stanford, who has is our former president and a current member of the Constitution and Rules Committee, and Rachel Cohen, who is parliamentarian and chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee, for first reading of some proposed amendments to the bylaws. So Rachel and Alex, we

Alex Tanford: We decided that I should do the talking. So that Rachel is free as the Parliamentarian.

Lauren Robel: That's wise, Rachel.

Alex Tanford: What we're bring to you here is our proposed changes in the bylaws governing the process of nomination for candidates for seats on the Bloomington faculty council.

The experience over the past four years of the nominations committee and of the BFC as a whole is that our current practice of having Third parties nominate people is not actually producing enough candidates. In fact, over the past few years around 50% of the seats on the BF conduct supposedly consistency in some of the UFC have not been contested they've had one or zero nominations and obviously without real elections.

We cannot say confidently that the BF C is a representative elected body that speaks for the units and for the faculty that we can start credibility with the administration, the process. Also, as you can see from the screen is cumbersome and slow the one we have Right now, when nominations

come into the nominations committee and to the faculty council office. We have no idea whether a person nominated by someone else.

Has actually agreed to be a candidate. So there can be long delays, we can't put somebody on the ballot unless we know that they want to run and there's often a long delay in that. Because people don't respond to their emails, it can just take weeks to get somebody to answer whether they're willing to be a candidate or not.

And I think in addition in the old system we had some confusion over this nomination process of selecting candidates, that is: was it a nomination process or some kind of primary where number of votes matter, rather than nominations. And if we ran into the problem that there were no nominations from a particular electoral unit than the BF the office and nom com had to spend time trying to find people to talk people into running to sort of contact things back and forth.

So this is intended to address in for we make for proposals in here for changes in the bylaws to address those problems. Now there are bylaws, oddly enough, do not contain a section on how to amend the bylaws.

So we follow standard Robert's Rules of Order procedure and have done so for quite a while that is the Proposed bylaw amendment must be on the agenda two consecutive meetings without substantial change in between.

And I believe though well I will defer to Rachel on figuring this out for next time when we vote means we don't vote today we vote. Next time I believe it has to be a two thirds majority. When that happens, right, the earring. Rachel, you can go to the, to the next one. There we go.

On this screen you'll see the first two things that this proposal does first it replaces the First, it changes November to January, which is the reality. Anyway, you can't find people to nominate themselves or to nominate people during Christmas vacation. So the fact is, it starts in January, most years anyway. That's not really a change but what it does do is It replaces the Third-Party nomination system. With a self-nomination system. So the language that you see up there is that now what happens is the faculty council office solicits Volunteers faculty academic appointees to nominate themselves as candidates.

Secondly, on this page in about the 234 fifth line down. It deletes the redundant requirement that the list of eligible faculty be organized by both electoral unit and tenure track non tenure track status because as long as it's organized by electoral unit. That's all that matters.

So it's eliminating this pod requirement. The old requirement about dividing by status and Then Rachel, if you can go to seven.

All right. And here the other two changes are on this screen. The first it replaces if you go down to the third line. It now says all volunteers shall be placed on the final ballot the old system had That some candidates were eliminated from the final ballot based on the number of nominations received by nom.

And because people were confused, whether one nomination is enough to get a candidate on the ballot. Some people got eliminated that probably would have been supported by a substantial number of people in their units. So this eliminates that it says every letter beyond the ballot and frankly I think what to do, is it's setting up, for some time in the future, our ability to think about ranked choice voting if we have multiple candidates.

We can't do that immediately, I understand, because it requires changing the software that we use. And this is not the time to be asking the Provost for more money, so we can make changes and wait.

The second thing that this does is the continuation of the third line. If there are no volunteers for a seat, it shall be declared vacant and referred back to the unit Policy Committee to figure out how to get representation.

That's the way we would normally fill a vacancy. We don't try and do it at the BFC level, we let the unit do it and it adds that we will invite. We can't compel but we will invite the current holder of that seat to continue in that seat until the unit selects a replacement so that the unit is not deprived of representation on the BFC.

Anyway those are the four changes.

Lauren Robel: What a wonderful Election Day topic you brought us. I have just a quick question before we open it up and that is when there are no volunteers and the seat is declared vacant and referred back to the appropriate unit, mainly to fill the vacancy, is the vacancy to the nomination, or is it to the seat?

In other words, are we asking the policy committees to nominate somebody to be voted for, for the units to vote for, or to actually fill the seat as if a senator has stepped down in the middle of her term?

Alex Tanford: To actually fill the seat. Again, other otherwise, it could delay the entire voting process and That seemed us to make the most sense of the way to because if no one runs. It's essentially the seat is vacant and we refer back to the unit. Okay, great.

Rachael Cohen: That's also current policy, practice so...

