

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL

February 2nd, 2021

broadcast.iu.edu

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

Members Present: Jim Ansaldo, Hussein Banai, Karen Banks, Jonathan Brauer, Dan Bullock, John Carini, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Barb Cherry, Dakota Coates, Paul Coats, Rachael Cohen, David Daleke, Dee Degner, 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, Nandina Gupta, Diane Henshel, Israel Herrera, Justin Hodgson, Larissa Jennings Mayo-Wilson, Colin Johnson, Kari Johnson, Peter Kloosterman, Ben Kravitz, Shanker Krishnan, Sally Letsinger, Bradley Levinson, Scott Libson, Margaret Lion, Annette Loring, Heather Milam, Ted Miller, Jill Nicholson-Crotty, Courtney Olcott, Sameer Patil, Eliza Pavalko, Chuck Peters, Linda Pisano, Angie Raymond, Cate Reck, Lauren Richerme, Steve Sanders, Elizabeth Shea, Marietta Simpson, Samantha Tirey, John Walbridge, Jeffery Zaleski, Kurt Zorn

Members Absent: Karen Allen, Rachel Aranyi, Allen Davis, Rob Kunzman, Jessica Lester, Pedro Machado, Miriam Northcutt Bohmert, Lauren Robel, Ruhan Syed, Lisa Thomassen, Erik Willis, Steve Wyrzynski

Guests: Barbara Dennis (alternate), Constance Glen (alternate)

AGENDA:

1. **Approval of the [minutes of January 19, 2021](#)**
2. **[Memorial Resolution for David Estell](#)**
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-A3 Bloomington Campus Policies for Non-Tenure-Track Instructional Appointments to include option of 5 year rolling contracts for non-tenure-track faculty (10 minutes)**

Israel Herrera, Co-chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee

Steve Sanders, Co-chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee

[Second Reading - Action Item]

[Current BL-ACA-A3 Bloomington Campus Policies for Non-Tenure-Track Instructional Appointments](#)

[B24-2021: Proposed amendments to BL-ACA-A3 Bloomington Campus Policies for Non-Tenure-Track Instructional Appointments](#)

- 7. Questions/comments on the proposed amendments to BL-ACA-A3 Bloomington Campus Policies for Non-Tenure-Track Instructional Appointments to include option of 5 year rolling contracts for non-tenure-track faculty (20 minutes)**

- 8. Proposed Resolution Regarding Academic Freedom Support for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (10 minutes)**

Israel Herrera, Co-chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee

Steve Sanders, Co-chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee

[First Reading – Discussion Item]

[B26-2021: Proposed Resolution Regarding Academic Freedom Support for Non-Tenure Track Faculty](#)

- 9. Questions/comments on the Proposed Resolution Regarding Academic Freedom Support for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (20 minutes)**

- 10. Possible development of guidelines for the Bloomington campus in the event of financial exigency (10 minutes)**

Barb Cherry, Co-chair of the Creation, Reorganization, Elimination and Merger Committee

Paul Coats, Co-chair of the Creation, Reorganization, Elimination and Merger Committee
[Discussion Item]

[ACA-41 Faculty Role Regarding University Financial Exigency](#)

[IUPUI guidelines: Appendix D Dealing with the Effect of Financial Difficulties Upon Faculty at IUPUI \(pp. 123-131\)](#)

- 11. Questions/comments on the possible development of guidelines for the Bloomington campus in the event of financial exigency (20 minutes)**

TRANSCRIPT:

WALBRIDGE: Welcome everyone. Lauren is not able to be with us today. She is in Indianapolis getting vaccinated she said, I was free to tell you this. And she also wanted me to be clear that she wasn't cutting in line, she was legitimately eligible now, so I will be conducting the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM ONE: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 19,2021

WALBRIDGE: All right, the first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes. Do I have a motion to approve them?

HENSHEL: So, moved.

CARINI: Second.

WALBRIDGE: All right, any corrections, or additions?

Hearing none, all in favor say aye.

EVERYONE: Aye.

WALBRIDGE: All opposed?

Great the minutes are approved.

AGENDA ITEM TWO: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR DAVID ESTELL

WALBRIDGE: The next item on the agenda is a memorial resolution for David Estell, which I presume Eliza will read.

PAVALKO: Thank you very much, John.

David Estell was an associate professor in the counseling and educational psychology department of the School of Education at Indiana University Bloomington from 2002 until his death at age 45 from an aggressive form of cancer on February 19, 2019. David is and will continue to be missed by his family, friends, students, and colleagues.

David was born June 28, 1973, in San Diego, California. He spent much of his childhood in Ridgecrest, California, where he formed a number of lifelong friendships. David received a B.S. with honors in psychology from the University of California at Davis in 1995, and a Ph.D. in developmental psychology from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 2001. His primary doctoral advisor, Dr. Robert B. Cairns, was a leader in the field of developmental psychology. After graduating, David was a NICHD postdoctoral research fellow at the Carolina Consortium on Human Development at the University of North Carolina.

In 2002, David began as an assistant professor of human development in the counseling and educational psychology department in the School of Education at Indiana University. He was promoted to associate professor and granted tenure in 2008. David's research interests included child and adolescent social development, with an emphasis on peer relations and peer dynamics. He examined the impact of peers on the development of aggression and bullying, as well as

academic achievement and self-regulated learning. His research was influential in the field of school psychology. In 2004, David received an award for best published article from the Society for the Study of School Psychology. In this paper, he and his coauthors examined similarities and differences between aggressive and popular students. Then, in 2009, David received the same award for a separate study focusing on social status and aggressive and disruptive behavior in girls. David was an editorial board member of the Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, Adolescent Research Review, and the Journal of Youth and Adolescence, and he served as an ad-hoc reviewer for many other journals.

David was an outstanding teacher and mentor. He taught a wide range of graduate courses, including child, adolescent, and lifespan development, social development, and the biological bases of behavior. He also led a proseminar in human development. As testament to his teaching skill, David was twice nominated for the Trustees Teaching Award. David was strongly committed to the success of his students, many of whom have gone on to become tenured professors at public and private teaching and research universities. He continued to publish with former students, Dr. Martin Jones and Dr. Neil Perdue. David was a positive and supportive mentor who cared deeply about student learning and growth. Throughout his career, David mentored many graduate students across a number of programs in the School of Education, including human development, educational psychology, school psychology, and counseling psychology.

In addition, David provided valued leadership at the department, school, and university level. In the School of Education, he served as the interim associate dean of teacher education and as the chair for the Committee on Teacher Education. David was also a member of the Indiana University Bloomington Faculty Council. Most recently, he served as director of both the human development and educational psychology programs.

Finally, David was a valued and cherished colleague, and he will be remembered for his humor, kindness, and intelligence. David was supportive, ready with ideas and solutions, and he was able to focus on both small details and the big picture. David was the colleague you hoped to have in the office next door.

Thank you.

WALBRIDGE: And have a moment of silence.

Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM THREE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

WALBRIDGE: As I said, Lauren can't be with us, so we don't have her usual fascinating collection of inside information. I just have a few things to mention from Executive Committee business.

First, is that what would normally be the next faculty council meeting on February 16, falls on one of our wellness or as their quote, well you know, mental health days so that meeting has been put off until April, at which time we will probably have more than enough work to fill it.

Second thing is we will have, as faculty, just received an announcement of the new Inclusive Excellence Award, to honor contributions to the university's mission and issues relating to diversity. The information has been sent out. The deadline will be March 1st.

A couple of incidental things from the Executive Committee. We approved a recommendation to establish a task force to review policies. This isn't intended to undermine the existing policies but it's something similar to what's happening with the University Faculty Council's Policy Review Committee which has been going through an ironing out obsolete language practices that we don't practice anymore, making old policies consistent with new policies and so forth. This will not as such, deal with substantive issues that, to the extent that those come up that will be, obviously, working with the relevant committees and critically constitution and rules.

The one other issue that we're starting to discuss is the question of intellectual property, what specifically happens with online course materials that are being created by faculty, which was a rather minor issue in the past, but obviously all of us are involved in it now, there's no decisions but it's something that policy will be looking at.

Okay that's what I have if there are questions that I can answer please ask them, otherwise we'll go on to the next, part of our business.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

LEVINSON: John, I like to raise the point now I didn't anticipate doing this. But in a sense, the fact that Lauren is not with us today, makes it less awkward to raise this this question. And it's a question that I and many people on this council have had over many years and it's why, in fact, the provost presides over our meetings?

