

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL

November 17th, 2020

broadcast.iu.edu

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

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

Members Absent: Karen Allen, Hussein Banai, Dakota Coates, Dee Degner, Larissa Jennings Mayo-Wilson, Annette Loring, Courtney Olcott, Linda Pisano, Lauren Richerme, Steve Sanders

Guests: Aaron Carroll, Stewart Cobine, Erika Knudsen, Moira Marsh, David Rutkowski, Alex Tanford

AGENDA:

1. **Approval of the [minutes of November 3, 2020](#)**
2. **[Memorial Resolution for John Dyson](#)**
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

[Second Reading – Action Item]

[Current BL-ACA-D9 Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council](#)

[B18-2021: Updated proposed amendments to BL-ACA-D9 Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of Indiana University regarding the nominations process - clean version](#)

[B19-2021: Update 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 amendments to BL-ACA-H28 Faculty Instructional Responsibilities to expand the definition of “early evaluation” to include instructor observations and feedback, in addition to “letter grades” (10 minutes)**

J Duncan, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee

David Rutkowski, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee

[First Reading – Discussion item]

[Current BL-ACA-H28 Faculty Instructional Responsibilities](#)

[B20-2021: Proposed amendments to BL-ACA-H28 Faculty Instructional Responsibilities](#)

9. **Questions/comments on the proposed amendments to BL-ACA-H28 Faculty Instructional Responsibilities to expand the definition of “early evaluation” to include instructor observations and feedback, in addition to “letter grades” (20 minutes)**

10. **Update on Indiana University’s response to the COVID-19 pandemic (20 minutes)**

Aaron Carroll, Professor of Pediatrics and Director of Surveillance and Mitigation for the COVID-19 Pandemic

Stewart Cobine, Associate Vice President and Chief Audit Officer

[Discussion Item]

11. **Questions/comments on the update on Indiana University’s response to the COVID-19 pandemic (30 minutes)**

TRANSCRIPT:

ROBEL: Well, welcome everyone. We are at the end of the in-person part of the semester. So, congratulations to everybody. This is, I'm thrilled and delighted to be here and I'm confident that we wouldn't have been here without every single person on this call and on our campus working really hard to get us here.

AGENDA ITEM ONE: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 3RD, 2020

ROBEL: So, we can, we can breathe a sigh of relief and send our students home and approve our minutes. So, I will ask for a motion for the approval of the minutes to get us started.

HENSHEL: So, moved.

SIMPSON: I'll second.

ROBEL: Thank you. All in favor?

BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL: Aye.

ROBEL: I don't think I've heard anybody opposed. That sounds great. I'll turn to our Vice Provost for a memorial resolution for John Dyson.

AGENDA ITEM TWO: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR JOHN DYSON

PAVALKO: Thank you Lauren.

Beginning as an assistant professor in 1965 in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, John Dyson attained the level of associate professor and was responsible – both single-handedly and in collaboration with others – for developing foundational parts of his department of 38 years. John's research and pedagogical focus were contemporary Latin American literature. And while he was an expert in his field, John achieved much more beyond his field and beyond academia.

John Dyson was born April 13, 1939, in Batesville, Mississippi. Batesville sits in the north of Mississippi on what once was the territory of the Chickasaw tribe, a personal proximity that would shape John's intellectual pursuits later in life. He earned his B.A. from Kansas State University in 1960, and a master's degree and doctorate from the University of Kansas in 1962 and 1965, respectively.

John's link to Latin American literature was forged in part by his experience abroad in Santiago, Chile, which enabled him to write his dissertation on literary criticism in Chile and be witness to the Latin American literary "Boom" that was unfolding. Among other topics, John wrote articles about the works of Jorge Luis Borges, often deemed a, if not the, precursor to the "Boom." John would ply his editorial skills by founding and editing the journal *The American Hispanist* and, for several years, edited the well-known Twayne World Authors Series for literature from Spanish America and Brazil.

During his time in the department, John wore many hats and is remembered fondly for his wit and understanding. In 1966, one year after arriving to Bloomington, John was tasked with creating from the ground up the undergraduate and graduate programs in Portuguese. He threw himself into his charge by creating a range of language and literature courses in Portuguese and went so far as to organize a lecture series featuring renowned Brazilian scholars and writers.

According to John's long-time friend Kathleen Sideli, associate vice president of overseas study, the creation of the Portuguese program also included a two-week journey through South America with Walter Nugent, then director of overseas study, to investigate possibilities for student programs abroad. That trip took them to capital cities throughout the continent, including Porto Alegre and São Paulo in Brazil. A few years later, Heitor Martins and overseas study settled on the Universidade de São Paulo as the chosen site for what would become a successful IU study abroad program. John also directed the graduate program in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese for many years and was instrumental in revamping different facets of that program.

John was a highly respected and popular professor. His former graduate students remember him fondly, and their compliments speak volume about John's character. A former professor himself at Georgia State University, Steven Dupuoy's remarks upon hearing of John's passing exemplify how much John was held in high esteem. Dupuoy writes: "I was impressed not only by [John's] depth of knowledge but also by the enthusiasm he brought to the class. Later, when he agreed to direct my dissertation, he offered me assistance with criticism that was relevant to my study of the novelist Manuel Puig. Not only did he share his joy of the novels and criticism, but he also brought a sense of humor to the class that created a camaraderie that is seldom seen. I shall always remember his quick wit and his ongoing support and understanding. My memories of my time at IU are among the highlights of my life and my interactions with Professor Dyson are among the best of these."

John was a man of many talents. He opened a foreign language bookstore; he sat on the Monroe County Community School Corporation for three years; and he even opened his own barbecue restaurant in Bloomington. Prior to his retirement, John's research and teaching interests came full circle to his childhood connections to Mississippi and, more specifically, Chickasaw history, language, and culture. John's publications and conference presentations drew the notice of officials of the Chickasaw Nation's Division of History and Culture. In 2006, John was accorded the tribe's Heritage Preservation Award, and in 2007 he was invited to join the Department of Chickasaw Language at East Central University in Ada, Oklahoma as a participant in its language revitalization program. John prepared instructional materials and taught adult education courses on Chickasaw grammar for the next six years in Ada. In 2013, he returned to Indiana with work still under contract with the Chickasaw Nation. He contributed two articles a year to *The Journal of Chickasaw History and Culture*, and wrote a definitive book, *The Early Chickasaw Homeland: Origins, Boundaries and Society*.

John's intellect, energy, humility, and drive will be missed. He is survived by his three children - Terence, Jennifer, and Christopher - as well as a sister, 8 granddaughters, 4 great granddaughters, and 4 nephews. We request this in memorial, be preserved in the BFC minutes and archived.

Thank you very much.

ROBEL: Thank you. What a wonderful life. Let's take a moment. It this week before Thanksgiving and give thanks for it with a moment of silence.

AGENDA ITEM THREE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

ROBEL: Thank you all. I turn now to our President John Wallbridge for Executive Committee Business.

WALBRIDGE: Thank you. I have two items this afternoon. The first one was a question based on a petition that came from a student in Kelly, an undergraduate student, asking whether the SF grading might be continued through spring? I told her that this was not under consideration to the best of my knowledge. The rest of what I told there is basically my opinion, but the gist of it was, we're all struggling. Faculty and students alike. Faculty are sympathetic but also responsible for ensuring that the credits and degrees means something. So, she responded and asked, what had changed from spring and I said, Well, first of all, we had more time to prepare faculty and students alike. And secondly, this is likely to continue for a while, I hope from recent news a shorter time than we feared, but for the rest of this year. And that we needed to return more or less to normal for better or for worse. So that was my reply, it much in my opinion.

Okay. The second item is a matter of happier. I have the honor to present a Bicentennial Medal to one of our own, to Elizabeth Pear. For her contributions to the Faculty Council. The metal comes in a nice box. And if I can find zoom again, I will try to show you the certificate that comes with it. Okay. Indiana University Bicentennial medal presented to Elizabeth A. Pear, given during the Bicentennial celebratory year in recognition that distinguished and distinctive service and supportive of the mission at Indiana University signed Michael McRobbie, President. This did not originate with me, but I have whole heartedly agreed that it is, it is merited. And, and I would actually appreciate my colleagues and the presidency, Diane Henshel, Marietta Simpson, and I think former president Alex Tanford is here. And I invited Moira Marsh, so if any of them would like to help explain why this honor for Elizabeth is merited, we would be happy to hear from them.

TANFORD: Well, I've never been shy about speaking first. Plus, I think I was the first president under, during its going to say that Elizabeth was under my tenure, but I'm going to rephrase, and I was the first president under her tenure.

PEAR: Actually sir, that was Rebecca Spang.