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON PROPOSED AMMENDMENTS TO BL-ACA-D9 BYLAWS OF THE BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY REGARDING THE NOMATIONS PROCESS

Lauren Robel: Well with that clarification. Let me open it up for questions for the committee and we'll have a look to our, our to shepherds of the questions to let me know if there are any outside of chat, because I can't see anyone else know with the document up

Marietta Simpson: Unfortunately neither can we, with the document.

Lauren Robel: Are there any questions for the Committee on this?

Alex Tanford: I would urge people. If you have questions or concerns to ask them now, because a bit to the next meeting. It can't really be amended at the next meeting. It could be amended now.

Marietta Simpson: I'm sure Diane has a hand. I see. And I also have a hand.

Lauren Robel: Can you, can you help me by

Marietta Simpson: Israel has his hand raised. Okay.

Israel Herrera: Thank you, Alex. So regarding the, the, the time this seat is vacant. So a the previous the former holder of that seat could be invited to hold that seat until the new person replaces right so even if it's after two terms.

Alex Tanford: When he has. Yes, the end of that sentence says, regardless of the length of time they have served designed to make sure that if they've used up their eligibility. We'd rather have them continue to hold that seat and have the unit have no representative

Lauren Robel: Right.

I think you had a question in the chat.

J Duncan: Yes. My question is, I certainly like this and I like that we're moving towards something like ranked choice voting.

I understand why we can't go there immediately. My question is what happens in the meantime, if we were to adopt this right now. And in the next election have a split vote between multiple candidates. How would that be handled.

Alex Tanford: Let me see. Elizabeth can answer that because we have somewhere...

Diane Henshel: We have a way of doing it. So what we did last time was we had a random sample, and it was created by Jonathan using a random sample generator a random number generator. So the people were assigned values and then the random number generator picked up from those values.

J Duncan: I'm not a better situation where no one achieves a majority between multiple candidates.

Elizabeth Pear: Right, what Diane is talking about is actually nomination. So because of the way we do nominations. Now, we end up with quite a few times. And how do we Rank basically who we're going to add in all done by lot we don't. We haven't dealt with that particular problem or situation in in elections because we've never It's only been twice as many people are less than

the seats available. So we've not quite had a split vote issue. Um, I actually, I know Alex this to me. I'm not sure how we would how we would handle that. Yeah.

J Duncan: I would feel more comfortable with this being paired with some temporary measure to resolve that before we have a formal measure that moves to rank choice.

Alex Tanford: In the, in the committee meeting we discussed though didn't somehow end up in what we did, we discussed the option of having Some kind of runoff election just in that unit. I don't think we'd gotten so far as to talking to Elizabeth about whether that was to do that, it but that's sort of as far as the discussion.

Lauren Robel: I would assume the one who got the majority of the votes cast would be elected, but there's some risk that given the fact that there isn't an endless number of votes, there would be a tie. And what do you do in the tie Um, other than a runoff. It might be a rare enough occasion that A runoff would be possible.

All right, well that kicks that back to that parts of the committee. Any other questions.

Going once, going twice. Alright.

Israel Herrera: Last question.

Lauren Robel: Is that—

Marietta Simpson: It sounds like Israel.

Israel Herrera: So, uh, going back, Alex, to how the seat is filled. So if the unit. The unit. A policy committee doesn't find the representative If there is not a representative chosen so that person could continue with one more term. Known as signing us as A someone who has been invited, but kind of stay until the end of the term. If the unit that's in find anyone

Alex Tanford: I then they would hope that they would be invited to continue until the next election. Okay, and if no one was not self-nominating the next election, they'd be invited to continue and eventually they would tell us to go jump in the lake and they would go do something else. And then the seat would be vacant.

I mean, it just it, we can't automatically Require the person to continue to hold that seat. But yeah, it would see sit until A record a replacement has been selected either by the unit or in the next election.

Lauren Robel: That sounds like something that we could talk about with the policy and minutes just to make sure that there's a process within the, within the schools and the college To deal with this. So we don't have people serving for a life or in violation of the 13th Amendment or Other issues that might occur.

All right. Unless I see anything else. Will get whatever the committee would like to do to change this, and it will

Thank you so much.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT: PROPOSED AMMENDMENT TO EXTEND THE AUTO-W DEADLING DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

Lauren Robel: Oh, the next thing on our agenda is a are A proposed policy regarding withdrawal from all subjects during the coven 19 pandemic. Jay, Duncan and David Rakowski, who are the co-chairs of educational policies are here to present it.

And this came to the APC originally from campus committee that was co-chaired I think by Mark McConaughy, and maybe Elizabeth curtain and

Lauren Robel: So Mark is also here to answer questions in his capacity as a registrar. So with that, I'll turn it over to Jay and David

J Duncan: Alright, so I'm going to go ahead and share my screen on this one. So first of all, I'd like to talk a little bit about a couple of quick General things here. The first one is that these this is an action item for today. So it is something we're looking for a vote for I've cleared that with the Parliamentarian but obviously people can ask questions about that we feel that there is some impetus to have an outcome on this very quickly because we are reaching a point in the semester where this policy already really needs to be in place if we're going to do it for the students who are currently enrolled.