And so, you know, and I want to make it very clear, of course, I've been here for 25 years and I've been on the council. For much of that time and so I've seen a number of provosts preside and I admire and care for Lauren a great deal, so this is not a referendum on her particular style leadership, but it's been noted by many of my colleagues that it seems kind of odd that the administer even though of course she is a member of the faculty as well, is the one who actually conducts the meeting certainly talking to colleagues at other similar bodies at our peer institutions, it seems fairly rare. And certainly, I wonder about where people are at with the policy councils in their respective units over in the school of education, of course, the dean does come to the meetings and there is you know, a 10-to-15-minute period for the dean's report but the president actually as the name connotes presides over the meeting. So I just wanted to raise it out that I won't take a lot of time, but I sort of wonder whether there is a sort of majority sentiment along the same lines that people have often wondered if there was something odd about this tradition, it must be in our bylaws, obviously, otherwise we wouldn't be following it but would there be enough, a sentiment to want to actually explore changing the bylaws say for starting next year, so that our dear Marietta could actually preside as president.

Again, this is all is something that I've many of us have thought about and talked about and kind of shaking our heads about over the years and just thought it was odd that the provost presides and not the president, the dually elected president, so I don't know which committee it might be

that would be charged with exploring this exploring whether there's enough sentiment to actually, to possibly introduce a change in our bylaws if we have even time and the remainder of this spring semester, or at least next year.

WALBRIDGE: It is in the bylaws, of course, in fact, the President of the University has the right to preside, should he decided to bother to do so which I haven't seen, and you haven't seen either. And then the argument, you make is valid. The counter argument that I've heard is the fact that the provost presides and ensures that the provost is involved. So, it sort of boils down to a you know, a question of whether the point of principle and what it's worth sort of marginalized and the role of the marginalized and the involvement of the provost and the faculty council. At the university level, of course, the president presides unless he happens not to be there, in which case, either the Bloomington, IUPUI or the president representing the regionals would preside. I'm inclined personally to think that the way we have it now works pretty well and I'm not sure I want to change it. I don't mind presiding over meetings. I've done them since I was in high school.

SIMPSON: John, I'm not sure if you are seeing Rachael's response in the chat. Rachael, I'm not sure if you'd like to just tell us what you've said in the chat.

COHEN: Sure, I was going to say that this, the provost providing is in our constitution so this would require a full vote of the entire faculty. This would be quite an undertaking not just a vote of the BFC um, and so I just wanted to make sure people were clear that that is put into our constitution, not our bylaws so that does require a full vote. It has to go to a committee and then have a vote of the BFC and then a vote of the faculty.

LEVINSON: Thank you yeah and it would have to be a two thirds.

COHEN: Yeah.

LEVINSON: So yeah, I mean I raised this of course just to see whether you know, am I in the majority or the minority. Again, it's not a matter of great input to me, it's just always struck me as a little bit odd, given you know that this is our faculty governance body and, of course, you know the provost or in the case of President McRobbie at the UFC is still going to be present and engaged and there to take questions. But sort of you know, the administration, the presiding over the proceedings, calling on you, you know the privilege to call on certain people, as in the order that one perceives them to have and often the prerogative to sort of decide that it's time to close down discussion and move on. These are not insignificant actions that the presiding officer, you know needs to take. So, I just again, raised the question of whether is there a committee which committee, it would be, what would it be the Faculty Affairs Committee that might explore whether in fact there would be two thirds sentiment and that it would be worth actually pursuing this or people just don't care about that much and it's just a big can of worms that need not be open?

WALBRIDGE: The constitution rules, I assume. Strikes me as a sort of thing that would become an issue if we had a provost who tried to run things with a heavier hand.

LEVINSON: Yeah, and that's why I wanted to qualify that like I've had this thought and this impulse for you know 15 years, well before Lauren so it's not as though I take exception to the way she runs meetings. It's a matter of kind of principle.

WALBRIDGE: That's from the other side, one of the things I mean Lauren has commented on a number of occasions that she has stress to her counterparts elsewhere that you know that if you don't have good faculty governance relations you it's too late to develop them if you really need them.

SIMPSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you, John, we have hands.

WALBRIDGE: We have hands.

SIMPSON: Ted Miller, and then we have Diane and I just saw Dave Daleke's hand and then Steve Sanders. Ted Miller, Diane, Dave, and Steve.

WALBRIDGE: Okay, Ted. It's nice to see you.

MILLER: Yes. Thank you. Well, it won't surprise you Bradley to hear that this is not a question that has not been raised before. I mean there, this has been raised many times over the years. My perspective on what the rationale has typically been that is sustained this practice is that the main job of the faculty council is legislative. Right, the academic policies of the campus are in the hands of the faculty council. One of the main jobs of the provost is to implement the policies of the faculty and the argument has always been that having the provost present during the discussion and approval of these policies will facilitate implementation.

SIMPSON: Thank you Ted.

LEVINSON: I'm not at all questioning the presence.

WALBRIDGE: Okay, Diane?

LEVINSON: Or the creation of a specific time for the provost's report it's really.

MILLER: This guarantees her presence.

LEVINSON: Well, it didn't today, I mean.

WALBRIDGE: Granted a line must be drawn somewhere for the admiralty once said.

COHEN: Let's maybe go to Diane next.

WALBRIDGE: Yes thanks.

HENSHEL: So as Ted said this comes up pretty much every year and the discussion has been had multiple times, both within exec and on the floor of the BFC. And when I look at, so in the past two years, I guess I've been involved with the National Council of Faculty Senate, which is what the faculty governance body is called on more of the campuses than it's called the faculty council. And in an awful lot of the universities that we deal with, if there isn't a strong tie to the provost and or the president, the governance bodies tend to exist without much power. We have

talked about the possibility of asking both McRobbie at the University Faculty Council level and the provost at our level, not to participate and just run it by ourselves. That would greatly decrease the communication as Ted pointed out, and at the same time, it also is going to decrease the buy-in into what we're doing. In my opinion, I think it's really important to have that buy-in when I see what happens on some other campuses maybe more than some other campuses. I think, I'm actually appreciative for the amount of power that we have within our university it sure doesn't feel like that, sometimes. But to be honest, I think that we, when the faculty council pushes for something most of the time things go through.

And just as a comment, if you haven't been paying attention to the news from Kansas, our colleagues a couple of states, three states over. They have had issues with tenure over the past few years, but the Board of Regents has essentially just declared that the six main Kansas universities, the administration of the six main campuses of the universities and that's like Kansas State, University of Kansas. I mean there's a whole bunch of them, are not protected by tenure year for the next two years. Period. Based on COVID and without declaring financial exigency. And to be honest, I can't see that happening because of the strength of our relationship with administration here. I just don't see it happening here. And I actually have come to appreciate the fact that Lauren and the provosts in general have considered faculty governance on this campus to be important and to be in many ways the voice of the faculty.

WALBRIDGE: Okay Rachael who is next? Or Marietta?

SIMPSON: Dave and then Steve.

DALEKE: Well, thank you very much, Marietta and John. You know Ted and Diane really express those, these points very well and I just want to echo what they have said. So, I won't reiterate all of their, all of those statements. I do want to add to it in another way, and that is that my time I found that the interactions that we with the chance of time led to collaboration, so that I don't think we could have had if we stuck to a strict legislative and executive division between our top administrator and the faculty council. And there's a lot of issues that could discuss with the Executive Committee and get discussed in the floor of the council, that really is, I have observed lead to compromises that I think end up with policies that are better in their final version. And so, I think I also agree with you Bradley it was an odd thing to see when I first joined the council. I thought this was an unusual thing. But I think I've come to see that it's unique amongst university senates and I think it's to our benefit not only to be BFC but also the UFC. So, it is odd, but I think it does work, it seems to work pretty well for us.

WALBRIDGE: Okay. Next, Steve.

SANDERS: Thanks, John. I would second everything that's been said, especially Diane's thoughtful comments. Just one thing I would add, in case this is helpful, to underscoring why I think it's important that there be this overlap, this cooperation, this collaboration between the provost as well as a number of administrators, such as David and Eliza in the work of the faculty council. Now, Ted is correct that the faculty council is a legislative body. But those powers are really self-declared, in other words, legally, if you look at the authority of the university it runs from the Board of Trustees to the president to administrators appointed by the president, such as

the provost to the deans and so forth. Unlike the federal government, there is no provision in Indiana University's governing documents or in statute for a legislative branch like a faculty council. That really means if push came to shove, at the end of the day their administrators, such as lower end or the deans or the president are really under no obligation to pay attention to what the faculty council says, or how the faculty council votes. Now we have become very accustomed to the idea that we do vote on policy and that policy gets embedded into campus policy documents. But in some sense that is by this sort of grace of the administration, by the decision that the administration of Indiana University has made for many years to honor the principle of shared governance.