TANFORD: Well other ones who are here today. I was President Elect, I knew that I was, I'm just extraordinarily pleased that Elizabeth is getting this well-deserved recognition. When I served as President of the Faculty, she was just completely indispensable. As all presidents will tell you, we come stumbling into this job with only a kind of vague notion to how it works. And Elizabeth was a combination of Chief of Staff, Policy Adviser, institutional memory, and quite frankly, a spy providing valuable intelligence about the administration. The BFC, its committees, task forces, and boards require a lot of attention, as frankly as academics, we often seem to lack the practical skills to govern ourselves, things like calendars and remembering where we put our notes.

Elizabeth, throughout my tenure, was always there with administrative support that we needed and without which I don't think we could have done our job. Congratulations.

WALBRIDGE: Thank you, Alex. Moira you have appeared on screen.

MARSH: Yes. So, I guess I am the second or the third, depending on how you count president in Elizabeth's reign. And I second, everything that Alex said. I always found Elizabeth great to work with a combination of friendliness and openness, great problem-solving ability, attention to detail for sure, and also flexibility. So remember that whether Elizabeth had to deal with us packing up the BFC office and moving it, lock stock and barrel from one building to the other in

the middle of the semester or maybe it was the middle of the summer, but same difference. It was just one of the many jobs that she had to do, in addition to her usual task of keeping the faculty, all the faculty that work on the BFC but not just the members, but the committees and many, many, many faculty and herding cats doesn't even begin to describe the task. And I include dealing with the BFC leadership and the presidents in that metaphor. So well done, Elizabeth, and congratulations, and this puts the coffee mug we gave you rather in perspective, it is very much deserved.

WALBRIDGE: Thank you. Diane, or do you have anything you wish to say?

HENSHEL: So, I will say this came from Moira and I in terms of the original planning for this and Elizabeth, that it's not just the BFC and I think that that's what's being missed here. Elizabeth essentially runs two separate organization. She is the backbone for about the BFC and the UFC.

For the UFC, she has to coordinate with people across all the different campuses. And she does it often at the expense of our own sanity, I'm afraid. And I do think we real we want you to realize that we understand that Elizabeth. And then in addition, just to look at what Elizabeth's been doing, she is one of the people who has had to be teaching her kid at the same time as she is handling the same amount of work from us throughout all this is going on. So, all I can say is that this thank you for all that you've done. You're the reason that anything works as far as I'm concerned.

WALBRIDGE: Yes. Marietta are you around?

SIMPSON: Yes, I am around and I of course, am the newest addition to this cohort. But I have to say that during my entire time on the BFC, it's been obvious that Elizabeth is the wind beneath everyone's wings. And I'm truly honored to call you friend and to be able to work with you in every capacity that I've been able to do that as a member of the BFC, as a member of tasked forces, and now as the President Elect of the BFC. I've realized that nothing works unless you're a part of it and you make everything function. And so, I am so thrilled that you've been recognized in this way. It's truly appropriate that you should be receiving a Bicentennial medal. Because the success of what we've been able to do on the BFC is because of you and so we are all immensely grateful to you for what you've done. Thank you, Elizabeth.

WALBRIDGE: Well, I'll take the privilege of closing unless Lauren wishes to add something. I think I once found something that Elizabeth overlooked. You know it's been a year and a half, and we did tell her that she had to take a week off, although I think that required a direct order from the Provost. But I have made considerably more mistakes than that. And my half a year as BFC president, and those tended to happen when I didn't ask Elisabeth about something before I did it. So, and all of us who work with Elizabeth, you know there's, Elizabeth's responsible for managing things and we're responsible for policy. But every so often, Elizabeth will say, "I know this is not my place, but." And silence falls on the rule because whatever it is, she's going to say next is something we really, really need to know. So, we're very, very fortunate to have you. You know, it's a privilege to work with someone with so much talent, so much energy. You know, quite an extraordinary memory for details. And as my colleagues have said, this would not work without you, Elizabeth. So, thank you so much. And it's an honor thoroughly deserved. And I will have to figure out how to get this to you. It comes with a very nice IU Bicentennial tote bag. Perhaps we can meet on a socially distanced corridor or something like that. So, thank you again for everything that you do for us.

PEAR: Well, thank you all. Thank you all so much. This is such an honor and so unexpected. So, I really appreciate all of you and I appreciate this. For once I am without words, I know the President's won't believe that.

WALBRIDGE: Did we actually managed to keep it secret from you?

PEAR: I was shocked. I saw Moira log-in, and I was like, "Why is Moira here? She didn't tell me she was an alternate."

WALBRIDGE: Okay. I'll add this to my second you've overlooked but thank you again. So.

ROBEL: Well, that is just fabulous, Elizabeth. We are all thrilled for you as well. Wow is that richly deserved. John, are you concluding your remarks?

WALBRIDGE: I'm concluding my remarks. That is a good place to end.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

ROBEL: All right. Well, I am, we've invited Dr. Aaron Carroll and Stew Cobine from Internal Audit to come at 3:30pm to talk about COVID related things. But since this is the last week of the in-person semester, I am only going to talk about happy things in my Presiding Officers Report.

So, I'll start with the happiest thing of the past week, which was being able to attend all of the wonderful lectures by the distinguished, the new Distinguished Professor class at Indiana University. And they're all available, I think probably still at broadcast.IU.edu. And I will recommend to you all personally and with the highest enthusiasm Marietta Simpson's performance as a new Distinguished Professor, she performed with Tyron Cooper and I have gone to many, many, many of the distinguished professor lectures over the course of many years on this campus. And I can tell you this is the only one I have ever been to where there was not a dry eye in the house. So if you didn't have a chance to see Marietta, I'm going to encourage you to take a look at that and just thank you so much for everything you do for the campus Mariette, in so many different ways.

And then because I have made this pledge to only share happy news with you today. I'm going to show you if I can pull it off. See, there we go. See if this works. We started the semester without a clear approach to using the campus and of course, with a lot of restrictions on our physical space. But I wanted to show you this little PowerPoint which is what happened over the course of the semester on the campus with our beautiful outdoor spaces. So, let me do that. Let's see if I can pull this off.

So as the little video showed you, we opened up 13 locations around the campus to be booked by well, really anybody who could think of a creative, interesting thing to do outside. We used both these little campus corners and of performance hubs across the campus. And those included things, big stages, like the Prebys Amphitheater to little pop-up stages. Over the course of the semester, there were over 300 events outside. There were 14 classes that regularly use the outdoor venues. Student organization meetings outside, lots of student life activities, regular health and wellness fitness classes, yoga, and things like that. And another 25 miscellaneous events. You see people sitting out on the, on the field at the stadium. I think that was for the showing of *Cinema Paradiso*. This allowed our first-year students, in particular, an opportunity to connect with others on the campus in a low stress, high safety environment and to get a sense

of the feel of this campus which has always been such a vibrant place for particularly the Arts and the Humanities, but for all kinds of student life activities. We were thrilled to be able to show movies outside quite a bit up against a number of walls on campus. We would, we had a lot of people participating and how to get these venues activated. I want to give a particular shout out to the Indiana Memorial Union and the Union Board for really working with what we had available this fall. You can see here a group of students over at the Prebys Amphitheater. I don't think there has been a single time I have walked by the amphitheater this semester when it hasn't been in use of by some, usually some performance-based group. And as you know, First Thursdays, which is always outside, continued and turned into First Thursdays trail. So, you could work your way through the campus, and to a number of events and these outdoor venues really helped with that.

So, this allowed us to really open up this beautiful campus for the kinds of things that a residential college experience typically would offer even in these constrained circumstances, and I cannot thank enough, Doug Bohr and his team, that group is responsible for doing all of the mitigation testing all semester. They did the on-arrival testing. But they were also responsible for all of these wonderful venues during the course of the semester.

So, if there's anything good that has come out of what we've been through this semester. I would say our understanding that we can activate our campus in this way and really make use of what I think is the most beautiful campus in the United States would be to my mind, it. So, with that I'll conclude my happy report.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

ROBEL: And open it up for questions or comments to members of the council.

LION: Will these spaces continue to be available next year and maybe after that and for a very long time?

ROBEL: I think so. I think what we've determined is that these are really useful spaces to have. So next semester we've worked with Tom Morrison's office, and I know Venkat, Vice Provost Venkat, has done quite a bit of work to make sure that we're able to keep them going and to get some heat into them for the spring semester. And not just from the, the heat of the many dancing bodies of our students. So, I think this is something we ought to be able to continue going forward. It's certainly allowed us to activate some possibilities we haven't had in the past.

LION: I would also think that even when the whole COVID thing is over and we're still on campus and its sort of business as usual. It's still great to have these spaces because I think of course about the performing art students and we have, they might be able to use that and even some performing art professor, we just really encourage these spaces to be used all the time.

ROBEL: Thank you. Any other questions or comments?

ARANYI: Hello Provost Robel, this is Rachel Aranyi, the President of Student Government. I want to draw your attention to a resolution that IU Student Congress passed last night in favor of satisfactory fill grading for this semester. This is something that Student Government believes benefits, would benefit students due to the extreme amount of stress and uncertainty that students had been under this semester. And I'm wondering if there's any way that this could be possible for this semester.