So both of these suggestions have some common language and basically I just wanted to go through and discuss why we have these policies in front of us.

So these are both intended as relief for students in the current semester, given the rather large number of unexpected difficulties that students can run into. We want to make sure that students have some extra safety nets that might not otherwise be in place.

These are not permanent policy changes that we are recommending rather they are temporary measures designed to reach for the duration of the coven pandemic.

They sunset automatically upon as you'll see in the language later a declaration by the provost that the pandemic has ended so that we have Basically a way for people to know when the policy is or is not in effect to answer some questions I've seen elsewhere as soon as That declaration has happened after the end of that semester. These policies would no longer be in effect, and they could be removed from the document, although they would be Kept in the history of the document as far as I understand it, for basically future use. If a similar situation where to arise.

So for each of these I've separated it out.

And if people are wondering why are we doing this in two steps. It's because I wanted to make sure that we could focus the discussion on each one of these individually. Rather than kind of conflating parts of one with another but please don't see these as this or that in an exclusive sense EPC is actually recommending both of these temporary policy changes at the same time.

These live inside this particular document here BL ACTA H 32. This is a policy that applies to undergraduate students only. So these particular safety nets are also Intended for undergraduate students only at the moment there is a separate group that has jurisdiction over the equivalent policies for graduate students, they are, as I understand it, working on these things. But APC can only bring forward what the BSC has jurisdiction on in this matter.

So the first thing I want to show you is under shade the relative language or sort of the relevant language as it went out in the circular. So this is for the first one, extending the auto W deadline during the covered pandemic.

This is basically what came out of EPC and was adjusted by exactly when we had the exact meeting to kind of put the language in slightly better shape.

We discovered after this that there were some issues with how we had phrase this specifically surrounding things like the last day that classes are taught

The last day that classes are taught me be a Saturday and as you'll see in here, since we're requiring students to meet with their academic advisor.

There, I can make advisor will probably not be there on a Saturday, and it is not our intent to require employees to work outside of their normal hours.

So the second thing that I'm going to show you is a friendly amendment here from colon. That basically make some small changes in there to make this livable for when that that last day of applicability would be to make sure that we have employees who are actually there to answer these questions and to assist the students Because it's usually a little bit hard to parse all of these out. I also have a version which is the accept change version here.

Which I think will be a little bit easier for people to read and notably I did make one change in this, which is the word withdrawal here. We were copying the language from one place to another and in the version that went out to you that incorrectly said, who isn't withdrawing from all subjects. That's the second thing we're going to talk about

So that really should say withdrawal there. So let me go through this in its kind of final form that's going to you. We can, of course, have more discussion if people have things that they want to add or change or ask questions about

So basically, the idea here is that we are proposing a temporary extension to the auto W deadline to the end of the semester, and that's the part that was a little difficult to describe. But basically before grades go out to students.

The provost shall declare when the pandemic has ended in that will sunset this temporary policy. Every time I say that I can see that. Lauren is just like excited about this idea of being able to do that. Trust me, Lauren, I will be super excited when you can do it to Our point at here is that students need to meet with their academic advisor or a similar person to initiate this

And the idea there is that we want people to go through somebody who can help them understand the implications of a W students may not understand what that Will do to say scholarship eligibility or visa eligibility or prerequisites. We want to make sure that they have that information.

Point to is something that came out of a PC. This was the idea that if we're going to introduce a safety net like this students really need to be informed about it. So we would like students to be informed electronically once a semester. While this policy is in effect.

Point three here is just to this. This is just to let us know that something is not happening in this policy, which is to say that A student who would take a sanction for academic misconduct of an F is still not eligible to get a W instead under this policy. So it is not a safety net. If you have committed academic misconduct.

Point for here is an effective starting date because this is intended to be retroactive. The reason we did this. After some discussion any PC is that it came out. That there were already students who had made decisions because they were they were past the normal auto W deadline or for other reasons. That that would be that would have been covered under the safety net. And we wanted to make sure that we could do so retroactively as much as possible.

So, that is that is my discussion of the first one and I'm happy to take questions or comments or friendly amendments or unfriendly amendments at this point.

Lauren Robel: Thank you so much. Jay.

AGENDA ITEM NINE: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON PROPOSED AMMENDMENT TO EXTEND THE AUTO-W DEADLING DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

I'm going to have to again rely on Mariana and Diane

Diane Henshel: And the first hand raised is Lisa

Lisa Thomassen: I am on a PC so full disclosure about that. So we've discussed this exhaustively and two things I'd like to say

First, I want to say that this is not only really for our students who are struggling. It is also relief for instructors. So by moving this away from students having to come to instructors. This is the students will be Going to the folks who can advise them and then the instructors don't even have to make this decision as they might have to with a typical withdrawal. So, that is, I think, is an important feature.