I just wanted to bring that up to sort of specify that if you know the faculty council can go on spinning its wheels without administrators present or involved. But I think it's likely, as others have said that that might diminish our effectiveness of our voice and our collaboration. And again, at the end of the day, we sort of depend on the campus administration to take faculty governance seriously and to pay attention and to feel a stake in it. So, I worried that essentially sort of kicking Lauren out, I know that's not how Bradley intends it, but you know that just wouldn't, the dangers, I think, and the downsides of that outweigh the points that I agree with that it does seem a little odd. We do have in the federal government this kind of thing the Vice President of the Executive branch is the President of the Senate, formally, so there is some precedent for that kind of overlap between executive and legislative functions.

Just one last thing, way back in the late 1970s early 1980s I've been an observer of the BFC since I was a freshman in 1980, covering it for the *Daily Student*. The academic school deans used to sit on the faculty council as well and, at one point in the late 70s, they were kicked out. And my old boss, Ken Gros Louis, who later became provost said as provost he supported that at the time, but he became to think it was a mistake again because the collaboration between administration and faculty really is necessary for shared governance to be effective, so thank you.

WALBRIDGE: All right.

SIMPSON: One more comment, and then I think we need to probably need to move on. Dakota is that last person.

COATES: Yeah, I just wanted to provide a little bit of a student context, as someone who served on both the Bloomington Faculty Council and the University Faculty Council. I think having access to both the provost and the president has been really important, particularly given, as has been mentioned that they're almost kind of required to attend these meetings, given the extension circumstances such as today. So, I think as a student perspective, I think it's definitely good to have them on here and be able to have that and see that dialogue between the faculty, student, and the provost in one forum. The only thing I think that would be good, is if we do experience a shake up with administrative leadership with the new president, would just be to make sure that we continue our current trajectory of communication and collaboration and that, if there were anything that would threaten that, that this would be a good thing for the body to keep track of.

LEVINSON: Can I just interject really quickly just to, by way of finishing up? You know I'm somewhat chastened and assured by my more experienced colleagues' comments that said, you know it seems to me that most of what has been said, to endorse the continued practice is primarily about the provost continuing presence and active engagement. And I certainly have never suggested that we do away with the expectation, if not requirement that the provost be there to deliver the provost report and to continue attending the entire meeting. It's really just about presiding, very specifically over the entire meeting and nothing that anyone said has suggested to me that the act of presiding is necessary to provide that critical engagement, liaison function and so forth that's been used to justify that practice. That said, of course, it's not an issue that I am inclined to pursue with great fervor part because I'm perfectly happy with the way Lauren presides over meetings and again want to end by saying that this is not at all a referendum about Lauren at all it's really about process over time, thanks for indulging me.

WALBRIDGE: Oh, you're very welcome, and I can add to what Diane said, we can look for a bad example, closer to home, which is University of Evansville where the relatively new president as simply decided to abolish, I believe three programs and get rid of 40 tenured faculty. Apparently with at best minimal contact with the faculty governance organization there. We are, I think fortunate.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BL-ACA-A3 BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS POLICIES FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK INSTRUCTIONAL APPOINTMENTS TO INCLUDE OPTION OF 5 YEAR ROLLING CONTRACTS FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

WALBRIDGE: All right. Let us move on. The next item on the agenda is the second reading of the proposed amendments to BL-ACA-A3 Bloomington campus policies for non-tenure-track instructional appointments to include the option of five-year rolling contracts for non-tenure-track faculty. This is being presented by Israel Herrera and Steve Sanders. I will give the floor to you.

SANDERS: John, thanks. I think, Israel and I are going to tag team here a little bit. We had some discussion of the proposal last week, you have it in writing, so I think we don't want to belabor it.

Let me just sort of point again to the fact that the critical language really is here, in what is section seven in the document, which is the only thing that is truly new here as a matter of policy. This language, most of it is pulled over from another existing campus policy so that there is parallelism between these two policies, but A3 is the policy for the Bloomington campus governing of non-tenure-track appointments and really at the end of the day, all this proposal is doing is adding the idea that five year rolling contracts are permissible. There's nothing in existing policy that actually says they're prohibited but the existing policy talks about contracts have a fixed term of not less than five years or a rolling contract of three years. There's been some sentiment that it would be a good idea to make campus policy clear that a five-year rolling contract is also possible if a school wishes to do it. So again, at the end of it, this is not a

recommendation it's not a mandate at the end of the day, it's the only thing that this language is really changing from existing policy.

There was though, based on some questions last week, I think we wanted to provide just a little bit of background. Israel and I will walk through the setup sort of arguments for and against rolling contracts that Lauren suggested we develop. Those would be fairly short just one slide. You know one slide of pros and one slide of cons. But for perspective if you haven't been following this issue as closely as some people on our committee and others have a little background might be helpful, about how common are rolling contracts at IU Bloomington and then at other campuses. Sorry, that is not intended to share.

First of all, Eliza's office has gathered some data about practices at the other Big Ten schools and that's what should be on your screen right now. Specifically, what are their practices with long term contracts. As you'll see, there are some institutions such as Purdue, and such as, I thought there was another one here at Nebraska that essentially don't have long term contracts at all, no matter how long an NTT faculty member has been there. Many other schools have term contracts, some have up to five years and I'm just going to ask Eliza for a quick clarification. Eliza, as I read this, there is no reference to rolling contracts existing in any form at any other campus, at any other university, other than Indiana is that correct, in other words in this column about long term contracts, where it says they go up to three years, or they go up to five years. Those are all term contracts that no other examples were found a rolling contracts at other institutions, am I reading that correctly Eliza?

PAVALKO: For the most part, yes, I think Minnesota, I'll have to look at the list here. I think Minnesota.

SANDERS: Oh, I'm sorry, yes there's a reference to rolling contracts in Minnesota.

PAVALKO: Yes, and I checked with my counterpart there, and she said there extremely rare they almost never use them and, in fact, most of their contracts, particularly for actually for their people that are in the lecture ranks they're actually considered staffs, and so their contracts are very short. The one institution that we don't have on here I just haven't been able to get the information from them is Michigan State so they're missing from here, but I'm not positive on them.

SANDERS: Israel and I were able to determine that the law school at Michigan State apparently does have a provision for both three year and five-year rolling contracts, but that's the only unit at Michigan State were able to find any evidence for it's not clear how informative that is because up until last year, the law school at Michigan State was actually separate as a corporate entity, it really wasn't even a part of the university even though the name, although that's changed within the last year, but anyway, this chart gives you some sense, sorry I'm scrolling through it quickly right of what the situation is at other schools.

HERRERA: One question Eliza because uh we don't have the information from the University of Wisconsin and also from Northwestern and the other university, well Michigan State and now Steve as mentioned about the rolling contract, but as far as I know, and maybe I'm wrong here

University of Wisconsin and also Northwestern are not on the on the list, they offer rolling contracts, I don't know what you know.

PAVALKO: My Big Ten colleagues and I we often pull each other and what they're doing and so we're a little bit at the mercy of those who's able to answer. Chicago, I know Colin mentioned Chicago they actually are not really a part of the Big Ten anymore for most things so, but I don't think they do, but I'm still trying to get that information from the rest of the institutions.

SANDERS: And then in case it's helpful here is the situation right now on our campus of the kinds of contracts that are in use in the various schools, as you see the college, for the most part, uses five-year term contracts although there are a few exceptions to that are noted there in the last column. Well and you see for yourself, there are some schools that use three year rolling and other schools that use five-year term contract, so that is the situation here on the Bloomington campus. Now, in response to a suggestion Lauren made that we come up with a sort of quick cheat sheet of arguments for and against rolling contracts for those of you, for whom the concept seems new or a bit difficult to get your mind around Israel, and I have developed that as well. Israel I'll be happy to put it on the screen, I think you wanted to go through the sort of arguments in favor.

