

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
December 1ST, 2020
broadcast.iu.edu
2:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M.

Members Present: Karen Allen, Jim Ansaldo, Rachel Aranyi, Karen Banks, Jonathan Brauer, Dab Bullock, John Carini, Barbara Cherry, Rachael Cohen, Allen Davis, Dee Degner, Constantine Deliyannis, J Duncan, Ann Elsner, Kelly Eskew, Pnina Fichman, Jackie Fleming, Anthony Giordano, Jason Gold, Lucia Guerra-Reyes, Nandini Gupta, Diane Henshel, 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, Miriam Northcutt Bohmert, Sameer Patil, Eliza Pavalko, Chuck Peters, Angie Raymond, Catherine Reck, Lauren Robel, Steve Sanders, Elizabeth Shea, Marietta Simpson, Ruhan Syed, Lisa Thomassen, Samantha Tirey, John Walbridge, Erik Willis, Steve Wyrzynski, Jeffery Zaleski, Kurt Zorn

Members Absent: Hussein Banai, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Dakota Coates, Paul Coats, David Daleke, Lessie Frazier, Linda Gales, Brian Gill, Israel Herrera, Larissa Jennings Mayo-Wilson, Annette Loring, Pedro Machado, Courtney Olcott, Linda Pisano, Lauren Richerme

Guests: Frank Diaz, Sylvia Martinez, Mark McConahay, David Rutkowski, Kashika Singh

AGENDA:

1. **Approval of the [minutes of November 17, 2020](#)**
2. **[Memorial Resolution for Michael Chiapetta](#)**
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-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

[Second Reading – Action item]

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

[B22-2021: Updated proposed amendments to BL-ACA-H28 Faculty Instructional Responsibilities](#)

7. **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)**
8. **Update from the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee (10 minutes)**
Frank Diaz, Co-chair of the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee
Sylvia Martinez, Co-chair of the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee
[Discussion Item]
9. **Questions/comments on the update from the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee (10 minutes)**

TRANSCRIPT:

ROBEL: All right. Well, welcome everybody. I hope that you all had an opportunity to get a little bit of rest and time to step back and maybe take a breath over the Thanksgiving break and we are really in the homestretch at this point. So, I believe this is our last meeting of the semester.

AGENDA ITEM ONE: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 17TH, 2020

ROBEL: So, we've got a lot to be grateful for overall. I'd like to start by asking for a motion for approval of the minutes of November 17th.

HENSHEL: So, moved.

ROBEL: Thank you and a second?

THOMASSEN: Second.

ROBEL: Are there any corrections? And if not, all in favor? I think we could. We can move quickly with this one.

BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL: Aye.

ROBEL: Thank you. Ok, I now turn to our Vice Provost for Memorial resolution for Michael Chiappetta.

AGENDA ITEM TWO: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR MICHAEL CHIAPETTA

PAVALKO: Thank you.

Michael Chiappetta passed away at IU Health Methodist Hospital in Indianapolis early morning on January 17, 2019, at the age of ninety-seven. A fascination with other cultures and a commitment to the internationalizing of American education are the twin threads that tie together his remarkable and varied career.

Born May 23, 1921, in Tacoma, Washington, Professor Chiappetta graduated from Central High School in Detroit in 1938 and from the University of Michigan summa cum laude in 1942. After serving in the air force from 1942 to 1946, he returned to the University of Michigan where he received an M.A. in classics in 1947, and a Ph.D. in philosophy and history of education in 1950. He married Violet Funk Chiappetta in 1944, and their children Vincent and Michael were born in 1951 and 1954.

Professor Chiappetta's teaching career began in the high schools of Ann Arbor, where he taught Latin from 1946 to 1950. In 1950, he became an assistant professor of education at Arizona State University, where he taught courses in history, philosophy, the sociology of education, and comparative education. He further directed the off-campus student teaching program and developed a comparative education program in Mexico.

In 1953, he moved to The Pennsylvania State University, where he became an associate professor of education and head of the Division of Social Foundations of Education. He remained at Penn State until 1960.