And we short believe that this is in the interest of our students who, you know, those of us who are teaching know we're really struggling right now. The registrar and we really wanted to do this beforehand, but there was a cancel the Fc meeting and so deadlines moved in our committee did meet you know called extra meetings and really Worked hard to particularly J to really get this in shape, so that we could bring it to you into the background to make sure that we could try to get this voted on so that our students have this relief as soon as possible before. Going into Thanksgiving break and those exams that, you know, or so stressful before kid.

The second thing I want to do, presuming that this passes in the second Piece passes as well, just to make sure that the faculty are informed about this in the beginning of the semester map memo because we're all used to this idea that there's a particular W date. So that's going to be an important Thing that instructors need to know about. Thank you all for considering this

Lauren Robel: Thank you, Louise, I think, Kurt is next. Kirk.

Kurt Zorn: Yeah, so I'd like to, to make a friendly amendment, if I may.

And let me state the amendment, and I'll give you the rationale for in part day. One day I would like to amend the language of possible to say, students are strongly encouraged to meet with an academic advisor or an ally, a staff member before initiating such requests, I would keep the remainder in there. But again, students are strongly encouraged to meet with an academic advisor or oh Is staff member before initiating requests.

There are two reasons, I suggest this This would mirror so I guess are three reasons. One, the wording here is really Consistent with what happens with withdrawal from all subjects when it is a requirement for a student to meet with a student advocate or an advisor.

So she or he can understand the ramifications of withdrawing from all subjects, because it's such a serious thing the current approach with automatic W's is

They're all students. As always, are recommended to talk to their advisor, so they can understand the implications, but there's no requirement to do so.

And I think we're just extending the deadline, we should continue to do the same thing, what I'm concerned about as I'm concerned about advisor overload having to meet with students to approve these or in the code age.

They would get an electronic Document from Marks office. Mark McCartney's office, the Office of the Registrar and this would increase the workload of the advisors substantially. So any questions, I'd be happy to answer.

Lauren Robel: Thanks, Kirk and there. That's an A I think is that emotion to amend

Kurt Zorn: That's what my intent is. Yes, long okay and

Lauren Robel: Is there a second for that motion.

Diane Henshel: Sure. I'll second. Great.

Lauren Robel: So is, is there any further discussion on the motion.

Dan Bullock: I have a question, I guess. Is a single W capable of causing the same sorts of problems that we'd be concerned with as an entire full withdrawal?

Lauren Robel: I think Kurt's a good person to answer that.

Kurt Zorn: So yes, there is the possibility of that with international students, especially if they go below 12 hours, um, they, they can run into some problems with their visa and also other students with regard to their financial aid Mark McConahey may have to speak to this because I've been seeing a lot of these things go across my desk or across my screen, I should say, and

When there is a question of the number of going below 12 for international students have a system catches that effect and it gets kicked over to OH is for approval before it. gets routed so it will get disapproved are held until it's approved by is I'm not sure what the financial way what happens market. Maybe you can help with that.

Mark McConahay: Yeah, and I can speak incorrectly right for various subpopulations like athletes like international students and a few others even regular auto who are reviewed before they're processed and awarded for other W's. There are both internal and external considerations. One is Satisfactory Academic Progress and in title for funding.

Mark McConahay: Another is competitive admissions within our own institution or on campus Kelly direct or I shouldn't say Kelly direct but the business school is a prime example of that where the number of W's can reflect badly or prevent you from making progress in your desired goal. So it does make sense to pay attention to the number of w's that you have

Lauren Robel: So the emotion that is on the floor right now is to amend the proposal from the PC to change it of one eight from students will meet two students are strongly encouraged to meet

Is there any more discussion on this motion?

Hearing done, could I ask for a vote on the motion.

Diane Henshel: Lisa, is that another—is that a vote, is that a question?

Lisa Thomassen: Again, I get from previously—yeah, I had a question. My understanding was that it was students will strongly advise to meet before initiating not just doing that simple replacement. Is that not correct.

Kurt Zorn: Yeah, I can. I can read the wording. Again, I did write it down. Students are strongly encouraged to meet with an academic advisor or oh Is staff member before initiating such requests. Thanks Lisa

Lauren Robel: Thank you. Are there any other comments or questions about the motion?

And if not hearing them. Can I ask for a vote on the motion and Elizabeth, will you help facilitate that.

Elizabeth Pear: Realize, that's not exactly it. But hopefully

I think we get the idea.

J Duncan: Thank you for Justin time polling.

Elizabeth Pear: We did it.

All right.