HERRERA: Right, so thank you Steve. So as Steve has mentioned and based on Lauren's petitions about sharing different pros and cons so some arguments in favor of the five year rolling contracts provide greater long term job security for NTT faculty and in case of non-reappointment more time to find another job, underscore the value of NTT faculty thereby fostering a greater sense of professionalism and commitment to the unit and IUI consistent with President McRobbie's call to provide a stronger NTT career paths mentioned in October 2017. Some NTT faculty believe they better protect academic freedom and the faculty member's ability to participate vigorously and without fear of retribution in department, school, and campus-level governance and also as a tool that may help recruit and retain outstanding NTT faculty members.

SANDERS: And then the arguments against I should say, these are really distilled from Israel and my sort of in-depth engagement in this question with the members of our committee. The concerns against five year rolling contracts are that they obviously provide less flexibility for academic units it's a different kind of lock-in then either a three-year rolling contract or a term contract that could make schools more conservative, more reluctant at the time of reappointment if a five-year rolling contract where what the school has decided to use.

Second, presumably, at least in theory there's some kind of annual review proceeding reappointment. And if that's the case that means either that the review is going to cause more work and more stress for the faculty member in the unit if it has to be done every year, rather than, say every five years, or the review will simply be the pro forma and not very meaningful. One member of this former, member of this council who's in a department that uses rolling contracts has basically candidly said everybody's contract is just renewed every year, there is no review. So, if you're comfortable with that or not comfortable with that it might, it may inform your view toward rolling contracts.

The third and even a couple of NTT members of our committee express this, that four years of continued employment after a non-reappointment decision, is not only sort of very rare in anybody's world, but it could create awkwardness. You know does somebody really want to be hanging around the department, knowing that they were not re-appointed. That they're potentially you know excluded or almost regarded as a sort of pariah. But they're still collecting a paycheck and still employed for four more years, is that really a healthy situation for the faculty member or for the department?

And, finally, that I think one conclusion we could draw from the data that Eliza's office gathered, although it's not complete yet is that IU's long-term contracts are already pretty generous compared to many, if not most of our peer institutions.

I think that's it for our presentation before we throw it open for discussion, I would say I don't have my notes on the vote when our committee voted on this at the end of last semester. I do believe that was a split vote, in other words, they were people on the Faculty Affairs Committee, including I think one or two NTT faculty members who voted against this, but a majority voted in favor of it and so that's why we are advancing it to the floor.

WALBRIDGE: Let me add one thing at this point we've received a letter of support for this third option of five year rolling contracts that's been signed by, the version I have 243 senior lectures, clinical assistants, associate professors of practice, etc., assistant dean's, associate dean's and tenure track faculty and emeriti, department chairs, former BFC presidents, current and former BFC representatives, current and former BFC committee chairs, former BFC task force chairs recommending that this option be there. I can put it on screen, if you would like to see it, but the gist of it is that strong support from a significant number of people, most of whom are non-tenure-track faculty but also including tenure track faculty and administrators.

AGENDA ITEM SIX: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BL-ACA-A3 BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS POLICIES FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK INSTRUCTIONAL APPOINTMENTS TO INCLUDE OPTION OF 5 YEAR ROLLING CONTRACTS FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

SIMPSON: John, we have three hands. I first like to read a comment and response in chat, Angie Raymond asked do we have any indication from IU hire ups, excuse me it went up, that they were in support of five-year rolling contract and Steve's response was Eliza's conversations with deans suggest no school is interested in adopting five year rolling contracts. There's further conversation, so you can read that in the chat. Alright, Eliza's hand was up first, then we have Shanker and then after Shanker we have Ted Miller.

PAVALKO: Yeah, thank you very much, and one of the things I want to emphasize, and this is also why the deans were concerned, is that there's a big difference between a reappointment decision and an annual review in between the reappointment decision by our policy or reappointment decision can be a decision to not re-appoint can be made for a variety, a wider range of things then a decision to you know dismiss somebody mid-contract. Once our faculty are in a in a five-year contract in the middle of that, a dismissal would be similar to looking at this as dismissing a tenured faculty member that certainly the way we've considered in the past.

Reappointment is a decision that you do, it is a different decision and there should be more of a substantive review of performance. And also, non-reappointment can be because of just kind of changing need in the program, and so one of the things that worries me about any rolling contracts, but particularly a rolling contract that has a long tail on it, is that those reappointment decisions are made every year, and so the assumption, and this was also the concern of the deans the assumptions that these are more protective is not necessarily consistent or is not consistent with our policy. And so that's the thing that concerns me the most and that's the thing that I know concerned the deans and most is that that the assumption that this would give people more protection may not be true.

WALBRIDGE: So, who's next Marietta?

SIMPSON: Shanker.

KRISHNAN: Yep thanks, thank you, Steve, and Israel. Thank you for presenting the proposal and for outlining the pros and cons. I looked at the document that kind of had showed the rationale and so on, and one thing that struck me is a lot of the language used the words you know, non-tenure-track faculty believe, you know it occurs two or three different times so it seems that there is a belief that this will be better for them. I think that is you know, certainly, you know kind of good idea moved forward on that basis. At the same time, on the other side is really better than a five-year fixed contract or three-year rolling contract and I think you know just coming on the heels of what Eliza said, one of the aspects that you know kind of bothers me is that if this review is going to take place every year then every year that particular faculty member is going to be under scrutiny and will have to justify their place in the ecosystem. And I think, even though there is a belief on one side from the non-tenure-track faculty that that the rolling five will be better for them. It actually will work against them because they're going to be constantly under scrutiny. The yearly review as a former department chair, I'm going to say, the yearly reviews for faculty are more on a routine basis. They're not the full-scale dossier prepared, all faculty coming and evaluate type of situation so if we're going to move to that on a yearly basis, I would say it's actually not in the best interest for the non-tenure-track faculty and I would look at that as under con against this particular argument, thank you.

SIMPSON: Thank you Shanker. Ted Miller is next, and then we have Dakota followed by Colin.

MILLER: Yes, well it's difficult for me to actually know how to begin here. With regard to the last comment, it isn't clear to me why anybody would think that that is what we're going to move to, is to a system where every year there are going to be in depth reviews it's not obvious that that is going to happen.

Let me, let me call your attention to what I think is the most significant part of the proposal that we're talking about here today and we're talking about section seven of this policy Bloomington ACA-A3. There's a phrase in this policy that reads as follows, "The exact mechanism for this shall be determined by the Dean and the faculty governance body within each school which use these non-tenure-track appointments." Right so just what is going to happen with regard to long term contracts? How are they going to be structured? How are they going to be implemented?

What the review is going to be? All of that is going is under the jurisdiction of the Dean, and the faculty governance body in the school. What decisions are they going to make? Well, I suggest we don't really know what those decisions are it's up to them. Alright, so for people who are making decisions today about you know about this matter regarding you know things that may happen, I just suggest to you that we don't really know what is going to happen.

Now, because of this particular phrase that I've read the exact mechanism for this shall be determined by the Dean of the faculty governance body within each school. The Faculty Affairs Committee at its last meeting, last week voted to remove the final sentence of this section seven proposal. Now I'm not sure what happened to that particular item whether the powers that be think we're going to come back at some future meeting and talk about that particular, that particular change to this policy it's not obvious to me, but the fact of the matter is that Faculty Affairs Committee voted to approve removal of that final sentence and the reason that that final sentence should be removed, is that it is in conflict with the sentence that I was just reading previously. In other words, the final sentence says that the long that the design of a long-term contract shall be determined by the school. It doesn't say how the school is supposed to deal with this, who in the school is supposed to make the decision and it strikes me that that is not really what we want to say here, because the university policy ACA-18, the university policy says that it is the Dean, and the faculty governance body within each school that is going to make this decision not some vague reference to the school. So that first clause of the final sentence to me, is a defective clause, the final clause of the sentence that it should be uniform within a single administrative unit, to me, that also violates the university's policy. I mean if the BFC does not have the authority to tell schools, what kind of power, what kind of contract, they should offer. How does it then have the authority to tell the schools that it can only offer one kind of contract? So It was, in my opinion that final clause violates the university policy ACA-18. And I believe that that that that final sentence should indeed be removed, so I would like to move here. Unless there's some other plan for dealing with this issue, I would like to move that the final sentence of this clause, this phrase this section seven of BL-ACA-A3 be stricken.

SANDERS: If I could just as a point of procedure explain Ted I apologize; I was under the impression Israel had spoken with you about this. And Israel can speak for himself if he wants but briefly my understanding of what happened is yes, the Faculty Affairs Committee did adopt an amendment by Ted to remove that final sentence, the vote was 6 to 4 in the committee and then after the meeting Israel determined that if we sent the new language forward it likely would have to go through the Executive Committee's since it was a substantive change the Executive Committee would want the chance to know about it that likely would push off the consideration of the whole thing for at least another meeting and so Israel and I made the decision that we would entertain the amendment on the floor so that this could come back to the council expeditiously and Ted, I had understood from Israel that he had spoken with you and explain that to you so I'm sorry if that wasn't the case.