During the early part of his academic career, Professor Chiappetta developed an abiding interest in Latin American cultures and education systems. He became a widely known authority in those areas at a time when the United States was first undertaking large-scale programs in technical assistance to developing regions of the world.

In 1960, he was lured away from his academic pursuits to serve as a program officer in the United States Agency for International Development with multiple high-level assignments in Latin America, particularly in Peru. Following his service to USAID, he was promoted to the position of director of the Multilateral Policy Planning Staff of the United States Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. There, he developed international programs in education, science, cultural exchange, and mass communications while collaborating with both regional and multilateral organizations, such as the Organization of States, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the World Bank.

In 1966, Dr. Michael Chiappetta returned to the academic world, this time to Indiana University, where he was attracted by the strength of the area studies faculties and by the commitment of

President Herman B. Wells to international programs. He served as professor of education and head of the Department of International and Comparative Education from 1965 to 1977, which he developed into one of the premier programs in this field. Other service commitments included directing international programs for the School of Education as well as the Center for Innovations in Human Resource Development, serving as member of the executive committee of the Latin American Studies program, and chairing the International Education Council of the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities.

During these busy years with Indiana University, Professor Chiappetta continued his service to outside agencies as well. He was as an advisor or consultant to the Indiana Department of Public Education, World Education, the Ford and Lilly Foundations, and the Interamerican Development Bank. As part of an effort to give American teachers opportunities to study abroad, he designed the National Education Association's International Institute in Mexico, which opened in 1977. He was a Fulbright Lecturer in Uruguay in 1976 and was an invited speaker throughout Latin America. Many of the innovative educational research and development projects, which he helped design and shepherd beyond their initial stages, have endured with significant impact on the educational opportunities for some of the most disadvantaged populations throughout the Americas and beyond.

Professor Chiappetta's scholarship reflected his wide-ranging interests. He wrote about teacher education, literacy, and a variety of topics in comparative education. Fluent in four languages, he published in Spanish as well as in English. He authored, for example, articles in the *History of Education Journal*, *School and Society*, the *Comparative Educational Leadership Delta Kappa*, and in *The Nation*.

He was an innovative and inspirational teacher who employed a comprehensive range of pedagogical skills. He developed and directed several programs of travel study, including leading a group of IU students in the mid-1980s to study at Hangzhou University in China. He exemplified an extraordinarily effective capacity for engaging students with what it was like to live and study in other cultural contexts. A speaker of great wit and power, he won especially high praise for his lectures to large undergraduate classes.

Michael Chiappetta, moreover, was a skillful administrator. A departmental chairperson most of his academic career, he recruited excellent faculty and built strong programs, especially, the prominent International and Comparative Education program. He was especially helpful to young faculty, serving both as a model and a wise counselor.

To all his varied tasks, Professor Chiappetta brought energy, enthusiasm, and an infectious joy for living. A superb athlete, he used his championship handball skills to teach humility to a whole generation of young, unsuspecting colleagues.

In his retirement, Michael Chiappetta maintained a very active lifestyle. Not given to looking back, he viewed retirement as simply another turn in his varied career. Notable is the role he played at the Meadowood Retirement Community, where he lived the last twenty years of his life, leading a very successful Great Decisions program on world affairs in conjunction with the IU University Club. To the very end of his life, he was actively engaged with creating and

steering education programs that contributed to public education on the most important issues facing an increasingly interconnected world that he foresaw and embraced.

Thank you.

ROBEL: Thank you so much, Eliza. Let's take just a moment to contemplate this extraordinary life.

Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM THREE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

ROBEL: I turn now to our President John Walbridge for the Executive Committee business report.