Lauren Robel: Elizabeth. This is an innovation that even when we are together. I wouldn't mind keeping

Elizabeth Pear: I would love if we could figure out how to do this. Believe me, I have asked

Lauren Robel: Okay, so did the motion pass or--?

Okay, the motion asked. And so now we return to discussion on the proposed policy, as amended. And I think Kari has a question.

Kari, are you—are you still there?

Kari Johnson: Is it not sharing my audio? There I am...

J Duncan (he/him): Now we can—

Kari Johnson: I did type my question in the chat. I was just curious what we mean by how will notify students or where students will see this electronic notification about the change to policy and then the discussion we were just having brought up one additional question for me is how does this policy interact with are incomplete policy because I'm assuming that students who are in good standing at the end of the semester, but maybe have contracted Covid or some other illness and need time to complete coursework, the incomplete is still the better option for that situation. Am I correct in that assumption?

J Duncan: I think that would be up to the individual student and instructor. Certainly, if a student came to me, I would advise them of all their options and definitely and I would be on the

table. In that case, but to some degree. This is the idea here is that the student and an academic advisor should discuss what would be best for the student.

As for how the notification would appear. I imagine it would come to them in the form of an email, possibly the registrar could send them that email or another campus office.

Kari Johnson: Okay. And do you anticipate that that would happen at the beginning of the semester or Closer to the time when that would close out

J Duncan: Yeah I anticipate it would happen in the beginning of the semester but

I'm you know I'm not wed to that if there's a better time or reminder should go on. This is just the minimum that we would we requested it, etc.

We want to make sure students are aware of this. It's not a secret. We're not trying to do this under the table. We want students to know that this options here for this semester, I think they would need to be notified obviously after the beginning of the semester inherently

Kurt Zorn: Right, so if I if I could jump in here. Carrie, the answer your question, the academic advisors would Definitely let students know that this options available. But I think the electronic notification is intended for those students who unfortunately don't Utilize serves the academic advisor to make sure they're covered and I can guarantee you, if this gets passed today. The Academic Advising community on the campus will know about it.

Because I'll be letting Elizabeth curtain know the outcome of today's vote and that will get out to all the directors as advisors throughout campus.

J Duncan: EPC was very concerned about students who might not utilize the advising system normally being the students who are perhaps most vulnerable to disruption this semester, and therefore needing a separate notification.

Lauren Robel: Will make sure it gets out to the students so that they are they're aware of it this semester.

Diane Henshel: I'd like to make a comment and then BB has a comment. Kurt cool would it be possible to put it on course as an encore span on course Canvas as a canvas banner.

Kurt Zorn: You're asking the guy who's been here for 40 years about technology. I'm assuming it could be, but I'd have to get somebody else to help me with that.

Lauren Robel: Way I can certainly ask about that.

Diane Henshel: Okay, okay.

And Barb?

Barb Cherry: Yes. Um, I have a question.

Something has arisen, even for me, and, I imagine, perhaps for some other people—this policy says it's supposed to be retroactive.

My concern is, for example, I have a student right now who just withdrew. From courses and under current policy. This person was failing. And I don't know whether I should go ahead and indicate as under there's another policy that says if a person is withdrawing and they're failing at the time I'm supposed to report that on the other hand, if the purpose of this is to somehow give some kind of extraordinary Relief for students can the circumstances. I don't know whether I should decline to report That they're failing or not. I'm just not sure how to handle this. Because of this becomes available for. So for right now with this not available as an option for a student. This student is withdrawn, I should report a fail?

Now this new policy. Let's say it passes and therefore supposed to be retroactively effective. Does that mean I should? And if this had been, you know, does that mean there, I should still go ahead and report a fail. And then maybe that can be undone. I don't know. If this policy passes I'm not sure what to do as an instructor. If the policy that says I'm supposed to report a fail if they're failing at this point because they don't stand finding complete

Lauren Robel: I, I believe this is a withdrawal from all subjects, but Mark or—

Barb Cherry: And that's what the student is doing that.

J Duncan: I learned we actually have two pieces. One is extension of auto W for individual classes. The other one is for all subjects.

Barb Cherry: And this student is right. And what I'm saying is this one is doing from all subjects.

Kurt Zorn: No, I think, I think your question, if I understand your question is whether Our link drop Period is already started for all but the second AP courses. So we've got we've got things being processed as if they're late drops. Yeah, drop the faculty members asked to either say that the student is passing or failing. If they're failing, then they get a WF instead of a W.

So the intent of this is to basically go back and change all that to just a W.

Barb Cherry: Would it be best, therefore, that I just not enter anything at the moment, in case this policy passes?

Kurt Zorn: Right, I don't think you need to do anything. And I'll be honest with you, I have some sitting in my inbox right now where I'm not taking the action about approving or not to find out what happens here.