WALBRIDGE: My understanding was that we were expecting an amendment to that effect, to come from the floor.

MILLER: Well, I have just made such an amendment.

WALBRIDGE: Is there a second?

J. DUNCAN: I'll second.

WALBRIDGE: Alright, so now we are, I believe discussing this amendment to the original proposal was there discussion pro or con? Colin, I know, has had his hand up.

SIMPSON: Yes, before Colin, Dakota also had his hand up then Colin and also J has two questions that he had, and now I also see Lisa's hand so Dakota, Colin, J's questions and then Steve and then Lisa after that okay.

COHEN: Just make sure that these questions deal with the motion, so we, because we need to deal with as an order. And so, the motion is now on the table and so.

SANDERS: The amendment.

COHEN: Right.

COATES: So, my comments don't.

COATES: I'm sorry go-ahead Steve.

COHEN: Your comments don't deal with the motion, so you want to wait?

COATES: Yeah.

COHEN: Okay, Colin's don't deal with the motion either so, sorry guys we will get to you. I just want to make sure that we do these in order.

SIMPSON: Okay, thank you Rachael. Steve?

SANDERS: Yeah, I would speak to Ted's amendment we discussed this at FAC, as I say, the vote was six to four I disagree, as a fellow faculty governance, you know nerd with Ted who tries to interpret the purpose of faculty governance and documents. I think the BFC, although we have decided it is best to leave the nature of reappointment decisions and the type of contract in the hands of the schools and in fact, I'm not sure you know I don't think we would have the power to dictate a particular kind of contract at the end of the day. Saying that the contract shall be uniform within a single administrative unit, to me, is much less of an incursion it essentially says they're shall not be discrimination, a dean shall not be allowed to offer one form of contract to one faculty member and another form of contract to another faculty member. That's exactly what you will be licensing if we take out that last sentence, it will allow different faculty in the same unit to have different kinds of contracts, perhaps again because the dean likes one faculty member better than the other. I mean, there are a lot of things we can't do in terms of dictating to departments and schools, who they can hire and how much they can pay. But we can tell them they can't discriminate on the basis of gender or race or sexual orientation and so to me a sort of non-discrimination requirement of uniformity like this is not nearly as great an incursion on the authority of the school as telling them what kind of contract they can offer, and so this language has been in A3, this is not new language, the last sentence that Ted is proposing to cut exists currently in the A3 policy. Presumably, it's there for good reason, and I think that the principle of

uniformity within a single administrative unit is important enough that we do have the authority to specify that it has existed, you know for some time now, without question, and while being observed by the schools.

SIMPSON: Lisa?

THOMASSEN: I'm going to lower my hand first. Thank you, I think Steve's point is a nice one about discrimination, but we already have other policies that deal with these discrimination issues and we certainly have channels if somebody feels that there's been a problem, and I think that the policy really is specifically about the nature of these appointments and I agree with Ted. I think in some sense this is redundant we leave it up to the schools, we leave it up to the units and there are you know policy committees and there's voting within for a unit to decide what they want to do, but this preserves some of the concern about maybe historical timing, about maybe faculty preference. So I really think that we strike it out, I mean it really is up to the schools, and I think this also speaks to the larger point about maybe some schools, want to do these kinds of contracts, some schools don't that's really at the discretion of that particular school, not every school may choose to have this and there may be reasons, whether it's comfort at the NTT faculty with concerns about the way their school might run or maybe it's concerns within the deans about how they'd like to keep the NTT structure, for whatever reason. So I'm in favor of striking this out, I don't think it does any harm, and I think a lot of times we have policy that has these sort of appendix, if you will, things that are sort of hanging out there for maybe one reason or it's not clear why, and I think this proposed amendment, the proposed friendly amendment to the proposed amendment makes a lot of sense, and I think it gives us more clarity to some of the things that concerns that people might have with this policy and actually I will note that I came around on this issue, initially, I thought it was important that there be uniformity within a unit, and that this be specified, but after discussion I've changed my view on that thank you.

SIMPSON: Thank you, Lisa. Israel?

HERRERA: Right, so I also, I am in favor of eliminating the last sentence where the design of the long-term contract shall be determined by the school because in line four and in line five, we have the language about the deans and the faculty governance bodies deciding in granting this. If we just leave the school, we don't have at the end in the last sentence, we don't have the faculty participating or being involved in this decision and regarding about being uniform, that is something, because we can also think about a school, we can think about a unit, we can think about the college granting five year rolling contracts and there might be NTTs, who like to keep the three-year rolling contract or the five year fixed so we also need to respect that request if the five year running contract is given to all the all the members that a Connie mentioned, this is kind of flexibility. That would respect the previous contract of the NTT. The other thing is the importance of knowing that this is something that could be agreed between the dean and the faculty members in the unit, the last sentence just leaves the school to be the one deciding, and I would like to have faculty governance participation in the decision.

SIMPSON: Thank you, Israel.

WALBRIDGE: Okay, so other discussion relevant to the amendment?

COHEN: Sorry for the minutes, we need a clarification of what exactly is been stricken from this, is it after the comma, or that the entire last sentence?

MILLER: The entire last sentence is my motion.

COHEN: Thank you.

C. JOHNSON: Thank you.

WALBRIDGE: All right, is there further discussion that's.

COHEN: Also, sorry I saw a comment, and I wanted to make sure, because Dakota brought it up again, thank you Dakota. In striking the sentence with this would critiquing professors have different types of contracts from senior lectures or would the phrasing "shall be uniform" prevent this? So, in keeping this or removing this would those prevent that this scenario, those scenarios um. Karen if I did not ask that correctly, please.

MILLER: Well, I'm not I guess I'm not sure about that, because the university's policy is that each school is supposed to decide. The dean, and the faculty governance body within your school is supposed to decide what the nature of the contract situation in that school will be, that is, the university policy. So, what decision you know decisions that they're going to make different decisions in different schools what decisions they're going to make, I have no idea.

WALBRIDGE: All right, why don't we move on to a vote on the amendment and then we can go back to the main proposal so Elizabeth can.

HERRERA: I don't know if J was up to comment, J Duncan, or maybe I'm wrong.

J. DUNCAN: I think we can move on to a vote on this one I have comments about the overall proposal.

WALBRIDGE: Okay, and bear in mind that we will have the chance to discuss the merits of this and connection with the resolution that comes next.

HENSHEL: Can I ask if we vote this down or if this amendment passes isn't it still up to the units so effectively it's really the just shall be uniform within a single administrative unit. I'm just trying to clarify, please.

MILLER: Well, a unit could decide that they wanted to use the same contract for every non-tenure-track faculty member. That's a decision, they could make, yes, but they could also have a different structure or if they wanted to it's up to them that's what our policy is.

THOMASSEN: I think Diane, I think your understanding is correct and what you stated, that is exactly what happens if you remove this it still leaves it up to the unit, this is just removing that other part.

HERRERA: And also, Diane, for clarification I don't know if this helps in line four and five, we keep we mentioned the dean, and the faculty governance. We are not saying that the school

doesn't have a voice, but the thing is that faculty governance bodies in each school and the college could be engaged in this decision, not just the dean.

PEAR: The polling closed itself, I don't know how that happened, but it did so do we need to reopen and which case everybody will need to vote? Yes, I'm hearing and I'm seeing in the chat that some people didn't get a chance okay.

HENSHEL: Yes, please.

WALBRIDGE: Alright. Let's do it again, yes.

SANDERS: Also, a question from one of the undergraduate representatives, I think about the availability of an option to abstain.

PEAR: I will have to default to our parliamentarian on the option to abstain.

COHEN: We normally do not abstain, if you do not vote that is your option.

Okay, we will vote one last time, and that is the vote. Just to be clear this is it.

WALBRIDGE: Thank you, Rachael.

PEAR: Okay last call. Ending.

WALBRIDGE: Okay, the motion is carried, so we go back to discussion of the main proposal which I recommend be fairly brief because the amendment, the resolution that we're discussing after this deals with the question, the advisability of such contracts so there's plenty of time for discussing the pros and cons still.

SIMPSON: Okay, so.

WALBRIDGE: Who's on the list.

SIMPSON: So, J had some questions in the chat before, Colin had his hand up before and then Diane. So, J, you had two questions that you had.