ROBEL: The Educational Policy Committee has in fact been looking at pass-fail grading and possibilities for pass-fail grading. I would defer to J Duncan on this, but I will tell you that this has been a discussion item in the Big Ten for most of the semester. And right now, within the Big Ten, it's only Michigan State and Penn State that has gone in this direction. The difficulties of moving, so the students are able of course to withdraw from courses up until the very end as a result of the action the council took last time, at our last meeting. And that should alleviate quite a bit of stress if students think they're headed towards and towards an F.

On switching grades from grades to P, the thing that has been of concern, at least in the discussions I've been in among the Provost of the Big Ten is that this is a short-term response that might have serious downstream consequences for students. And the biggest set of issues that other Provosts in the Big Ten have raised have had to do with concerns about the fact that this has not been universally adopted across the United States. And therefore, it might adversely affect students who are headed to law school, medical school, and graduate school. And that there are concerns that accrediting agencies and for some of the programs on various campuses have not indicated a willingness to go along with a long pass-fail set of proposals.

The two universities that did adopt pass-fail for the semester, Michigan State and Penn State, couple that with the faculty not being subject to "grading". That is, they're not using their student evaluations for any purpose. Something that I know Student Government objected to when this council looked at it also earlier in the semester. So, I'm confident that the Educational Policies Committee will continue to look at this. And I would direct you there if you would like to continue to pursue it. But I do think there's more than one side to this. There are concerns, particularly among students who are headed to an advanced degree of any kind that pass-fail grading is something that would be difficult for them. So, I'm not sure if J Duncan is on and would like to say anything else.

SIMPSON: He is.

J. DUNCAN: I'm here and certainly you're welcome to forward a copy of the Student Government resolution to us. We'll take it as another piece of what we're considering right now. We've reached out to a number of units and programs to provide us with some feedback for how pass-fail or something similar might be implemented during the COVID terms. We are not currently in a position where we have all of that information and therefore, we're not ready to bring a proposal to the BFC at this time.

SIMPSON: We have two questions. I see your hand, Lisa. And we have two questions that are ahead of you. So, it's Israel, Ruhan and then Lisa. Okay.

HERRERA: So, I don't know if maybe Lisa question is related to Jay's information. So you can go because my question is different from this.

SIMPSON: Well, there's someone right after you. Lisa, if you would mind, if we can take that order so we can come back. So, Israel, go ahead and ask your question

HERRERA: Right. So yeah, my question is related to the DACA students, Castilians, there were several changes happening during the weekend. So Lauren, I don't know if you happen to have the number of DACA students that we have in this moment and also have a question regarding the work possibilities they have because I know that they are, for administrative admissions, they admitted as international students in, but they have the in-state tuition. And I

wonder if they are accepted as international students if they have the same limitation, working limitation as international students or not? My other question related to that is the BFC scholarship for DACA and underrepresented students. I don't know if this is going to happen this year.

ROBEL: I'll start with the question, of how, is John Nieto-Phillips with us today? Do you see his name on the list? We had a discussion this morning about DACA issues in the vice provost meeting. As you know, DACA is a program that has been on a roller coaster ride for the last several years and is now and things are now looking much more hopeful going into the Biden Administration, which has signaled that it will make permanent the issues around the protections around the DACA program when it when it comes in.

So, I know from the discussion this morning that we have, all of the campuses, in fact of IU have smaller numbers of DACA students then we have had in the past. I know that John Nieto-Phillips and the Office of International Services stays in very close touch with our DACA students. And that's necessary because of the various legal issues that have been swirling around the last couple of weeks. And if you'd like to have, probably it would make sense when we get back as opposed to right now. I'm sure that John and Chris Viers would be happy to come and talk about the issues around those students. Okay. And I think Ruhan was next.

SYED: Yeah. Hi everybody. Once again, my name is Ruhan Syed, I'm in the Student Body Vice President this year. And I just had a follow-up question to Rachel's and thank you for clarifying the position of the pass-fail and satisfaction and satisfactory across the Big Ten. And I guess my follow-up question, is a lot of the students who started this petition and have come to IU Student Government are facing some incredibly extenuating circumstances with financial instability or losing family members. So, I was wondering, is there an avenue for students in these situations do to COVID to be able to opt into a satisfactory or satisfaction grading system. Because especially auto-W or W just doesn't work for them because of the cost of retaking a class or throwing off their four-year plan for university to go look at advanced degrees afterwards.

ROBEL: I would urge anyone who was in that situation to work carefully with their advisors to try to make a plan. And I don't want you to take my explanation of what's happening in the Big Ten as opposition to this idea. I just think it needs to come through the Educational Policies Committee and I know that it's under consideration there and being discussed with the with the schools.

SYED: Thank you so much.

ROBEL: You bet. Who's next?

SIMPSON: Lisa.

ROBEL: Okay Lisa.

THOMASSEN: Yeah. I was I'm sort of glad it came around to this because I was just going to drop my comment. But I am on the Educational Policy Committee and so I've been talking with our advising staff about this and hearing what the students have to say because they hear that we have five advisors in our program and also getting the advisors take on it and, you know, what their concerns are. And of course, the satisfactory unsatisfactory isn't on the table as was discussed, this would be sort of a pass- fail because of all the reasons that the Provost mentioned.

And they had real reservations about it, not only for the consequences of students going on to graduate programs and how this is going to be interpreted, but that is also, students are looking for short-term relief. That long-term is not in their best interests, but also for things like meeting major requirements as well as people who switch majors. They really believe that the W, the policy that was put into place offers that short-term relief for a really disruptive semester. And I'm in sympathy as we all are for the challenges that students are facing and you have to believe that the faculty and administration have only the student's interest at heart. And that these are decisions that are made, they're going to affect not just some students, but in fact all students and in ways that the consequences might not be known. So that's just to share with you a little bit of some of the background work that some of the consideration that goes into it. I know that's not as satisfactory, especially when folks want to get through, meet their goals to get their degree on time and have those financial considerations. And hopefully they'll be mechanisms to help students with that. It's very hard and it's been hard for instructors, as an instructor to see students struggle. And certainly, online learning, it's not what people expected or hoped it would be that you could take the same load of courses and be as successful. Students who are usually successful are just not as successful. And it's been very hard for instructors and students alike. But I just wanted to give you a little bit more of that sort of background story.

ROBEL: Great, thank you so much Lisa.

SIMPSON: There's a comment from Kari Johnson in the chat. Would an incomplete be a reasonable accommodation for this purpose?

ROBEL: That's why I think it's important for students to work individually with their advisors who can help them in situations where they need some kind of accommodation.

SIMPSON: Ok. Diane and then Israel.

HENSHEL: My point was exactly that. In this kind of a situation, I invariably gone, worked with the student, and given them and incomplete. And then they work out how much time they want to take but they have a year, and they can even extend it beyond a year if they need to. So, it's a very flexible type of way to handle a situation in which there's a short-term problem. So, I do agree that this is an individual situation case-by-case and would be best to address that way.

ROBEL: Alright, let's if I could Israel, I'll take yours as the last. I'm going to try to keep us so that when Dr. Carroll and Stew come in, we can get them in and get them out no matter where we are on the agenda.

HERRERA: Right so yeah. The other question that I have, is regarding the Study Abroad programs and the Global Gateways and the Global Gateways grants. So, I don't know if you have Lauren, any updates because I know that programs like in Peru, Madrid, and Barcelona, they have been cancelled. So, I don't know if you have any update about the summer study abroad and also the update about the Global Gateways in fall.

ROBEL: I don't have any updates on the Global Gateways. I know the Study Abroad programs. The Restart Committee has looked at that. And I think where we are at this point is that study abroad, in some countries for the entire semester is, will be permitted. But I can get, I can certainly get more information for our next meeting.

And I see Ruhan asking if it would be possible to send an email telling students what avenues they currently have to help handle extenuating circumstances. And I will get that out to the students.

SIMPSON: And also do you see Bradley Levinson's comment as well, that he would hope that your early directives to the faculty about sincere efforts to accommodate students' situations.

ROBEL: Thank you Bradley.

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

ROBEL: Alright. Well, let's take a look at the proposed amendments to BL-ACA-D9. This is a second reading and an action item. And I'm hoping perhaps Rachel and Alex, it's not a controversial one.

TANFORD: Me too. I can't imagine it would be. Just one thing thought. I couldn't do it in comments because I'm not actually a member of the BFC. But now that I have the floor just for people who missed it. In today's New York Times, in a story about students going home for the holidays, IU was singled out and praised for its testing program.