Because normally I would disapprove because they don't have a good reason for a leg drop, other than they're doing poorly in the class after this happens, I'll just approve it knowing the marks off since I'm going to have to go back and clean all this up, Mark, you might want to comment.

Mark McConahay: Yeah, you know, the thing I would say is if this does pass the instructor would never even know that there was an opportunity to provide a WR, they automatically get the W. Therefore, the whole idea of being a grandfather clause is that we would go back to those who had already chosen to withdraw. But after the audit W deadline.

And they would have been provided a bait and switch, in essence, I have I have dropped late I received an F. But if I would have waited another week or two, I would have gotten a W and that certainly didn't seem fair

Barb Cherry: Yes. So that's why—

Mark McConahay: I lost your audio.

Barb Cherry: I'm sorry. Oh, I'm sorry. I just wanted to make sure. Thank you for clarification. I just want to make sure that since being a PFC rep. I do know this policies and play that it would be okay to hold off and not file a filing when otherwise it might have been Supposed to do so.

J Duncan: And just to be clear, if students received enough due to academic misconduct. This is not affecting that

Barb Cherry: Correct. I understand that. Thank you. Okay.

Lauren Robel: Hence, hence the relief for instructors, as well as Lisa. Lisa has reminded us so. Alright. Are there other questions about this. Are we ready for a vote on this particular part of the policy?

Diane Henshel: Colin is next and Lisa. Did you have another question?

Lisa Thomassen: No, I'm fine, thank you.

Lauren Robel: Colin.

Colin Johnson: I'm Sorry. Yeah. So I just wanted to ask about the implications for students for it's a retroactivity question.

About the implications for students, for example, who began first eight-week terms have already received grades potentially failing grades. Who are presumably also in the most expansive reading this policy being grandfathered into its provisions or grandmothers into its provisions or whatever it is.

How does, how does this policy implicate them or how do I mean, I personally would advocate because of the circumstances because the intent of it is clearly to allow students to manage difficulties that they have been confronted with since the minute they stepped on campus.

For the most generous reading of it, which is to say I am otherwise categorically opposed to the idea of retroactively expunging quality grades that have been assigned by unstructured Instructors under any circumstances because to me that amounts to notification of essentially a contract that students and faculty members enter into, but in this case.

Because of the fact that That we're applying retro actively I would actually lean in the direction and maybe this can just be done through legislative history in terms of coming to some consensus about intent. amongst ourselves, I would be willing to actually be a bit more generous in the name of fairness, because I do think

Students shouldn't be penalized for the fact that we're just kind of processing this now and making it available to them.

I don't think students, for example, who took a course in the first eight weeks and failed should have fewer opportunities to manage that situation. Using this policies and students who are currently enrolled in let's say an eight-week course.

J Duncan: So certainly, I would support Colin's interpretation there, Mark. Is there an implementation difficulty in that or is that reasonable

Mark McConahay: I think that's reasonable. Although Where I'm a little gray is does that mean every F that was awarded in the eight-week session or only those in which f was awarded as a result of a W. F.

Decision you. Am I making sense column.

Colin Johnson: Yeah, but I would say it's not every app it's f F's under circumstances that apply under the terms of this condition which is every app that's awarded would not be turned to the w only students who initiate Late withdraw request right to basically say, it wouldn't even be an F, somebody could initiate late withdrawal quick request because they got to be minus, which would be crazy, but they could do it under the terms of this policy right

And I think that allowance should be made for a student, I would advocate for that allowance being made for students, under these circumstances, only and uniquely because the failing was ours in terms of not making the full scope of this policy available to all of our

J Duncan: scan it, it won't be an issue. After the semester.

Lauren Robel: It's Just this semester. Ah, yeah.

Kurt Zorn: Oh, and if I understand your question correctly, I think the policy already takes care of that. If a student in the first eight weeks.

Asked for a late withdraw and got a WF instead of a W. The grandfather and would take that WF off that students transcript, it would change it to a w. So I think that answers your question.

Colin Johnson: Well, but what if there was a point is this policy doesn't require people to be failing to withdraw.

Right, it could be getting a D and choose to withdraw, even under the regular policy. Am I correct, yeah.

Lauren Robel: So the, the question I guess if I understand your question, calling. It's not just people who applied for a W during the first eight weeks and Got a W. F it students who never applied for withdrawal at all who didn't know they had the opportunity to withdraw late. Yeah, okay.

So in other words, we could have students If, if it's really important. They talk to their advisors, because this would be a terrible idea. But we couldn't have things going back in and getting rid of other parts of their of awarded credit at this point if we, if we think about the possibility of those first eight weeks students

Lauren Robel: Applying for a W at this late date right

Colin Johnson: Right, I mean I'm not saying it's advisable, necessarily, and I would hope that advisors would counsel students about kind of not to indulge you know

Their worst instincts where these things are concerned, I just think as a kind of categorical issue. It does seem to me.