J. DUNCAN: Yes. Thank you. So, first of all I wanted to make the comment somebody addressed that they were not unaware of any units, where the dean was currently in favor of this option. I can say unabashedly that the dean of the Luddy school is in favor of it. I spoke with him yesterday about this matter he was very enthusiastic about having this option, because that's all it is an option.

The second thing is that Eliza said the assumption that this will give people more protection may not be true, so I would like to know how that is the case? For those of us already unrolling contracts would this not be the exact same terms, but with four years, subsequent to a non-reappointment decisions that have two? If that is not the case, how is it different? Somebody else said that this would involve a full dossier review every year, there's nothing in the language that suggests that and that's not how three-year rolling contracts work, so why would there be a presumption that that is the case?

PAVALKO: Would you like me to answer?

WALBRIDGE: Yes please.

PAVALKO: So, with a rolling contract that means there is a reappointment decision every year and I know some schools in practice have not been treating it that way they've been treating it more is just a standard review. But it's a reappointment decision, and so we shouldn't assume that the current practice will necessarily go, particularly if, in for rolling five years contract there they're making a long-term decision of five years. And so, the practice it's used for three-year contract is not necessarily what would be used there it's a long-term decision and it's a reappointment decision and policy reappointment decisions have broader reasons for non-reappointment then dismissal.

J. DUNCAN: So, what you're saying is you don't believe that certain units currently practice rolling contracts correctly and if we were to give the option to a longer one suddenly that would be relevant, whereas it hadn't been before.

PAVALKO: Well units decide how they're going to do their review, but you know, so the processes they use for a three-year rolling contract with you may not be the same, that they would use for a five-year rolling contract review, because it's a reappointment decision every year and the bases for not reappointing somebody are broader than the basis for dismissing somebody who's in the middle of a contract.

J. DUNCAN: Again, you said, the current practice, you do not believe is necessarily correct, but your office has not followed up with people performing that practice prior to this date.

PAVALKO: The schools can decide on their processes, but what I'm saying is, we should not assume that the processes and practices they use for a three-year rolling contract would be the same as what they would use for five because the reappointment decision, they're making a decision about how they conduct the reappointment decision, but by policy a reappointment decision is a broader decision.

WALBRIDGE: Okay. Who's next on the list Marietta?

SIMPSON: Colin is actually next.

WALBRIDGE: Colin.

C. JOHNSON: Yeah sorry, so I just want to say, I mean, I do think that there's a resolution following this that I think speaks to the issue of kind of advisability of wide scale adoption. I just wanted to I, I will say personally, I think there are other people who have concerns about five year rolling contracts, not because they had their in opposition to the kind of idea of working with our colleagues who are in NTT positions for the purpose of creating greater job security. I am always concerned about the creation of unintended consequences, and one of my concerns around five year old contract is that, in fact, for some of the reasons Eliza has laid out that if somebody's having to make a calculation, for example, about what their budget situation looks like five years from now and having, for example, in a unit where enrollment trends are declining revenue is under pressure, I do think that there could be circumstances where plausibly you

know, some like putting people into five year rolling contracts and asking them to make decisions about what their budgetary situation is going to look like five years from now could actually perversely create circumstances where people were more inclined to be kind of carefully reviewed and, potentially, not necessarily reviewed, for reasons that are you know, have to do with gaming the system. That's a separate issue in my mind, though, from so, all of which is to say, I do have legitimate concerns about the creation of unintended consequences.

I don't actually think this proposal guarantees that those will come to fruition, I would just underscore the idea that this is allowing for the implementation of five year rolling contracts by schools where that's deemed appropriate and my sense, frankly, is that the place where this is most likely to prove beneficial to our NTT colleagues would actually be under circumstances where they're negotiating for retention, which is just to say currently I can imagine a circumstance, where somebody would want to negotiate for a five year rolling contract because people's relation to precarity is different if you're an NTT position, I think the appeal of this, among other things, is that you have more of a sense of if, for some reason there's not going to be a job for you in five years it's better to know that four years in advance, then too. So, I can imagine under circumstances where people are negotiating for retention purposes saying I want this, but ultimately schools are going to be able to make decisions about how commonly these are handed out or how commonly these contracts are written on the front end.

So, all this is just a very complicated way of saying I support this position, I support this proposal strongly because I think it would give our NTT colleagues another thing to negotiate for greater security for their purposes, but I do think it's a legitimate line of discussion to ask whether the expansion of these, and certainly the mandating of five-year rolling contracts might create unintended consequences that would actually be potentially damaging to those folks. That's all sorry.

SIMPSON: Okay, so, John I'm not sure how much longer you're going to hold the conversation.

WALBRIDGE: I would, I would like to end it soon, because we're now running 13 minutes behind.

SIMPSON: Okay, so we have actually five people that that are in the queue to talk so.

WALBRIDGE: Okay we'll cut the queue off there and I would ask you to be brief and not repetitive.

SIMPSON: Alright, so we have Dakota. We have Diane. We have Israel, Nandini and Angie. Alright so Dakota you're up next. Diane comes after you.

COATES: I'll try to be brief, but I think my biggest concern on this from the non-tenure-track faculty that I've spoken with is a little bit of the buying from our deans from the larger programs where there does tend to be a little more difficulty in 10 years non-tenure-track faculty in terms of academic freedom concerns I'm thinking kind of like our larger programs like Kelly and SPEA and some of our COAS departments, were we do have a history of non-tenure-track faculty having some difficulty and I'm again I'm kind of agreeing with Angie and a couple other people in the comments that the shift to the five-year contract is likely going to involve a bit

more department politic and a bit more of a hefty review, given the longer duration of the contract. And so, I would be concerned about that potentially expanding outward and I would be curious because I know that there's been the constant reference that it's an option it's an option, if that becomes the stance that it's pretty much predominantly an option, what is there to incentivize any program to ever even then consider a five year. Because again if the concerns that department doesn't like the five year overall, would there ever be a pathway for the non-tenure-track to actually get a five year or try to negotiate a five year? If the department essentially from the get-go takes the stance of anyone who tries to negotiate for five years, you're not getting it, and so I was curious on if there was anything that spoke to that I hadn't seen it yet, but that was my main question.

SIMPSON: Okay, thank you Dakota, Diane?

HENSHEL: Now I have two points, one to address the ongoing discussion, which is just that, since Dakota mentioned it, SPEA has exactly two types of review. One is for tenure and promotion by the tenure track. Well, no, actually it's pretty much just the tenure decision one and or the up and out so if you're at the point of an up and out or promotion, that is one review committee, if you are just doing an annual review that's the other review committee and we do not have even an option for a third, and I do not think that the people that are going up for their five year renewals go through the promotion and tenure. Because once they've been promoted, I think they stay promoted. So just to comment I'm not sure that I think SPEA, for example, would have to change what we do and I'm not sure that would be something that a lot of people would want, but just as a comment. Alright so back to what I originally wanted to ask. It seems to me that since the whole point of this was for third tier why not include a phrase that clarifies that this is for third tier.

WALBRIDGE: Who is next?

SIMPSON: Yes, Israel.

HERRERA: Right so um, I have had this question for a long time because the comment has been that are there will be more stringent reviews, the annual reviews would be very different, and I would say what else could the school or the chair request if we mean stringent reviews. The teaching professor in the case of lecture the teaching professor promotion involves a lot of all, a lot of review in certain letters, endorsement by the faculty and everything. From there, we will have the best the outstanding teaching faculty in in our university, so I don't know why is that a concern of providing these people who have been promoted and contributing to the university. Why, they must fear that would five year rolling contracts that will be more risk knowing that we have been going through the different promotions, we have going through that program story period of seven years and also a five year or 10 years in the senior lecturer rank so it will be more than 10 years inn different ranks to prove that all of the sudden there will be, you know bad teachers. If there is something related with sexual misconduct, exigency, incompetence, there is a policy related to that, but in the conversation with different schools and different units, but the department or the school do it's an offering if there is a bad year or something wrong with the teaching. There is mentoring, or there is supervision, but I don't know why we are assuming that

we are getting frequently now bad teachers if they're comment has been that this is rare in our university.

I would also like to mention that this is not something that we are creating as Indiana University, the language is there already existed and it's something that universities are doing in our conversation with the University of Minnesota they feel that they are also are working on different, changing different policies and one of these is a contract, so this is not something that we are the only ones. The conversation has been for a very long time to prove among the NTT with, I had this conversation that this is something that is going to be beneficial for the NTTs.