WALBRIDGE: All right, I don't have a great deal of substance to say, but I do want to take a few minutes just to thank all of you. This has been an unusual and difficult year. None of you have to be here on the Faculty Council. For the most part, there's not a lot of glory to be gained from it. None of us are going to get a raise this year as far as I can tell, despite everything extra we've had to have done. You're also unless we overlooked you all on one committee or another. We are well aware that you are here because you care about the well-being of the university, the well-being of your colleagues and well-being of your students, the work that we're doing on the Faculty Council. This year has been unusually important, and I just want to thank all of you for being willing to put out time to do things that aren't your research, that aren't your teaching, but that contribute to the well-being of the university and all of the people who work here. So, thank you all.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

ROBEL: Thank you so much John. I want to start my remarks in the same way that John did. This has been an extraordinary semester. I would venture the most extraordinary in in our 200-year history and every person on this campus has contributed to making the semester as successful as could be possible during a pandemic and a period of fairly extreme national unrest. The level of appreciation that I, President McRobbie, and the trustees feel for what everyone has done from every faculty member to all of our graduate students, to all of the staff members on our campus is as deep and strong as I could, I really don't have the words to express how magnificent your work has been this semester and how much it is appreciated we have brought our university together through a very difficult period. We will face the same challenges in the spring, but we can see the end of the tunnel.

The news on vaccines is as positive as it could possibly be. And so, I expect and hope that by next fall, we will be back in our classrooms and offices. We're watching quite carefully the efforts to distribute the vaccine and I guarantee that we will do as good a job of getting our community protected with the vaccine as we have done, ensuring that everyone is tested and that we have all gotten our flu shots, which, as of this morning we're at some place in north of 80% with our faculty and staff. So that's a that's quite amazing.

I have had a lot of reason this year to think with deep appreciation about the institutions of faculty governance. I've told colleagues at other institutions that it is only through the long relationship that we have had with each other, that we have been able to get through this semester and make decisions in a timely manner to take into account the difficulties, our colleagues and our students are facing and to adjust our policies in order to do what is humane and compassionate with respect to those difficulties.

I had planned last spring. In fact, I had prepared last spring citations and Bicentennial medals for all the living presidents of the of the Bloomington Faculty Council. And of course, I was hoping for a moment when I could present them in person and that time never materialized since last spring, but I've had many, many reasons to appreciate, once again, over the course of the past year the role that shared governance plays in in a well-functioning institution. The role that the faculty necessarily play in protecting the integrity of our academic and research missions. No one else can play that role. The protection of academic freedom. And the deep understanding and concern about the experiences of our students, whether they are graduate students or undergraduate students, nobody else can play the role that we play as faculty and that you play in protecting these critical pieces of our mission through your work on the Bloomington Faculty Council. And so, I would like to just take a moment and read the names of the presidents, the living presidents of the Bloomington Faculty Council, each of whom will receive a Bicentennial medal and a citation in the mail from me. I wish it could be in person and handed to you. But I look over this list of names. Some of these individuals, all of whom I know or have known and some of whom have served multiple times in this role, and I think about the careful, thoughtful, decent stewardship of our universities academic mission that their service to the university represents. And so, if you will indulge me, I would like to read the name of every living member of the BFC who has served as president, and who will be receiving a medal. Rita Naremore, Paul Strohm, Roger Dworkin, Don Gray, Stephen Wales, James Patterson, Norman Overly, Paul Eisenberg, Ed Greenebaum, Ted Miller, Jim Sherman, Robert Eno, David Daleke, Lisa Pratt, Herb Terry, Erika Dowell, Carolyn Callaway-Thomas, Cassidy Sugimoto, Rebecca Spang, Alex Tanford, Moira Marsh, Diane Henshel, and John Walbridge. All of you, every one of you has been an excellent steward of our institution and a valued colleague and advisor to everyone who has sat in my role over the years. And so, I hope through this gesture to thank you not only on my own behalf, but on behalf of everyone on this campus who has benefited from your wisdom and your calm and your guidance and your advice in ensuring that those of us who have ventured into the provost role and the president's role over the years. Our, our healing as closely as possible to the values that a public institution like ours should follow. So, thank you very much.

WALBRIDGE: Well, I for one am honored and thank you very much for your kind words.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

ROBEL: We'll turn now to questions and comments from the council. I'm going to rely on my eyes and ears out there are. Marietta or Diane, do you see any questions?