All right, what we've got here today is proposed amendments to the bylaws second reading for the nomination process. Just a quick summary from last time, our current practice is with candidates being nominated by other people. So, we never know whether or not they had permission to nominate the person. So, we spend weeks trying to, Elizabeth Pear, spends weeks trying to run these people down and find out if they consent to being on the ballot, that delay in that process, in turn has moved the starting date up from when we have to start this process to the worst possible time of the year, November, when everyone is doing final exams and grading and the holiday is coming up and things like that. So, people aren't necessarily paying attention to emails from the Faculty Council office. The net result is that it doesn't produce enough candidates. And we've had situations where individual seats from some units, nobody gets nominated at all, and no clear procedure for what to do in those situations.

So, our proposal is in two parts. One proposal, but it addresses two aspects of the nomination process. The first is to replace the third-party nomination with a self-nomination system. That eliminates the delay in verifying people want to be candidates and basically opens it up to a more democratic process. It includes in here the elimination of redundant language. In the old days, the list of faculty that came from the Vice Provost of (inaudible) to be divided by tenure in non-tenure track. That's now redundant because we have separate non-tenure track seats. So that's all is divided by electoral unit, election units. So that's part one.

Part two has to do with the preparation of the ballot itself. It replaces the old, somewhat cumbersome rule that some candidates were eliminated between the nomination and ballot process because we narrowed it down to two candidates proceed based on who got the most nominations. A process that over the years, and nobody on this campus has ever completely understood since that it takes multiple nominations to get someone on the ballot. We've eliminated that in favor of everyone goes on the ballot. Much simpler. Everyone goes on the ballot who self nominates. Now, if that passes and we anticipate that it will, that means you can expect down the road a further amendment to deal with what we do in multi candidate races, in

say, five people running for one seat where no one gets a majority. We'll have to think through whether or not we should go with plurality or run-off election to resolve those situations. And if anybody has any, anyone on the BFC, has any thoughts about that. Please email me or Rachael or Elizabeth or one of your co-chairs, anyone who can get that to the Constitutional Rules Committee as we think through that.

Second thing this does is it addresses what happens if we don't have any volunteers out of a particular electoral unit? The answer is we'll then just declare the seat vacant. And under a vacancy policy, we then delegated to the policy committee of that unit to find a candidate. And in the interim so that nobody goes unrepresented, we invite the current holder of that seat to continue to represent that unit until the unit finds a replacement. There's the clean copy of part one and the clean copy of part two anyway, that is the proposal. We have no specific procedure in the bylaws for amending the by-laws. So, we've always gone by the policy of two readings and a two-thirds vote.

ROBEL: Thank you so much, Alex. And we'll open it up now to questions.

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

ROBEL: So, I see at least on the in chat from J Duncan.

J. DUNCAN: So, I have a couple of questions about this. First of all, I really like it and I think it will make things a lot better. So please take my comments with that in mind. The first thing is that there has occasionally been an unexpected benefit to people nominating you without talking to you, which is to say that we get occasionally some people nominated who might not have considered a self-nomination or running on the BFC, who then do decide to go ahead and run because someone else put them forward. So, I would ask that this be coupled with an effort to reach out to the faculty and continue to advocate for people to engage with the BFC so that we can keep the numbers of people who involved high rather than seeing the same people running over and over again minus the term limit part.

The second thing is that my suggestion for multi candidate elections is instant runoff voting, so that we avoid having to have an extended run-off election process.

ROBEL: Thank You. Are there other questions? Hearing none. Are we ready to vote then?

Elizabeth, will you do the honors?

All in favor of this proposal?

Great. Thank you. And Elizabeth, you'll report in seconds, I think. Oh, there you go. Hit it out of the park Constitutional Rules Committee. All right. Let's see what happens on the next one.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BL-ACA-H28 FACULTY INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES TO EXPAND THE DEFINITION OF "EARLY EVALUATION" TO INCLUDE INSTRUCTOR OBSERVATIONS AND FEEDBACK, IN ADDITION TO "LETTER GRADES"

ROBEL: And I will start the discussion here. But if our guess come for, if Dr. Carroll comes while it's still going on, I may cut away to him and then finish this discussion if that's all right. J, I think this is you and David. Proposed amendments to BL-ACA-H28.

J. DUNCAN: Indeed, I think we have some minimal slides to share with you. I'm also hoping that this will be a fairly non-controversial change, although I always solicit people's opinions. Elizabeth, I'll go ahead and share the slides on my screen. So alright. So here we are. Hold on. Okay. There we go. All right. Hopefully, people can see the correct screen. So, what we're proposing today is an amendment to the policy on faculty instructional responsibilities that has to do with early evaluation. So currently, the systems that we use for early evaluation are in the process of changing. We have two that we have at the moment, the SPR and the SER, the student performance roster and the student evaluation roster, I should say that the proposal has nothing to do inherently with what system we use. Rather, it has to do with expanding our ability to give different types of feedback to students. When this policy was originally created, the intent was that students would be given a mid-term evaluation in the form of a grade, a letter grade. However, for a variety of reasons faculty don't always feel that they have a letter grade to accurately represents students' performance at the midterm point in the semester. And the new tools that we have allow us to give many more types of feedback.

So, I've got the red line version here, and we'll take a look at that first. So essentially our proposed amendment here is that we have the ability to give more than just grades as midterm reports for students where that is appropriate. So, I'd like to draw people's attention to the line that says observations and recommendations sent to the student. This is the core of this proposal that we're suggesting that it's not required that a letter grade be submitted instead, although faculty still can submit a letter grade, the SER gives us the ability to give a lot of additional flags to students. Some positive, some negative. But the level of detail that, that can be given there is much higher than it was in the past. So, this lays out that idea, letter grades and rather than restricting things to just a letter grade is how I see this. So, there's some language that has to be cleared up here so that we can specify that this is broader than it used to be.

The other section is down here. Again, just replacing a letter grade with an evaluation of progress where the evaluation of progress could be a letter grade but does not have to be. And so, the language has been expanded in that way. I do also have a clean copy of this if people want to see it altogether in one place. So, here's the first part that you give this evaluation at midterm. And again, the population here stays the same. It's junior division students. The evaluation can consist of a letter grade, but also can be observations and recommendations. And again, the clean copy for the second piece where we have changed that language to be more expansive. It is still possible that it is a student that gets a letter grade, but it is not required to be. I'm happy to go through any of these pieces. So, questions about this.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Duncan, I have a question, please. You articulated some beautiful reasons why you are bringing the proposal before the council today, but I would like to know where their other animating reasons for bringing the proposal to us today? What spoke the idea into existence? Did your committee just say we need to do this, or did we get comments from students, concerns from advisors or anything of that nature?

J. DUNCAN: Sure. So, first of all, just to clarify, because this is probably the thing, I encounter a lot of misunderstanding for in my daily life. My name is J. Duncan is my last name. So not my first name. I know it can be read as a first name in American culture.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I love the name Duncan so that's why I said it.

J. DUNCAN: So anyway, this comes to us from the registrar and from the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs. So those are the people who brought the suggestion to us. We have discussed it in EPC for a couple of meetings. We brought it to Exec, had some additional commentary there, and that is where this proposal comes from.

ROBEL: And just to clarify, this is a discussion item. It's at first reading.

J. DUNCAN: Yes.

ROBEL: I'll note, from the notes, there's a request that the language in the proposal will be made gender neutral.

J. DUNCAN: Oh wonderful. I love that. Where specifically? I think I tried to look for those. Did I miss it?

ROBEL: I think this student is referred to as his in several places.

THOMASSEN: In the clean copy it's now the beginning of the third line.

J. DUNCAN: Yes, I see that. Thank you very much. I would like to take that as a friendly amendment and absolutely make that language gender neutral.

ROBEL: And then from GPSG, there is a request that the feedback be given in a durable format as opposed to, for example verbally, for record keeping purposes.

J. DUNCAN: Alright. So, they mean there that it not be merely verbal?

ROBEL: Yes.

J. DUNCAN: Yes. Certainly, I think that's reasonable. I'm happy to say that this needs to come in some manner other than just an oral evaluation. Great. I will take that as a friendly amendment.

ROBEL: And then from Diane, will this need to be, and I think you're going to have to explain what you mean by a set online form or does this just requires some feedback to the junior division students within the first month of the semester.

HENSHEL: So, when I've seen a variant on this before, it was to fill out those forms in the course response piece. And so that meant actually transferring information from your gradebook to this online form effectively for every junior division student that you have. And for the people that are teaching several 100 to even a few thousand students, that is extraordinarily time-consuming. So, how is this feedback to be given? I don't see this really being specified it.

J. DUNCAN: It's because it's not. This is agnostic of how it's specified as long as it's compliant with the policy.

HENSHEL: Right. So, does it just mean that therefore, the faculty needs to make sure that they get something back to the junior division students within one month?

J. DUNCAN: You need to have a written evaluation of their performance. That is the requirement. The means you used to do so is not specified here. The university obviously

provides things like the SER is one option. But this policy does not mandate that you use the SER.

HENSHEL: And that is of every single junior division student instead.