And I guess we could just, we could, for example, take the tact and say, well, it's only people who actually have W's, we could take the alternative tact.

I think the more consistent thing if we're retroactively applying it would be to afford students the full scope of the policies of allowance, right, which actually doesn't require people to be failing at the time they withdraw. Yeah, it's it

Kurt Zorn: May be a little slow on the uptake on this, but students have been advised during the first eight-weeks by their academic advisors, and it's been publicized what the automatic W deadline is just like during a 13-week session this this semester. The 16-week semester so students Presumably would have already made that decision, whether they want to continue the course through the full eight weeks take their chance with the grade or they decided to drop because after the all the W Dr deadline. Right.

Colin Johnson: Yes.

Kurt Zorn: Worried, are you worried about the student who's failing and didn't want to get the F on there didn't want to get the WF they want they want to try to get out of the failing point no

Colin Johnson: I'm worried about logical consistency between the terms of this, the spirit of this provision as it applies in the second part of the semester after decision is made, and everything that proceeds that given the fact that it's intentionally being retroactively.

You know retroactively applied and so I, it may be. It's something that comes down to a question of art, but I would just say, Kurt, for example, this the situation you described, which is well students know you know they've been advised to the auto deadline.

Doesn't seem exceptional to me because the same thing could apply to 16-week courses right now, they've known with the auto W deadline is we're specifically changing it so that they essentially have until the 11th hour to make a decision about whether or not they want to withdraw from the class or proceed into the final and then receive a gray. So it's, there's no distinction between what you're describing and the circumstances, we're dealing with now with regard to students who are currently enrolled in 16-week courses.

Lauren Robel: With the exception that the students who were in enrolled in the eight-week courses have already been awarded a grade.

Colin Johnson: Exactly. And that's what's a controversial thing about it. Why would really support it, under these circumstances, for the purpose of a consistency of opportunity not beyond because once this policy from the claim for I

J Duncan: I have a suggestion, then it seems I'm trying to follow the chat. Also, and it definitely seems that people are not entirely in agreement about whether or not they would support that interpretation. My suggestion is that we read the policy to not Apply to people who've already been awarded a grade that was not W related but then perhaps calling you might be suggesting an amendment to the policy that does. And then we could have a vote on that.

Because I think this is a substantive enough difference in interpretation that I would like to see a vote of some kind.

Lauren Robel: And let me see if I can. I could really join the issues here around this. So what this proposed policy does is it gives students in till really the 11th hour to pull out of a class with no penalty.

So it is possible for a student at that point as Cate read --the point Cate makes in in the chat. It's, it's possible for a student to predict that they won't do as well as they want to and withdraw without penalty at the 11th hour what Colin is suggesting is that they should also be allowed to withdraw at the 13th hour that is the

They've gotten their grade and now they should be permitted to go back in and with withdraw centrally

J Duncan: For students in the first eight weeks of this semester only.

Lauren Robel: First aid.

J Duncan: And that's going to be important for calling.

That letter.

Right, yeah.

Lauren Robel: And again we're talking here about withdrawal from all subjects you.

J Duncan: Know. In this one, we're talking about withdrawal from one class withdrawal from all subjects will be the second thing that we discuss.

Lauren Robel: Oh, OK. I thought this. That was the first but—

J Duncan: No, this.

Lauren Robel: It's okay. There will be an opportunity under either scenario at the 11th hour or 13th hour for students to take advantage of this policy for reasons with intent that some of us will not like. And the question I think you have to wrap your minds around as a group, is whether, given the circumstances were in more generally with Covid you care about the students intent. At this point, you know, the point Kate makes in the comment and perhaps you'd like to make it herself is that we do have classes, anatomy and physiology classes are good examples, where students routinely pull out of class because they're not getting the very, very top grade because they are looking forward to medical school.

We've done studies actually, and Cate probably knows this, that show that that that behavior does not ultimately help students in their quest to go into medical school. But there it is, we will have students who use this for reasons that go beyond what the circumstances of the day. So I'm not sure this needs an amendment, one way or the other, unless you want to make it clear that the 13th hour is unprotected when the 11th hour is not this semester.

J Duncan: The only thing I can say is that EPC discussed scenarios of both types related to the larger scheme of recommendations we received and we did not advance this one with the idea that it would nullify any grades received in first eight weeks of the semester, I can see the interpretation. And so it might be good to have a vote one way or the other, to clarify whether the BSC as a whole, supports that interpretation.

Lauren Robel: And to go back to what the interpretive question is then, this would for sure. In order for purposes of fairness applied to people who had in fact withdrawn during the first semester and done it in a way that left them with a WF. The question that Colin raises is should we, we essentially still have open the possibility for those students to withdraw. Now, who did not attempt to withdraw.