HENSHEL: I'm just seeing comments. Right now, I'm not seeing any questions.

WALBRIDGE: If I could ask a question. Are we inline to get vaccines, given the need for at least one of them for special facilities for refrigeration that we likely have?

ROBEL: We don't know the answer to that yet. We don't know how the vaccines will be distributed. We don't know whether we will be asked to play a role, although I would have to guess, we will be asked to play a role. We're just at what beginning to get information about what the very first phase, 1A, of the distribution will look like. But it we are monitoring it as closely as we possibly can.

SIMPSON: We could probably remind members that they can either use the raise hand function or post a question in chat if they want to ask a question.

ROBEL: Great.

AGENDA ITEM SIX: 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: All right. Let's move on then to proposed amendments to the Faculty Instructional Responsibilities Policy and I'll turn to J Duncan and David Rutkowski.

J. DUNCAN: Thank you. Since the last time that we convened we've taken some input from faculty and other members about this. So, I'd like to present some revisions. We had to what we had last time I'm going to go through a couple of slides here that will go through and share with you. Alright, so the first slide that I have for you has to do with a piece that we have removed from this policy because it turns out it had already been removed from this policy about 10 years ago. And then it was that was not correctly updated in the records and thus we thought we had to amend it, but it turns out it doesn't exist anymore. I would like to call out Alan Bender for noticing that I do appreciate his careful than detailed attentions here. So, this part, which caused some questions last time about the nature of junior division students, isn't there. And so, we don't have to worry about those at all. So, this is the actual piece that we are proposing changes to the changes that are in red. We're also present the last time that we presented this to the line in purple there I have brought in, because it was originally a change. We had inserted in the previous paragraph that I believe is still worth keeping. Notably, an evaluation may consist of observations and recommendations to the student instead of or in addition to a letter grade. Now, this morning I received a friendly amendment from one of the members of the Council and I would also like to mention that one. It's a very short one. It would go on the very last line of this policy. This is from Jozie Barton and it would add in digital and or hardcopy format. I believe this does address a concern that was brought before the Council last time about whether or not the observations would be durable in nature and this would be intended to address that. That would give us a final version where we to adopt all of these changes that looks like this. I'm happy to bring it back to the red lines, though, for people in questions because I usually find those a little bit more valuable in that nature. So, I feel that at the moment, this is a fairly mild change to the policy. But of course, I'm happy to entertain questions and comments. I'm going to

bring it back to this red line version with Jozie's addition since I can't easily see the questions in chat. Would anybody kindly direct those to me.

HENSHEL: So, there's, there have been questions but not about this.

J. DUNCAN: Okay.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: 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"

J. DUNCAN: Does anyone have questions about the proposed changes that are brought to you from EPC for this particular policy? I'm of course happy to answer other questions if they pertain etc. But I'd like to restrict the discussion to this first.

HENSHEL: Okay so Shanker is asking, what are the main changes in the policy?

J. DUNCAN: The changes are as you see them on the screen. The red lines. The main one is that instead of the policy just calling out letter grades instructors now have the option to present their early feedback as letter grades or observations and recommendations which fits a little bit better with the tools, we have for doing this as faculty these days. It also helps address faculty whose instructional styles. Do not give them an accurate letter grade at this time in the semester. But still, remind faculty that it is important for us to present feedback to students so they can make accurate decisions about how they want to complete the semester.

KRISHNAN: Thank you, J. Can I ask a follow up question?

J. DUNCAN: Certainly.

KRISHNAN: So, if I understand it, right, the policy change, basically, is to expand the set of feedback mechanisms tools available to the instructor without mandating that they do a particular one.

J. DUNCAN: Yes, that is correct.

KRISHNAN: And there was also some discussion last time about who, what type of student this pertains to, that there is no change to that from what I understand, is that correct?

J. DUNCAN: That is correct. And this time, I do believe that we should, as faculty have a discussion about the group that is appropriate for these policies, but at this point, EPC is not bringing a change to that area.

KRISHNAN: Thank you.

HENSHEL: Colin has a question.