J. DUNCAN: Which is the current policy, and we are not currently proposing any changes to that.

ROBEL: Right. Alright.

ZORN: Lauren and J, can I jump in for a second?

J. DUNCAN: Sure.

ZORN: This came from the Registrar's office and my office. Mark McConahay is not here, but Erica from his office is here. I'm going to basically one of the reasons to go back to Carolyn's question. One of the reasons we're suggesting this because as J alluded, well, we now have the student performance roster and the student evaluation roster. Bloomington is to my understanding, the last holdout with regard to the SPR, the student performance roster, and it will go away come the end of the spring semester.

Actually, when I first took over the acting role if the idea were to do it after the fall semester and I encouraged us to extend that deadline for the spring to let us get through this rather difficult year. The idea is to change the early evaluation, which J is already aptly noted, is the requirement to take full advantage of the robustness that is available in the SER as opposed to the SPR, basically allowing the faculty member to have flexibility to provide a letter grade if she or he so chooses. But also, to comment on the student's attendance, participation, assignments, quizzes, and exams, writing quantitative skills, overall engagement, leadership, a whole raft of ideas. So, this is a much more robust mechanism to communicate.

There was a question in the chat that asked, how will advisors be looped in? Well, they are automatically looped in. This is part of the beauty of SER advisors are part of the recipients of this type of information. So, we can have the advisors help us intervene with students when they're facing some difficulty and some challenges. I hope that helps a little bit. Erica, you may want to augment my comments.

KNUDSEN: I think what I can add to the discussion is yes, the student engagement roster, which is the relatively new tool to add student feedback to students regarding attendance and midterm grades through that. It's also a little bit broader than that because it allows for evaluations not tied to a percentage or a letter grade and that in the Registrar's Office is one of the problems that we hear the most frequently from faculty. We send out notifications that you need to provide feedback in terms of a grade, to your freshman and sophomore in the university division. And they say, "well, we don't know yet. We haven't working, picking intensive writing. We don't have a paper that's there yet." And so, we tell them, you know, do the best you can. But these various options, not tying the policy to grades specifically opens up other avenues for evaluation.

J. DUNCAN: One thing I'd like to say is that I think people have some legitimate questions or comments about the implementation of SCR specifically, for that I would direct them to Tech Policy. Tech policy handles that.

AGENDA ITEM NINE: UPDATE ON INDIANA UNIVERSITY'S RESPONSE TO THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

ROBEL: I'm going to ask J for you to stop sharing now. Actually, because we are at 3:30 and we have Dr. Carroll and Stew Cobine with us. And I will come back to this discussion after we have an opportunity to hear from them and let me say a few words about both of them.

Stew Cobine is Associate Vice President and Chief Audit Officer, and this is his first appearance before the Bloomington Faculty Council. How many years have you been at Indiana University Stew?

COBINE: A long, long time. Thirty plus.

ROBEL: So, this is a historic moment. And for those of you who don't know what Stew and his team do, Stew and his team keep Indiana University honest. Their job is to ensure that we are following our own policies and that we're doing what we said we would do. And particularly with matters that have anything at all to do with finance or integrity. So, I have had the absolute pleasure of working with Stew for a number of years and his audit reports are something that happen whenever there's a leadership transition in any unit. Whenever there's any reason for us to think, it would be a good idea for us to understand more completely what is happening in a unit. And I've invited Stew here today to talk about how internal audit has been auditing our, has been truth testing our commitments around COVID.

And then of course, I've also invited Dr. Aaron Carroll, who is a Professor of Pediatrics and Director of Surveillance in Mitigation for the COVID-19 Response for Indiana University also, I believe has a title with the Big Ten now and is as many of you know, the star of the highly ranked Ask Aaron series that is on multiple times a day and I'm sure we'll be in reruns next year if we get our vaccines. So, I know Stew thought that he could talk through what he is doing a good three to five minutes. And then I think I'll ask Stew if you will start first and then move on to Dr. Carroll.

COBINE: Well, thank you for that kind introduction. Provost Robel. I do want to thank you and Faculty President Walbridge. And it is in fact an honor for me to be to sit here with this highly esteemed group today. Again, Lauren, thank you for the invitation to share just a little bit of a high-level summary of some of the projects and internal audit has in progress that are designed to provide a measure of additional assurance that the protocols and the controls designed to maintain safety of the campus community and to mitigate the COVID related risks are in fact in place and functioning as intended. I do need to kind of put a little caveat here and specifically mentioned that our efforts are still very much a work in progress. And we have people today out on several campuses and we're trying to wrap our work up, fieldwork, so to speak, before Thanksgiving so that we could then provide a report back to Provost Robel and President McRobbie and other stakeholders, shortly after Thanksgiving. So I can't get specifics and reporting out results yet, but I do want to be able to provide a good sense of the nature of the work that we're doing.

Internal audit is conducting a series of consultative reviews on the Bloomington campus, the IUPUI campus, and most, if not all of the regional campuses that focus on COVID safety in response protocols through interviews with numerous key campus personnel, on-site observations in a large number of facilities. We're assessing whether these COVID risk protocols

are being followed. Sources of input that we've tapped, developed a review program and the onsite observation checklists include CDC guidelines, environmental health and safety guidelines, facilities operations guidelines, the IU Restart Committee Recommendations Report, and IU Health and IUPUI Health Center a Guidelines among others, as our some of our source material for the work that we're going to be doing.

But the specific COVID risk areas and I'm going to hit on just a few high-level risk areas that we're focusing on with much more detail down below these and the work that we're in, the checklists and things that we're using to evaluate. First, the availability and use of personal protective equipment, or PPE, will be assessing and are assessing whether students, faculty, staff, visitors are wearing PPE, are masks, hand sanitizers and similar PPE readily available in facilities? Is appropriate signage and instructions available and where needed training in place?

We're looking at cleaning protocols were evaluating the cleaning schedules for facilities including common areas. We're checking to confirm that sufficient cleaning supplies are on hand in the facilities that we evaluate. We'll be observing physical distancing and noting whether or not seat spacing is appropriately distance and demarcated, observing whether occupancy guidelines are in place and with adequate signage, whether plexiglass barriers are in place where appropriate.

Another area that we're looking at is that of air handling infiltration will be checking in our checking air handling unit maintenance schedules and records, air filter replacement schedules and records. We'll also be looking at employee training and assessing whether adequate training has been available and is available and is actually being taken by the appropriate staff and members of the IU community. Areas that will look for specifically kind of within the training area include is there training on basic and has there been training on basic understanding on the nature and effects of COVID disinfecting protocols in general, but specifically in the COVID environment. The correct use of PPE during cleaning and other operation operational activities. Disinfectant products in their appropriate use, things of that nature.

And the last broad area that we're looking at has to do with effective in university communication. Specifically, when a positive case is identified in one of our facilities. Things such as will be looking at, are there good communications and formal communication channels open between various stakeholder groups, residential programs and services, academic research, leadership, EHNS, facilities, operations, building managers and the campus. And appropriate as appropriate if there are, you know, well informed and well-documented issue escalation in cleaning response protocols when in fact, when there's been someone identified that's had the virus in one of one of our facilities.

I should also mention that the review checklists in the evaluation process that we're using are tailored to different the different types of facility. So, the checklist for an IU operated clinical facility like a Student Health Center or optometry clinic, will differ to some extent from that that we use for residence hall, academic and research facility. So, at present, the scope of the project includes a dozen academic and research facilities in a half a dozen residence facilities on the Bloomington campus, a similar number of facilities on the IUPUI campus, and obviously as fewer, a smaller number of facilities on regional campuses.

I mentioned that we are planning to have our observations pulled together into a report for Provost Robel, President McRobbie and senior management stakeholders soon after

Thanksgiving, as soon as after Thanksgiving as we can. But from a high-level perspective, that's really kind of the summary that I had, Lauren, for the group. I again, I thank you for the opportunity and to the Council for the opportunity to share. I know there's a question-and-answer period after Dr. Carroll is able to share. So, I'll stick around and to the extent that I can answer questions you might have, I'd be glad to do so. So, thank you very much.

ROBEL: Thank you so much Stew. And now I'll turn it over to Dr. Carroll. We are here. Here we are at the end. Indiana's blowing up around us. Can you give us a sense of where we're headed from here and where we are?

CARROLL: Yep. First of all, I say this all the time but Aaron, please. I think I said, I can't remember which group I've talked to, but I know I've been pretty consistent that even at the beginning when people kept asking me like what would make us shut down enough to send everybody home. I said the biggest thing I'm worried about is that Indiana could get so bad that we wind up having to shut down the state. Because clearly there's nothing we can do in that situation. Unfortunately, we're heading in that direction. When we were having real conversations in August about how we would bring students back and how we would do so safely, we were concerned because there was a surge leading to about 1,000 to 1,200 cases a day being reported. That seems quaint now, given that these days 5,000 is low. And we surged to 8,500 or so on Saturday.