Colin Johnson: Yeah, I mean, again, it's really just a question I have, and I agree with everything you said about the sort of non-advisability of some of the. It's for me it's a question of kind of consistency.

Of opportunity, we're, you know, we're backdating. And so that's how the only reason I read it and I would be happy to be defeated other suggestion, but I just felt obliged to raise it.

Because I do feel like there are probably students who will read the fact that those opportunities are available to people now to approach there you know when courses array that were not available to them first eight weeks classes is a bit of an unfair, you know,

Lauren Robel: Although, although I will say that it is any law line drawing exercises going to present perceived unfairness. You know, the students who had a students proceeded through the first eight weeks and got their grades. The relief. You could offer them is full withdrawal privileges as if this policy had been in effect when they were in the first eight weeks, or you could offer them the relief of the w f leaving their transcript and having it replaced with simply in W.

I guess that's a question, and if so, I'll, I'll pause here and see if anybody wants to put an amendment or motion on the floor.

Diane Henshel: Currently there is nothing in either chat or participants raising him.

Lauren Robel: Well I would. What we have on the floor is the proposal from EPC, as amended by the motion from Kurt Zorn earlier and I think we're ready for a vote.

Elizabeth, can you facilitate a vote, please?

Jay, you might want to put up the next one.

J Duncan: I am. I'm just waiting for the results of the Vote before we proceed. Yeah, but yes. Otherwise, I'll be happy to share the second one.

Lauren Robel: Elizabeth. Do we have a result?

Elizabeth Pear: 85% reporting.

Lauren Robel: Alright.

J Duncan: Alright, thank you very much.

Lauren Robel: Thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM TEN: PROPOSED POLICY REGARDING WITHDRAWAL FROM ALL SUBJECTS DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

J Duncan: So I will move on to our second item then.

So this is the withdrawal from all subjects. This one is similarly housed in the same language and also similarly applies to only undergraduate students, for the reasons I've already described.

This was the original language that went out in the circular it had similar issues with the timing of things and making sure that we were within business days and so forth. So we received a similar friendly amendment from Colin. Again, I would really like to thank Colin for all the work he's done in helping us sort out this language. It was really appreciated, and this is the final version of the language which goes to the floor here in this one. We are definitely asking for the student to meet with their advisor withdrawal from all subjects is a very serious situation.

But we do anticipate that some students will need this for, for reasons that should be very obvious looking around all of us and our present circumstances.

Lauren Robel: All right, thank you so much. Jay. Is there discussion of this proposal?

Diane Henshel: Hi, John.

John Walbridge: Yeah, it's just a quick question of information, how much does this differ with what the actual practices when there are Students who get into health problems and the similar those kinds of things that cause of draw from all subjects minute in practice.

Kurt Zorn: John. This mirrors the Auto-W deadline. I checked with Elizabeth Curtain today to clarify to make sure my understanding was correct.

Lauren Robel: All right, is there other—are there other questions? Is there other discussion of this proposal?

Diane Henshel: Currently there's nothing in either chat or participants. Great.

Lauren Robel: All right. Um, Dan, Elizabeth, if you could facilitate a vote for us.

J Duncan: And after we have the result, I would like to request, just a few more minutes to discuss the piece we did not see on the floor today and some questions that EPC has.

Lauren Robel: That would be great. Jay, thank you.

All right. Congratulations. Thank you for getting that through on behalf of all of our students and tell us what else you've got kind of in your queue.

J Duncan: So of the large suite of requests that we received associated with this. There was one other piece that EPC passed along to Exec and they referred this back to us for further discussion. So I wanted to solicit general comments from the faculty about extending the pass/fail deadline in a similar manner. So I, I understand why it was referred back to us.

And we will continue to work on that we will probably bring another proposal before the BSC as soon as we can.

But if people have a particular opinion about when you feel the pass/fail deadline is no longer appropriate to extend EPC would be very interested in hearing that. So, otherwise I assume that we might see a similar before the end of semester proposal for the duration of Covid-19.

One thing I want to note because it was the subject of a lot of discussion need PC is that pass fail is something that all the units already have policies to deal with. Unlike SF, which was a little bit

Uncertain in places as to how the units would deal with things like major requirements under SF So if people are concerned. Well, I'm not sure what happened to students taking a major class if they took in elite pass fail. Instead, your, your unit should already specify whether a past satisfies those requirements or not.

So please, otherwise forward. Any comments that you have about that to me or to Dave.

Lauren Robel: Thank you so much. Jay, and thanks to Mark McConnahey, and Elizabeth Curtain and this group for teeing up a number of issues for the BFC to consider. I think we are at the end of our agenda. And so I would take a motion to adjourn.

Rachael Cohen: Motion.

Diane Henshel: Second.

Lauren Robel: Thank you. I think emotion in a second and a flurry of people pushing the leaf button would probably do it.

Thank you all so much. Have a very productive meeting.