C. JOHNSON: Yeah, I just have a question about. So, in principle, I mean, I understand the concern about students receiving feedback in a durable form. But I'm wondering what the implications of adding the hard copy provision are given the fact that the earlier part says that instructors will receive a request for this feedback, which is then, needs to be submitted presumably digitally by the end of the sixth week. Is that correct?

J. DUNCAN: My understanding is that while the request advises you about systems that you can use the policy doesn't mandate that you use them, and you could choose a different format in which to give that feedback. This amendment is about saying that it would probably not satisfy the requirements for you to meet with the student in person and to tell them good job. And then consider that to be sufficient. You would need to put something either in a hardcopy format or you would need to use some digital system. But again, we're not mandating what you use, and the policy doesn't.

C. JOHNSON: But just so I'm clear, so for the last however decade or more than 15 years that I worked here when I've gotten those emails from the registrar's office saying your mid semester evaluations for early career students are due. Those were optional?

J. DUNCAN: The system that you use is your choice, although there are some that are provided to you because they are probably the most consistent means of doing so.

C. JOHNSON: Okay.

J. DUNCAN: But this policy has never said you must use the SER, or you must use the SPR or anything else like that.

C. JOHNSON: But it says with a submission deadline of Sunday after the sixth week.

J. DUNCAN: Sure, and I can imagine you as a faculty member understand how a submission deadline would affect a hardcopy document if you chose to use one.

C. JOHNSON: Okay, I find this very confusing, but, uh, but that's fine.

HENSHEL: Which part is confusing Colin?

C. JOHNSON: As I'm thinking about how this is practiced for years, we essentially received communications from the registrar's office saying mid-term grades are do. Right? You drop them into SIS, and you hit submit.

There was never any sorry. Was there ever any implication that that was a or in practice, was it ever was the implication ever that that was an optional practice. I mean, it may have been a policy. I'm just saying that in practice.

THOMASSEN: I believe there was something required for university division and freshman. The early warning roster. And that was a requirement for federal aid, I think. So those of us who are teaching those classes were already familiar with having this early notification that was about who's attending, who's not attending and also could include this information. I think right.

C. JOHNSON: Okay. Alright, well, we'll see how it plays out.

ROBEL: All right. Are there other questions about the policy? Alright.

BRAUER: I had one and put in the chat. I'm Jon Brauer and I was somewhat convinced by some of Alan's comments last time where you raise concerns about removing the requirement for presenting letter grades. And he suggested or alluded to the intention of the initial policy was to provide those so that advisors can make important decisions early on and help students and so on. And I'm curious as to what the logic is for just not adding observations and recommendations in addition to letter grades and whether we have strong reason to add this instead of language?

J. DUNCAN: My responses that I trust the faculty members to provide an evaluation that is sufficient for the advisors to know the information that they're looking for. And I believe it behooves us to extend that trust.

HENSHEL: Mark McConahay has a comment, I suspect.

MCCONAHAY: Yeah, I just want to, I'm really going back to Colin's comment. I think the nature of the policy in the past was to provide feedback to students in a very deliberate way and that was by way of a letter grade. The intent of this policy is to enhance that policy by saying, it can be a letter grade or an observation, but we still capture it and by defining a group we're in essence saying by policy, you really need to get back to us in this mode for this group of people by a given time. I think the addendum was to simply say, you know, you can also provide feedback in any number of ways to all your students. I still think there is a requirement, unless I'm misreading it J, that in fact the early evaluation policy is still meant to mandate some sort of proscribed mechanism properly evaluation for this subgroup of students.

J. DUNCAN: Oh yeah. It explicitly, it's staying the same with that population of students and it still has the same deadlines, you'll receive the request by the fourth week, and you have a submission deadline of Sunday the six week, nothing has changed about that part.

ROBEL: All right, any other comments or questions?

HENSHEL: Not seeing any additional ones in chat.

ROBEL: And J, I'm not sure where this is, are we voting at this point?