Amazingly enough, however, our protective schemes have worked reasonably well. Bloomington rates on off campus population is held at about 1% plus or minus about 0.5% for almost the entire semester. Our dorms have spent most of the last few weeks under 1%, I think right now we're sitting at about 1.4 for the last two weeks, which is higher than I'd like, but nothing like what the rest of Indiana looks like. The Greek population is surging quite a bit, but for the last two months has been relatively quiet. Our faculty and staff have had just unbelievably low rates of positivity across all of our campuses, never even hitting 1%. I think last week was about 0.6%. That's all great.

We also have to put a lot of the credit to people adopting good behaviors, being careful about social distancing and masking up and making sure that they're not close context to other people and clearly doing the right things with hand washing and everything else to keep themselves safe as possible. And all of that matters. And it's good to see theory put into practice and to see it succeed. And so, you know, certainly everybody can go to the public facing dashboard and see our numbers week to week. But our commitment and our goal was always to make it safer to be part of the IU community, not being part of the IU community that we, in a world where community transmission exists can't legitimately think we're gonna get it to zero unless we can squash it out everywhere. We are around infected people; we live in communities for diseases being transmitted. But our goals were to make it that you are safer and less likely to get infected if you're part of the IU community than if you were not. And I think we've done a relatively good job, if not a good job of achieving that goal.

We are right in the midst of departure testing. We have started up our labs. All of our tests done in Bloomington and Indianapolis now being run on our own Bloomington and Indianapolis labs. Those are faster, cheaper and our ability to do stuff has gotten only better. So, we're hoping to do upwards of 25,000 tests just on those two campuses alone this week. Anyone who wants to get a test can get a test this week. We've opened up slots. I think we've already got about 21,000 people scheduled. That's not a licensed to strip off your mask and go to a party. But it's an added

layer of safety is people are rejoining their homes or traveling or just even checking to see what is going on.

We are then going to pause for Thanksgiving week. But in December we snap right back into play. I talked to too many people who think we're shutting down until February. The opposite is true. We're going to try to do about twice as many tests in December than we were doing in most of November each week, you know, trying to aim again for 25,000 tests week, truly doubling down on our highest at-risk constituents. But probably increasing our testing of faculty and staff and off-campus students because we have significantly more capacity. And those are the people who will likely remain in December. We'll do that in December and in January. We're also trying to figure out ways that anyone can opt into testing each week so that if people want to get tested every week, we have ways that in addition to you've been selected mitigation testing, faculty, staff, or students who want to get tested can. We're figuring out the kinks of that right now and trying to work through them. But we will do that level of testing through December.

Pause again for the holidays. Come right back to that in January. And then do on-arrival testing again in February as students come back antigen tests for all those and congregate living with PCR-based follow-up. But also testing as people come back and arrive again in January and February. And then in February is when we startup school, it's my goal to be able to do maybe like 50,000 tests week. Really try to stay on top of things and avoid the surge we saw at the beginning of the fall, test some of our congregate living students even twice a week if we need to. But test even more people every week so that we can try to catch, and limit infection spread as we all come back in February and then continue testing as we need to throughout the spring because I truly do believe spring is going to look like fall here. It's not going to be eradicated or everyone is not going to be immune. We're still likely in this well into the spring and will be ready to go and continue to do all of the testing and symptomatic testing and contact tracing and education and everything else that we need to do to hopefully make our spring semester more successfully than our fall was.

ROBEL: Thank you so much, Aaron.

AGENDA ITEM TEN: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE UPDATE ON INDIANA UNIVERSITY'S RESPONSE TO THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

ROBEL: I'm sure that people have questions for both Aaron and for Stew.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, Lauren, I have questions.

ROBEL: Carolyn.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, my first question is for Stew. Welcome to our world. I know you have not issued your audit yet, but I was wondering whether you could give us a sense of the whole in terms of how you arrive at these conclusions, is your system points given? Do you just do a check? Or what?

COBINE: In this particular process, Carolyn, we have a checklist that will indicate that generally in the way we approach these is a, like a risk scale, I would say the best way to, to evaluate it and whether or not the controls that we're looking for in place an effective whether there. And we actually do a color scale, yellow, orange, and red, with yellow being very low risk, an orange score being a moderate risk, and a red score being a high risk, needs to be corrected

immediately. So that's the process that we typically apply both to audits and review processes. We haven't quite decided how we were going to formulate our final report at this point in time, but it will involve some kind of assessment of that nature.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Could you give us a preview of what's working spectacularly well so far? And then what, if anything, horrified to you?

COBINE: I can tell you that nothing has horrified us, but that's about as much as I can say because we really do literally have people, I have people out on multiple campuses today. In fact, I think we may be on three different campuses. I know we have people out on Bloomington. And so, they're really going out and it's still very much a work in process, so I don't want to that's why I said I really can't get, I can't report out yet. But what I do know is if something had been horrifying, I would have heard about it immediately. And at this point I'm not getting any sense that there's anything near that range. And that's about as far as I think I can go at this point because I just don't have complete information. Does that answer your question, Carolyn?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes. Thank you so much.

COBINE: Thank you. Thank you for the welcome as well.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: You're very welcome. And my question for you, Dr. Carroll, is what's accounting for the slight surge in Greek houses, do you know?

CARROLL: Alright, so that's an excellent question and we actually, now we have people who do much more retail close work. Problem is we just had outbreaks. One or two houses are responsible for the vast majority of positives that we're seeing right now. It is incredibly hard not to pass this infection in a Greek house. When we made recommendations in the summer as to how to make congregate living safe for dorms, for instance, you know, there were some recommendations we need to de-densify singles, maybe doubles, tops. Only so many people in each bathroom. Definitely don't eat where you live. Mask up anytime you are not in your room. Close all the common areas off, like don't congregate. Everything I just said is and also have significant quarantine and isolation space way over there so that when people are infected or need to quarantine, we get them out of the house, and we move them into Ashton for us implemented somewhere else. Everything I just said is almost impossible to do in a Greek house. They just don't have the number of bathrooms. They can't de-densify. That is where they eat, common areas are why they all choose to live there. They don't have separate quarantine and isolation space. None of this is pejorative. It's like there's no anger. They're not it's not that they're not trying. It's impossible to do what we just said without some significant changes to how Greek houses are constructed and run. On top of that, in a dorm, you may choose your roommate, but otherwise you're somewhat randomly place, so you're not necessarily choosing to hang out on your floor all day. But every single person in a Greek house, that's their reason for being there, is to be social with the people that they've chosen. It's almost impossible to think that they will not be social with their brothers and sisters, but they have chosen to live with. So, when someone gets infected, it's just so hard not to spread it. So, we have outbreaks and we reached positivity rates unfortunately too quickly that it's incredibly hard to control. Now we could theoretically, I suppose, try testing them everyday kind of thing. But even then, all of the recommendations that I just mentioned are almost impossible to pull off in a Greek house. Having said that, we're trying our best and we're gonna work. We're working closely with Greek houses and we're trying to find ways. Maybe find quarantine and isolation space, maybe de-

densify further, maybe really get better with the education, maybe close down the common space, but we're trying to find ways to make them even better. But of course, they're off campus and independent. We can recommend, but they still retain a fair amount of autonomy.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you for that.

ROBEL: Other questions?

SIMPSON: Lauren, Ruhan has a question. And also, there's a comment from Dan Bullock in the chat. I'm not sure if you got a chance to see that.

ROBEL: I'll take a look at that and Ruhan?

SYED: Yeah. First off, I just wanted to say thank you to Dr. Carroll, for I mean, the absolute amazing work you've done by far, much better response.

CARROLL: I keep saying, Aaron please Aaron.

SYED: I feel weird doing that as a student. But I do have to say a much better response than our state and federal government and allowing students to come back and feel incredibly safe in this community. I've heard a number of students already say that they would rather stay here for break because they feel safer here than in their hometowns. So, I guess my question is for next semester, I knew that off-campus living wasn't sampled as much in the mitigation testing. I know that our numbers are being run, more tests are going up. So, I'm just wonder what the plan was to increase that number for off-campus testing. Because firstly, from a student perspective, there's that fear about off-campus residence though.

CARROLL: And I hear you. But here's the thing is like what's amazing is that like Bloomington off-campus numbers had been surprisingly good. I mean, it's very easy to focus on social media and see the spontaneous gathering of 100 students out there in the stadium and then panic that did all, that, everything's gonna go crazy. But the Bloomington numbers have been relatively low for off campus. We have oversampled them, nonetheless. So, we test Bloomington undergraduates at a higher rate than most of our other groups, not including Greek students and the people in dorms. Partly that's because in dorms it's just because the chance for an outbreak is just so high and congregate living that we just need to be much more on top of that. Having said that, because we are doubling our capacity in terms of testing, we will be absolutely testing more of every group next semester than we are this semester. So, testing will go up.