SIMPSON: Thank you, Israel, our last comment will be from Angie.

RAYMOND: Hello everyone, I want to be sure that people know right off the bat that I strongly support non-tenure-track faculty having longer term contracts. But I'm really worried about this proposal. I don't understand why we haven't flushed out the processes and the actual rules that will be implemented as well as the terms of the contract. You're now placing the position in the hands of the individuals to negotiate independently, with their deans and their unit heads, instead of us using our collective power to make something that's actually supports strongly what it is that you're advancing. Eliza told us the deans intent to make these more onerous you can keep ignoring and repeating what your hopes are, but the deans told us what they're going to do, they also told us they won't use these, there is no reason for them to now compromise and you're asking individuals to take on this action on their own.

I think this is a really bad choice for those reasons, not to mention several others that have already been said, I will not be supporting this for those reasons. I think you're selling the NTT faculty down a river that they're know going to have to negotiate these independently, individually with absolutely no collective action on our part and we're leaving them exposed because of it. And I'd much rather see us flush out a compromise that includes us actually thinking about the processes that would be put in place and what the terms of the five-year rolling contract would be and use our power as the BFC to support NTT faculty instead of leaving them out on their own.

WALBRIDGE: All right, thank you Angie. We need to go to a vote because we have an hour's worth of material to go through and 38 minutes.

HERRERA: John?

WALBRIDGE: Yes.

HERRERA: And Elizabeth, I would like to request a roll call vote, please for these for the archives.

WALBRIDGE: I believe that's your privilege. Rachael, is that correct?

HERRERA: Under 5.4 in the Constitution.

PEAR: Yes, we were not expecting that so it will take me a minute to get.

COHEN: I was going to say yeah, we can do it, it's just figuring out how to do it in this format will take us a moment, so please wait a second.

PEAR: Alright um. My best guess at this point is I'm going to go down the list of members that I see so it's not going to be in alphabetical order I think that's just the easiest way, so I know who's who. If you are a substitute, you need to tell me your name, voting for and BFC Member, please. We will have a record here but I'm going to keep a tally over here as well, so please bear with me.

COHEN: Elizabeth do you want me to read out the names, so you can record.

PEAR: I don't know if we have the same list, do we?

COHEN: Not sure. I just wasn't sure what's easiest for you.

PEAR: Let me do it. Thank you. Thank you.

GOLD: So, what are we voting on.

WALBRIDGE: We're voting on the proposal as a whole, as amended.

COHEN: As amended, yep.

PEAR: Okay, I'll do my best.

Simpson?

SIMPSON: Yes.

PEAR: Cohen?

COHEN: Yes.

PEAR: Walbridge?

WALBRIDGE: Yes.

PEAR: Levinson?

LEVINSON: Yes.

PEAR: Calloway-Thomas?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes

PEAR: Cherry?

CHERRY: No.

PEAR: Miller?

MILLER: Yes.

PEAR: Raymond?

RAYMOND: No.

PEAR: Elsner?

ELSNER: Yes.

PEAR: Loring?

LORING: Yes.

PEAR: Dennis? Barbara? Alright moving on.

Kravitz?

KRAVITZ: Yes.

DENNIS: Sorry, Barbara Dennis is here I couldn't get my thing unmuted fast enough. I'm here for Jessica Lester.

PEAR: Okay.

DENNIS: Yes.

PEAR: Thank you.

I'm trying to find my place.

Gill?

GILL: Yes.

PEAR: Reck?

RECK: Yes.

PEAR: Deliyannis. I'm sorry Con, bear with me.

DELIYANNIS: Yeah, I couldn't unmute. Yes.

PEAR: Thank you. Peters?

PETERS: Yes.

PEAR: Johnson? Colin?

C. JOHNSON: Yes.

PEAR: Cook Glenn?

GLENN: Yes, I'm here for Alan Davis, and yes.

PEAR: Thank you. Olcott?

OLCOTT: Yes.

PEAR: Coates? Dakota.

COATES: Uh nay.

PEAR: Bullock?

Ah thanks Dan. Daleke?

Nobody? Maybe he'll come back. Degner?

DEGNER: No.

PEAR: Henshel?

HENSHEL: Yes.

PEAR: Pavalko?

PAVALKO: No.

PEAR: Guba? I don't know.

GUBA: Yeah, that's right. I'm here for Rachel Aranyi and I vote yes.

PEAR: Thank you. Milan?

MILAN: Yes.

PEAR: Banai?

BANAI: Yes.

PEAR: Duncan? J?

J. DUNCAN: Yes.

PEAR: We're getting there folks.

Fleming?

FLEMING: Yes.

PEAR: Gold?

GOLD: Yes.

PEAR: Nicholson-Crotty?

NICHOLSON-CROTTY: Yes.

PEAR: Ansaldo?

ANSALDO: Yes.

PEAR: Carini?

CARINI: Yes.

PEAR: Brauer?

BRAUER: Yes.

PEAR: Hodgson?

HODGSON: Yes.

PEAR: Kari Johnson?

K. JOHNSON: Yes

PEAR: Eskew?

ESKEW: No.

PEAR: Zorn?

ZORN: No.

PEAR: Jennings Mayo Wilson? Okay um Richerme? Lauren Richerme.

RICHERME: Yes.

PEAR: Thank you, sorry.

RICHERME: No problem.

PEAR: Gales, Linda oh you're, nevermind. Sorry.

Pisano?

PISANO: No.

PEAR: Thomassen?

THOMASSEN: Yes.

PEAR: Shea?

SHEA: Yes.

PEAR: Guerra-Reyes?

GUERRA-REYES: Yes.

PEAR: Gupta?

GUPTA: No.

PEAR: Coats? Paul.

COATS: Yes.

PEAR: Kloosterman? Pete?

Fichman?

KRISHNAN: Krishnan?

PEAR: No, Fichman, Pnina.

KRISHNAN: Oh, sorry. I thought you said Krishnan.

PEAR: No but I'm getting there. Alright. Letsinger?

LETSINGER: Yes.

PEAR: Tirey?

TIREY: Yes.

PEAR: Patil? Sorry Sameer.

PATIL: Yes.

PEAR: Libson?

LIBSON: Yes.

PEAR: Wyczynski? Stephen sorry.

WYRCZYNSKI: Yes.

PEAR: I think that's everybody. Anybody I missed?

HERRERA: Herrera.

KRISHNAN: You missed me. Krishnan.

PEAR: Krishnan?

KRISHNAN: No.

PEAR: Herrera?

KLOOSTERMAN: Kloosterman. But yes.

PEAR: Okay so, Israel?

MAYO-WILSON: I also sent my vote to you privately.

PEAR: Okay um I don't think we are allowed to have secret ballots.

COHEN: Larissa, you're gonna have to say it out loud.

MAYO-WILSON: Yes.

PEAR: Okay.

FRAZIER: Lessie Frazier, yes.

PEAR: Thank you.

COHEN: I think we missed Margaret Lion, didn't we?

PEAR: Margaret, yes.

LION: Yes, please yes.

PEAR: Thank you. Anybody else?

HERRERA: Herrera, Elizabeth?

PEAR: Yes.

BANKS: Karen Banks, yes.

PEAR: Okay, I got Karen. I got Israel.

Anybody else?

SANDERS: Steve Sanders. No. In case anybody cares, I would have voted yes, but for the amendment, but I, which I think is so advised so I'm a no and Elizabeth, I think you may need to come back to Dave Daleke and maybe other people who were absent the first round.

PEAR: I can. David Daleke?

DALEKE: No. Sorry, my microphone wasn't working.

PEAR: That's okay. Sally Letsinger?

LETSINGER: Yes.

PEAR: Okay.

COHEN: Did you get Tony in the comments? He also abstained.

PEAR: Yeah well, he's non-voting.

COHEN: Okay, perfect.

PEAR: And I think, anybody else?

PATIL: Pnina Fichman.

PEAR: Thank you. Pnina?

Okay. I will formally count these up but it's very clear that the yays have it so I will give you a formal tally in a minute.

WALBRIDGE: Thank you everybody. It's kind of exciting to have a roll call vote where we don't all agree. Okay, can we move on to the next item while Elizabeth is doing her counting which is a first reading on a propped amendment regarding academic freedom for non-tenure track faculty, so this is going to have to be held to about 15 minutes so Stephen, Israel, you have the floor.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: PROPOSED RESOLUTION REGARDING ACADEMIC FREEDOM SUPPORT FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

SANDERS: I put the text on the screen. Essentially, what happened in the Faculty Affairs Committee is we decided we would bring to the floor what was just voted on, which was not a recommendation, not a requirement simply adding language, indicating that maybe clarifying the five year contracts are an option, but there was sentiment among some on our committee again it was a split vote coming out of committee that the BFC might also make a more affirmative statement in favor of rolling contracts, particularly five year rolling contracts.