J. DUNCAN: Yes. This was the second reading.

ROBEL: This is the second reading, I thought so. All right, so it comes to the council as a recommendation from the EPC. I'd like to call the question then. All in favor or opposed, as it turns out, with the simple submission button.

All right, thank you so much. And thank you, J and David and the EPC for your work on this.

J. DUNCAN: If I could just before we move on, I would like to ask the general membership for the council to please go to your constituencies and ask them whether they still feel that the population represented here is the most appropriate population and whether they have any other concerns with this policy. EPC will be happy to hear feedback from you. Please send it to either myself or David. Thank you.

ROBEL: Thank you so much. At this time, I'd like to recognize Frank Diaz and Sylvia Martinez co-chairs of the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee for an update.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT: UPDATE FROM THE DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION COMMITTEE

DIAZ: Ah good afternoon, everyone. I'm trying to adjust my screen here. Greetings from me and Sylvia and greetings from Mr. Rogers neighborhood set. I figured this would be a nice way to get everybody in a state of equanimity, as we report on our activities this year. Just a quick check, can everyone see the screen, the PowerPoint? Excellent. Thank you very much.

So, let me go ahead and get started here. First of all, thanks to the BFC for inviting us to report. I don't know when the last time we had a general report like this was, but we are excited to talk about some initiatives. For those of you that are new and or perhaps some familiar with our work. You can see here that we have five basic charges as a committee developing policies related to campus diversity. Responding to campus issues on DEI on our website. It does say affirmative action, but we are working to get that language changed.

We also monitor campus performance on DEI issues. We confer with DEI officers and we prepare an annual report for the BFC, which will happen this year. We're very excited will happen this year. So, we're excited about that.

The folks on the right-hand side of that that slide are all the wonderful people who are working very hard on this committee and you can sort of browse through that. We have a nice, really, really active community this semester.

For our agenda today we're going to cover six items very quickly presidential search letter. Some initiatives on Critical Race Theory, some suggestions we have made for the Digital Measures Activity Insight with respect to checking off diversity initiatives. Some movement on the Diversity in the US, to US co-curricular recommendations. And ba ba ba very exciting, at the very end we will be talking about the establishment of a new teaching award, which we just received some great news from just a few minutes ago. Hot off the presses. So, I'm going to go ahead and pass this over to my colleague, Sylvia, and she will begin the report.

MARTINEZ: Hi everyone, I'm going to talk briefly about two items. First is about the presidential search, we thought that it would make sense to write a letter to the search committee. We don't know if there will be a response or what the response will be. But we thought it was important to make known some, a concern. I don't know if it's concerns, but we submitted a letter recently to the search committee requesting a long list of items, but here are a few suggestions for the search committee, we are hoping that the search committee, along with the consulting firm that they're working with will identify a diverse pool of candidates for the university president position. We hope that the final candidates demonstrate a proven record of institutional change, with a lens in diversity, equity, and inclusion and we're also hoping or, I guess, requesting an expansion of the search committee to include culture center directors and we would also love to see some interaction with our committee. Like I said, we made these requests. We don't know what the response will be or if there will be any response, but we felt it. We felt strongly that we needed to make these things known.

Frank, if you could and the second thing that I want to talk about is a subcommittee on Critical Race Theory. And this was a response to the presidential executive order banning critical race theory in, I guess federal and public institutions or initiatives. In some ways, we feel we're on hold, given the transition in government, but we still thought it would be a good idea to start curating critical race theory resources on campus, identifying faculty centers, and community resources. And so, we're hoping to develop a speaker series, perhaps invite some speakers that do this type of work. And something that came out of our conversation too was sharing this work or resources with the community because we notice sometimes a misunderstanding about what this work is about.

And then lastly, I want to know, given a recent conversation with James Winbush and Lem Watson that Lem Watson does have a website with pretty extensive anti-racist resources. So, he wanted us to share those with you. So, we posted the website there. There's a nice anti-racist checklist for units, departments wanting to do some transformational change. So, we just want to point you to those resources. Frank?