I'll also say that we're also adding in a lot of that opt-in testing, students who want to be tested more will also have that capability as will faculty and staff as moving into December, but definitely next semester.

ROBEL: I'm going to ask Dan Bullock to raise his question because it gets asked frequently. So, could we recognize Dan?

BULLOCK: Sure. I mean, I've often asked this question myself that, you know, is it possible to specify certain community positivity rates or campus positivity rates that would trigger certain policy responses. And I wanted to sort of make sure the specifics of my question are clear. It's not that I'm asking for those to be provided now. I'm just asking, is the administration actually able to do this? Are there systems in place that would permit this sort of activity? I know that actually coming up with those specific policies would be quite difficult.

CARROLL: So, I'm going to put my money where my mouth is. I had a column literally today in The New York Times where someone railed against even New York City because they've and Marion County because they set positivity rates for when they were closed schools. Positivity rates are bad. They're just as much dependent for the most part on testing as they are on prevalence. You know, clearly one of the reasons that Monroe County has the lowest positivity rate almost of any county in Indiana is because of us. Like we do so much testing that we're artificially lowering Monroe County's positivity rates. I don't think that Monroe County should be resting on its laurels and thinking that they're doing great, we're artificially doing that. And so, I hesitate to say, this is the positivity rate at which I would act.

Now I can tell you that what would be much more important is to know like prevalence if we could like how much disease is actually there. But part of it is, how quickly is it spreading? How easily are we able to act to slow that spread? How much we feel transmission is occurring with, without interactions? How safe are people being? When we, the first, the second, third week of school saw incredible surges in Greek houses, we acted, we went to the county and said this is incredibly concerning to us. If this was a dorm, we'd be in locked down. We would say like, you have to shelter in place. We have to really stop the spread. It has gotten out of what we can control. The county has quarantined some of the houses and there was clearly a lot of press about that anode, but it's a wood that was the tool in the toolbox. I can tell you that no dorm ever looked like that. No area of campus ever came close looking like that. But if we felt that we had steps in place to get before there, to get there. So even in week two and week three, when dorms were ticking up and I mean, ticking up compared to, we're talking a couple percent, not the 25% we saw in the Greek houses. Then we said, let's universally test those dorms because we wanted to see if, make sure that we could suppress that. And then we saw that there was no method to it. Like it was just dorms popping up. It wasn't that there were outbreaks. And so, we said let's just universally test the dorms every week because that way we were catching everybody. And if that didn't hold it, then we could take other steps. But to be honest to do that not only held it, but that suppressed it, we pushed it down, I think at 1 even like 0.5% in the dorms.

And so, we don't wait until things are on fire and then say we have to shut down. We take tons of steps before we get there. And so, I don't have a number nor do I think we should set a number and say that's when we shut it down. It's a whole gestalt about how capable we are of managing it, of how, you know, week to week our interventions are working, how it looks compared to the community, and a bunch of other things. So, I resisted it on week one. I'll resisted it publicly on week 13. I just don't think that there's good science or modelling to tell us this is the number and the metric you would use to make a decision like that.

ROBEL: I will say just, I have no idea how many hours a week the members of the medical response team meet and analyze the situation of our campuses, the transmission events, they're seeing the individual cases, the turnaround time on testing, things like that. But I can tell you in every week, I have about 12 hours of meetings around these things and the level of attention and care and detail to, you know, to every, every possible metric you could look at. And then what those mean for each of the campuses is what has allowed us to be here at the end of the semester leaving. And I must say this exactly when we should be leaving given what's happening in Indiana. And so, I just wanted to say I've been convinced that this approach is the only way we can pull this off. And I know from talking to the rest of the Big Ten provosts regularly that there are many other campuses that wish they had gone in this direction. So, can we open up further questions? I see one on deck. Marietta perhaps you have a queue.

SIMPSON: I do have a queue over here. Brian Gill also has had his hand raised for a while.

GILL: Hey, hey, hey. Thank you very much. I am outside enjoying a cold walk during this meeting. Forgive my attire. Aaron and thanks everybody for all the great work that you've been doing and keeping our numbers low and also getting that shoutout from The New York Times is quite nice. My question was, Aaron, you mentioned that our mitigation testing has artificially lowered the positivity rate. And that has been the news circulating in the Monroe County School System discussions. And I'm wondering if you could comment a little bit more on that because that is one of the numbers that they are looking which will keep our children in school or not. And that's been a concern of ours in the community that it is artificially low.

CARROLL: No, no I was going to say look like that's my concern too. I think pegging whether schools should be opening to a county positivity rate is not the best way to do this. I would say that just it's not I don't like it in Marion County. I don't like it in Monroe County. I don't like it anywhere. It's picking one number sort of out of a hat that can be driven by multiple different factors, some of which are related to danger and some of which are not. For instance, we have a low positivity rate because we're doing a lot of mitigation testing. That's not a good reason to keep schools open or closed. It just isn't. So, I would say I don't know why the counties are pegging their decisions to that metric. I would tell them not to before I would say, we should change what we're doing. Having said that, today's column that I wrote was all about why what schools need to do to be safe in all of the things I think we, as the public school should be the last thing to close. We should be closing bars, we should be restricting restaurants, we should close down gatherings. Schools are almost the most important thing we've got going right now. So, when they see their positivity rates and their concerned, I wouldn't be like, should we open or closed schools? It should be we close down everything else so that we can keep schools open. I know I'm preaching to the choir here but we're talking about K to 12 school. So, I get that they're concerned, and I've talked to them multiple times about this. And I just think that it's our responsibility. We should be doing everything in our power to make it as safe as possible, to keep their schools open too.

GILL: Wonderful. Thank you. Thank you for that. That helps a lot. And my last follow up question is the did you mentioned the tests that'll be available is the newer the T-cell test one of those things that will have available for us?

CARROLL: We're not doing any kind of serology antibody or t-cell tests to test for past immunity were just, there's just no-good guidelines on that yet. The tests are not really great or accurate enough yet for us to do anything. For the most part, those are used to like give people a sense of, "oh, I've already been infected, maybe I'm less at risk" and I don't feel comfortable telling anyone that to the point where they might feel more comfortable. We should be careful, careful, careful period. So, the test that we're doing or saliva PCR test. So, I mean, they are PCR tests. They're very accurate, but we can do them hopefully within 24 hours. As opposed to most of the PCR tests in the state, which can take days or more.

GILL: Fantastic. Thank you very much.

CARROLL: Sure.

ROBEL: Marietta whose up?

SIMPSON: Samir.

PATIL: Oh, did you want me to ask it?

SIMPSON: Yes. If you don't mind.

PATIL: Yeah sure. So basically, I know there's a whole lot of uncertainty right now, but we are getting hopeful news about vaccines and there is going to be the holidays coming up. So, I'm just wondering, assuming a vaccine were to become available soon and some are claiming 20 million next month. We can assume that's not going to happen, but still, let's say a vaccine were to become available kind of January, February-ish. What kind of wheels are we planning to put in motion for planning for this, for planning for acquiring them, distributing them, and ensuring that people are vaccinated, and all of those things are we thinking ahead already?

CARROLL: Yes, and to be honest with you, I actually am sometimes, Lauren can back me up, I have to sometimes bite my tongue in the meetings because I think we're almost acting too early because absolutely leadership is acting. I just think that we are not going to see vaccines for most of our constituents on campus for quite some time. It will still take you're right; we'll have millions of doses by the end of this year potentially. But you have to remember the pharmaceutical companies are international companies. They're not giving those all to the United States. Even when we have theoretically a billion doses in the spring, those will be divided up amongst the world, plus you gotta cut them in half because everybody needs two doses. So even the vaccines that the United States get are going to be given out in a prioritized manner.

The first people to get them, were going to be frontline workers like health care workers, you know, people who are in high-risk environments, people in nursing homes and in prisons, the elderly. The last group that's probably going to be in line is like healthy 20 somethings. So even when we have vaccine, there not probably coming to most healthy college students until well into the semester, if not to fall. So, we should, we will be setting up because we still have of course, constituents who are at higher risk and they will probably get the vaccine early and we want to be ready for when it comes, and we discussed this in the meeting I was in before this. So, we are getting ready. Now we know that our healthcare system is going to be a distribution point we expect IU may be a distribution point. We need to know about storage and how we will get this out there, how we will do it. We will be ready. But I don't think it's something that's kinda majorly impact our spring. I think it's much more likely to impact our fall. Having said that, we will be ready no matter when it is ready to make sure that everyone who can get it does.

PATIL: My question was also about, for example, you know if faculty, many of whom might be in high-risk groups and get those vaccines. Once you get the vaccine, will there be different policies around mask use and all of that for people who get the vaccinations or how's that going to be figured out?