DIAZ: Thank you, Sylvia. Okay, moving on to the DMAI Diversity Indicator Task Force recommendations. We were asked by the executive committee of the BFC to make some suggestions about the DMAI with respect to checking that little box that says I did something related to diversity. We had several suggestions that we sent forward to John and the rest of the committee. But these are the three, I think most salient points. We believe as a committee that each department should be able to establish guidelines for meaningful DEIJ work so that there are guidelines available for faculty to see what this actually means with respect to research, teaching and service and creative activity. We also strongly believe that there should be some reward for actually clicking this and there might be again anticipation, there might be some reward coming. We'd like folks to be rewarded for this kind of work, or at the very least, this should be used as some form of accountability depending upon what the departments want what their goals are with respect to diversity, equity, and inclusion work.

We also felt like the checking of the box might not be as meaningful to faculty or to folks evaluating this kind of work without some contextualization so we made a recommendation that

perhaps we should add some kind of narrative or some kind of opportunity for faculty to describe exactly what they mean by the kind of work that they're checking to contextualize it further. Of course, we don't want to add any more work. The faculty and I know how much we all love filling out the DMAI but hopefully this will be this will, having some teeth behind it, some contingencies, such as rewards and accountability might help.

We were contacted by J Duncan from the Educational Policies Committee to follow up on some work with Diversity in the U.S. requirements that we're discussed in the BFC over the last couple years. Earlier last year, I think we were asked to make recommendations for how to fulfill the co-curricular requirement. We did send five suggestions over that have to do with first year initiatives and then initiatives for the undergraduate student population as they go through. He's included some sessions. The first year for respect and equity. So how to have conversations dealing with respect, an equity and these would be facilitated. Also, a way for students to meet DUS co-curricular goals being tracked through Canvas that we would provide for example, speaker series, events all of them facilitated and curated where students could do some co-curricular work. And have this tracked on Canvas meeting some of the requirements of this DUS. We would also like, of course, for there to be continued engagement reflection evaluation, the subsequent years, of course, those the way that will be formatted will be up to us once the DUS finally gets passed in some meaningful form or in some reformed way. We would like to find ways of making sure students are still involved and actually doing some work, some active work.

And then finally, there were two events, two things, DUS event curator designer committee. We feel strongly there should be a committee overseeing what kinds of events might qualify as the U.S. co-curricular requirements and then possibly having a faculty fellow or a group of faculty facilitators that are funded through some kind of fellowship in order to be able to track all of this work, it would be really quite difficult for the art committee or any other really standing committee to do this through service. So those were our recommendations.

And now finally that what we've been very excited to report up on. Over the last couple years, the committee has been looking at ways to reward the DEI work among our faculty and so we set up some meetings to talk about how to set up an award that would be meaningful. And we did come up with one. We have some criteria we can share with you later once everything is finalized but this award that we are presenting today would reward faculty research creative activity teaching and service efforts on DEI work. The nominations will be evaluated by our committee. The goal is to have three awards, a year at 5000K each followed by a banquet where we would be able to showcase these folks work and have them service, you know, as a point of inspiration and conversation for our faculty and students. And we found out today that we have initial funding provided by the Office of Research and the Provost Office, thank you very much Provost Robel and Fred Cate, who very generously have agreed to fund this initiative for five years at certain amounts. We will be looking in the next couple of months to find other ways to keep this funded in perpetuity for our faculty. That's it. Thank you very much for letting us present. If there are any questions, we're happy to field them now. Oh, it looks like the chat has blown up. I'm going to go ahead and shut this down for a minute.

ROBEL: Thank you so much Frank and Sylvia. Are there questions for our chairs?

AGENDA ITEM NINE: QUESTION/COMMENTS ON THE UPDATE FROM THE DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION COMMITTEE

HENSHEL: So what you've been getting is congratulations for getting the award through in the chat.

DIAZ: Some very hard work and a lot of meetings by some fantastic folks on this committee. So, thanks, especially she's not here, but especially Selena Carter, who is our former chair has just worked tirelessly to make this happen. So, kudos to her and all the good work that she did.

ROBEL: Fantastic. Well thank you to the entire committee that was an inspiring report and I think.