CARROLL: Probably not. We're not going to because it's like again, remember that just because you can't get infected doesn't mean you can't transmit. So, we're exposed to viruses and to diseases all of the time. They try to take hold of us, and our immune system fights back. So, we could be exposed to COVID over and over again and have COVID on us or among us. The question is, does it take root and infect us? When you are immune, it should stop that from happening. But we don't know yet if while it's trying to, you could still infect someone else. And because of that, everyone is still a risk to everyone else. And until we are sure that there is enough herd immunity, that we're not going to be transmitting it to each other, we're not going to be able likely to have policies where anyone can just be like not wear a mask, not socially

distance, and everything would be okay. We also can't get into, uh, we can't get into a world where it's like we're asking people to show their papers, to not wear a mask. To say like, well, I've proven I'm immune, therefore, I'm not under the same constraints as everybody else. It's logistically impossible. It's also just a recipe for disaster from, you know, just living amongst each other standpoint in terms of equity and making sure that everyone is treated similarly. So, until we are sure that it is much safer, and this has been like stamped into the ground. I don't think we will feel comfortable loosening most of those restrictions. Which likely means our spring will look very much like our fall.

ROBEL: I see a question in the chat asking about false positive and false negative rates for PCR test that IU does.

CARROLL: So, this is one I wish I could give you better answers if you want to understand logistics about test work in order to determine a false positive or negative, all those things we need what's called a gold standard. We need a test, which we are really sure this is truth, so that we can compare other tests to truth, see whether this is correct or not. Here's the problem, I have no idea which test is truth. You know, we'd like to think that the PCR is the best, but we already know offhand the PCR is not perfect. Why do sometimes we get different results in PCR tests? Sometimes that's how the lab has done. Sometimes it has to do with how the sample is done. And nasal pharyngeal PCR test is only as good as the person getting the sample. Saliva in some studies is better. Saliva in some studies is worse. But in the in those studies where they say it's better or worse, was the truth correct? Or was the test correct? So, I get an antigen tests and I did a PCR test, and they differ. We think the PCR test is truth, but we're not sure. So, it's very, very difficult to say what is the false positive and false negative rate. Because still what we're pegging that to at the end of the day isn't necessarily truth because we're not doing viral cultures to determine whether or not this test is correct or not. What we can say is this. The PCR tests do appear to be pretty accurate in the sense that we can test them on people who are symptomatic and on ways that they get transmitted and everything else. I would also say that for most of our tests, we're worried about surveillance and screening. And all the studies in the world would tell you that when it comes to surveillance and screening and mitigation, what matters much more than test characteristics is how often can you test people, how many times can you test them, and how quickly you can get the results. And that's why we're using this saliva-based PCR test because it is rapid, it is accurate. I can test a lot of people. It's not too expensive, so we can do lots of them and we can do them over and over again. And that's what matters for screening and surveillance when we're really trying to suppress this from a public health standpoint. For diagnostic accuracy, in a hospital, you really probably want the most sensitive and specific test you can get, which is why they still rely, for the most part, a nasal pharyngeal swabs and PCR tests, but I'm not yet convinced that that's still the best way to do it because that's still very dependent on who's getting the sample. So, our tests are pretty good, and they are PCR-based test.

Now, the antigen tests more recently have shown a lot more false positives. That's making the news. I believe that because we're even running lots of antigen tests now and we do a lot of tests where someone's already had this, they're outside the 90-day window, we get a positive antigen test that we immediately check with the PCR and it's negative. Then we get another positive antigen test. We test it again with the PCR tests. It's negative with that kind of repetition. And someone who's already had this, I believe that antigen test has a false positive, but we've not seen that same kind of thing happened with the PCR tests.

ROBEL: I've got a question from Ann Elsner about a hope for a future. And I think it's basically what are the odds we can scale up IU's approach for the whole country?

CARROLL: We could, I say all the time this is a matter of resources and will. It costs money but the United States has money. At which point it becomes will. If you'd asked a lot of people in the summer what we were trying to do, even in terms of our testing, getting the labs; I heard many times that can't be done, there aren't the resources, it's not possible. It can work. Other countries have done this. Other schools have done this. We've done it in a very large scale. And this is when I will tip my hat to leadership because that's the will part and the commitment of resources. It takes, you know, people saying this is going to happen and we're going to put whatever it takes behind it in order to make it happen.

And it's not just money, it's manpower. I mean, if you could have seen, I've said this before, the stadium parking lot for arrival testing. There was like an army of people working that stadium parking lot must have been a 100 people just to do arrival testing for our students. That's will. That's not just dollars. That's, I'm going to make this happen and we're going to all in this together, collective spirit. You know, there are times I said to my wife like this restored my faith in humanity after a rough 2020. Seeing how so many different parts of IU came together. From the events group, from the labs, from the IT perspective, from the hospital system, the public health like everyone coming together to make this work, the number of people working on this a staggering. We lack that kind of collective attitude too much in the United States right now. I think we all feel it. I think we feel it in Indiana. I hope we recapture that in the next few months. It'll take leadership and it will take, will, it'll also take resources from Congress. But it is doable. And I really do, and I'm not the most optimistic guy in the world, but I believe that this is a tackle able problem if we could really get behind it.

ROBEL: Thank you. And I want to be respectful of your time and Stew's time just convey what I'm seeing come up in the chat over and over and over again, which is the thanks of our campus. The deep gratitude we feel for the work that you have done. I will tell you, and I will tell the whole council, I am teaching in-person in the spring and I feel very safe doing it. So, I really think that our mission is a critical one. It is a critical one to the country to be able to run a university like this one, and to be able to do it even with all the limitations that we are all aware of. This fall has been possible only because we have pulled together as a campus. And we have had the phenomenal leadership that we've had from our medical response team. So, thank you from all of us, Aaron. And thank you, Stew.

CARROLL: Appreciate it.

ROBEL: All right. Maybe we could let our guests get on with their day and we'll see you next semester.

CARROLL: Yeah well, we'll be here in December too. Thank you.

ROBEL: And we can return if we would like. You've had a little bit of a chance to think about the about the proposal that's in front of us. It is a first reading and so any kinds of concerns or questions or thoughts that you have can go to J as chair of EPC and we can make the appropriate changes before it comes back to the council at its next meeting.

AGENDA ITEM ELEVEN: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BL-ACA-H28 FACULTY INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES TO EXPAND THE DEFINITION OF "EARLY

EVALUATION” TO INCLUDE INSTRUCTOR OBSERVATIONS AND FEEDBACK, IN ADDITION TO “LETTER GRADES”

ROBEL: Are there any other thoughts or comments for J and David before we finish our meeting today?

J. DUNCAN: Ah Lauren, I just want to share that I did I take the petition from Student Government and forward that to the EPC membership. So, we'll certainly discuss it at our next meeting.

ROBEL: Thank you and I think I see Lisa’s hand up.

THOMASSEN: Yeah. Thank you. So, there were some side conversations in the chat and I'll just bring those up as questions about this particular piece of policy. So initially it was presented as these evaluations would be given to all at-risk students because to sort of ease the burden on instructors who have massive sections. But now it's all students and I'm not saying that it doesn't have value.

J. DUNCAN: No, it's not all students right now. This is not changing the population. We discussed changing the population in EPC, but that did not go through Exec and that's not what we're seeing right here. This has the same population it's always been. Junior division students.

THOMASSEN: And junior division students are who?

J. DUNCAN: The junior students in the university division.

THOMASSEN: Okay. As it’s always been right?

J. DUNCAN: That's what it's always been. Yes. We would like to bring another policy at some point that has a discussion about at-risk students further, but that is not what we're doing at this time.

THOMASSEN: Thank you.

SIMPSON: Erica did you want to say something?

KNUDSEN: Yes, thank you. I just wanted to clarify the population. There is another piece of it that is still part of the population of the early evaluation. It's all freshman on campus, all sophomores who are still in university division, and then everyone who is enrolled in a general education course.

J. DUNCAN: Thank you for the clarification.

KNUDSEN: Yeah. Thank you.

THOMASSEN: Was that everyone who is enrolled in a gen ed. class, did you say?

KNUDENS: Yes.

THOMASSEN: Oh, that's all my students.

KNUDSEN: Yep, now you know how you got them.

ROBEL: Okay and then I see Alan and you have a long comment. Is this something that you'd like to make? I'm not hearing a response. Marietta, anyone else in the queue?

SIMPSON: There wasn't when I looked.

ROBEL: Ok. Well, thank you, everybody, that this was a highly productive meeting and I'm glad that you all, if you hadn't had an opportunity during the fall semester to attend any of Aaron Carroll's many, many, many, many webinars. I'm glad you had a chance to meet him. I will report back when I hear the results of internal audits, audit of our coded protocols. And in the meantime, I think we should just all congratulate ourselves for getting here. And look with Thanksgiving at the coming week, my huge gratitude to all of you. And maybe we can adjourn at our usual way. Thank you, everyone.

LION: Thank you. Have a great Thanksgiving, everyone.