HENSHEL: No, we have one more. Steve Sanders.

SANDERS: Yeah. Hi, this is just to echo something I put in chat and it's really too late to do anything about it now, I guess. But I guess I question the idea that a BFC committee should feel empowered to send its own letter to the Presidential Search Committee without having discussed the contents with the full council or at least the Executive Committee. Maybe it was discussed with the executive committee, I don't know. Because rightly or wrongly such a letter will be assumed to sort of carry the consensus or the endorsement of the full council, I guess, the thing that particularly encouraged me to make this comment was the suggestion that culture center directors now sit on the Presidential Search Committee, I suspect that if you pulled BFC you get a multitude of views about constituencies or groups or perspectives that are not represented as they should be on the Presidential Search Committee. Maybe culture center directors would be among them maybe non tenure track faculty would be among them. And so, I guess I just as I say, it's too late to do anything now about it now. I certainly don't think the letter should be retracted. But I just wondered if the Executive Committee had any input on the idea or whether there's much precedent for the idea of a committee of the BFC essentially purporting to speak for the BFC and sending a letter like this to the Presidential Search Committee.

HENSHEL: Steve, I'm going to speak for myself. I don't think that the DEIC sending a letter to the search committee constitutes reflecting necessarily something that I voted on. I will say that they asked the executive if we wanted to sign it and I don't know if any of us did. But I personally think that it's fine for a committee to express its own opinion.

SIMPSON: Brandley Levinson has a question.

LEVINSON: Well, yeah, I was just, I was actually going to say the same things, Diane. I would respectfully disagree with Steve on this one. I think that I don't think it's necessarily implied that a committee does speak for the council and I think a committee is within its rights to send a letter like that. In fact, I happen to know that a number of other letters have been sent by other faculty and staff groups directly to the committee's or the or the person can be committees and I've been signatory on at least one of those. So, one could argue that it might have been worth taking the

time to bring it to the council to see whether there would be a full BFC endorsement of some sort but in the absence of the time to do that, I feel perfectly comfortable with this.

WALBRIDGE: At least we did talk about it briefly in the Executive Committee, but I think our general sense was that you know something coming from the DEIC you know, should represent their views and that they were within their rights and basically the search committee soliciting opinion from all over. Marietta is a member of it. So, we have not hesitated to bend her ear or she may want to talk since she's at the other end of this particular pipeline.

MARTINEZ: I just wanted to jump in and say, I only pick like three bullet points. The letter does include other constituents in faculty research, you know, so I just picked three bullet points to give you highlights.

DIAZ: The only thing I would say, Steve, thank you very much for bringing that concern forward. We did look to see if there was president the DEIC committee on its own has sent out letters before for Dean searches and for other situations. We were very clear in the letter that this was our committee only that had said this, that we did not sign or we're not speaking on behalf of the of the BFC Executive Council or the BFC as a body, but there were, there certainly was president. Ideally, it would have been fantastic to get full input from the entire BFC. We were pressed for time, as I believe they are starting to, they moved up when they would start selecting candidates, we felt it was in terms of getting our message across as quickly as we could, we felt we had to send something out, but your concerns are duly noted. And we certainly do not have any intention of speaking for the entire BFC as we did this.

ROBEL: Great. I will note, I am, I have been a board member for a national organization that has a lot of committees and this question of committees and their relationship to the entire body or to the governing board is one that is typically through bylaws, and I don't think we have anything in our bylaws that addresses the question of when a committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council can or cannot speak and for what purposes. So, I'd just note that I suspect many of us are also involved in various boards and this is something that's usually dealt with in bylaws. If it's dealt with it all. There isn't anything in our bylaws that constraint our committees in any particular way.

All right. Well, with that, I believe we are at the end of the agenda. Congratulations to the entire council. Thank you for your patience with the Zoom meetings. Thank you to our able assistant, Elizabeth Pear, who has at this point gotten us to all kinds of technological prowess in our meetings and have a wonderful restful holiday, and I will see you back here in the spring. I think we will adjourn in our usual matter.