Ted was kind enough to take the laboring war in drafting this resolution. It was discussed in the Faculty Affairs Committee a number of times and you see it in front of you. It has some rationales, but the bottom line is, this is a statement that the BFC believes that rolling contracts, particularly five-year rolling contracts are the best mechanism for long term contracts for non-tenure track faculty members. Let me be clear, it's been clear in committee that this, this is not policy, this is not intended to be binding. This is only intended as a sense of the BFC resolution.

I'm not clear myself on why the Executive Committee called it, you know, slated it for a first reading and for a seconding reading, because this is not a policy change, its merely a resolution expressing the sense of the BFC. And I would say, although personally I will vote against this, I favored in committee at least bringing the idea forward that there should be a discussion about that this is something that was worth having a, I'll just leave it at that, worth having a discussion about it to sort of, to get the attention of academic deans and schools, for whom this whole conversation might otherwise sort of disappear down a rabbit hole. But at least having the discussion at the level of the council whether you're in favor of it or against, it elevates the issue and gives it some attention and puts it on the radar screen of deans and other administrators. I don't know if Israel wants to add anything to that, but hopefully that gives you the context for what we're discussing.

HERRERA: I guess, I would add Steve that yes, as you mentioned, this is a resolution and this is a recommendation, it's not something that is going to be a mandate, after you know passing the language so these would be, as you mentioned Steve, a sentiment that that deans and the faculty governance parties could take as a reference based on the decision that we're taking in for our council.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION REGARDING ACADEMIC FREEDOM SUPPORT FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

WALBRIDGE: All right. This is open for discussion and please be brief and if you've made your views clear in previous discussion sort of put yourself at the end of the line as it, as it were, so.

SIMPSON: Ted has a comment, John.

WALBRIDGE: Yes, please.

SIMPSON: Ted.

MILLER: Yes, I see you've indicated, I was the person who drafted this resolution, I would just like to call your attention to the title of the resolution, please. It is a resolution focused on academic freedom, support for non-tenure track faculty. It is not a resolution that argues that five-year rolling contracts are the best kind of contract for every situation for every faculty member. What it argues is that, that kind of contract better supports academic freedom, than other kinds of contracts do. So, this is a fairly targeted resolution.

Now some of the of the discussion in the Faculty Affairs Committee revolved around the idea that we already have a policy on academic freedom. And therefore, this consideration of contracts and how that might affect academic freedom really isn't necessary. And it certainly is true that Indiana University has a policy on academic freedom, for those of you would like to ready that policy it is ACA-32. It was approved, initially in 1966, it's been amended a couple of times since then, but it's been a long-standing policy of Indiana University. It applies to all academic appointees who have teaching, research, and librarianship responsibilities, including part-time faculty, adjuncts, all academic appointees that have teaching, research, and librarianship responsibility, so there is such a policy. Some people think that that's enough.

So, I would just a given, we have just a few minutes today to do this, let me go to the core of the argument, for you to know what this is trying to say. We do have a policy, but I would remind you that for tenure track faculty members the university does not think that the policy itself is enough to support academic freedom. In fact, the university in fact supports a system of tenure for tenure track faculty members and tenure is widely regarded as an essential element in the protection of academic freedom. So, for tenure track faculty members, we have a policy, and we also have an appointment type that supports academic freedom.

Now the last 20 years has seen a very dramatic change in the faculty composition at Indiana University, we have a large number of non-tenure track faculty members. In my opinion, and I've tried to express this in the resolution, in my opinion, you know, and you've given the essential role of the non-tenure track faculty in teaching. You know at least 50% of the undergraduate credit hours, I believe, are now taught by the non-tenure track faculty. I believe that Indiana University is going to be the worst for it. I would like to see us, in addition to having a policy that covers non-tenure track faculty academic freedom, I would like to see us have an appointment type that supports that academic freedom.

So, what is it about a tenured appointment, you know what is important here? You know, a tenured appointment, if you think about it, you think about what is the end of a ten-year appointment? Well, it's an indeterminate end, it's out there in the future. It goes on. There's a chunk of time involved in the appointment, So, when I tried to think about what kind of a contract for non-tenure track faculty would be better, it would kind of move in that direction, it became pretty clear to me that a rolling contract, especially a long-term rolling contract would better replicate the conditions of a tenured appointment. So, if you have a five-year rolling contract, you know, at any point in that contract you're always at least four years away from the termination of the contract. If you have a five-year fixed contract well there is a time when

you're five years away from the termination, a time when you are four years removed from the termination but there's also a time when you're one year removed from the termination. And that strikes me as being problematic from an academic freedom perspective.

I believe, if we had contracts that had this chunk of time where you were always a chunk of time removed from the termination it would better support the academic freedom of non-tenure track faculty and that's what I'm trying to suggest here. That's really the basic support for the you know, whereas that's the second from the end. It says, whereas rolling contracts better accomplish these goals than do fixed term contracts, that's whereas in this resolution that is perhaps the one that is arguable, so I've just tried to give you the idea why I've concluded that that's true. Thank you very much.

WALBRIDGE: Hey Marietta, do we have other people?

SIMPSON: Just Dakota in line right now.

WALBRIDGE: Okay and I'm gonna have to close it after that, we have one more item on the agenda.

COATES: Okay, um so I actually wanted to propose an amendment to this resolution, and I typed out in the chat so that way it could be easily available to everyone. But I just wanted to add additional language that would up the academic freedom protection element of this, and this is based off of the discussion that went on in the last discussion for the actual policy change, and it would be that the implementation of the rolling contract policy would be done in a manner that protects, again, it's just a resolution that protects the academic freedom of the NTT faculty and particularly that the mechanisms for review would be that are associated with rolling contract will be developed with a strong deference to academic freedom. I know that this isn't a policy and it's not binding but I think that it might speak to some of the concerns that were raised in the last resolution discussion about wanting to make sure academic freedom was really not a potential for being deemed with a failure or lack of renewal.

WALBRIDGE: All right, thank you Dakota. Rachael, do we do amendments to first readings of resolutions? Or do you just.

COHEN: I would recommend that that gets sent back to the committee as like a recommendation for them to consider.

WALBRIDGE: All right, well so faculty affairs, please look at Dakota's text and consider it before this comes before us again. All right, we have half as much time as we need to talk about the question of financial stringency, so I will turn the floor over to those who are in charge of it, Barb Cherry, and Paul Coats.

AGENDA ITEM TEN: POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES FOR THE BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS IN THE EVENT OF FINANCIAL EXIGENCY

CHERRY: Good afternoon, you there Paul?

COATS: Yes, I'm here as well.

CHERRY: We have an outline of questions that we think should be considered and what we want feedback for or give, where we are in the agenda right now, we don't have enough time for feedback. However, we could at least share with you what our questions are and then that could perhaps then guide your thoughts, if we want this on the next UFC agenda, perhaps John, to get the feedback, but we can at least introduce the nature of the questions that we have which we're seeking guidance. Would you like me to do that?

WALBRIDGE: Yes, please do. As far as the next meeting, we'll talk about that in the Executive Committee.

CHERRY: Okay can you see this document? I put up share screen. Just want to make sure it took.

WALBRIDGE: Yes.

CHERRY: Okay, so let me outline for you. Paul and I have thought through what we've been asked to do, and after some further review, we find that we have some questions that we think it's important for us to get feedback before we embark.

So let me explain the background. The BFC Executive Committee has asked CREM to draft a Bloomington campus policy related to financial exigency, and CREM was provided with a copy of an existing IUPUI policy as a frame of reference. As Paul and I looked into this more closely, what we discovered is that what we are potentially asked to do, could serve more than one function. And further background will be provided to set this up, but the summary here is one function of pursuing a campus policy is number one here just for purposes of implementing an IU wide financial exigency issue, pursuant to the UFC policy that was adopted in 2020.

A totally different function is for the purpose of addressing financial exigency that occurs at the Bloomington campus only. Recall that, by definition, the UFC policy only deals with the university wide financial exigency it does not deal with campus or units or schools within a campus. Therefore, in terms of the big picture, CREM is asking for feedback from the BFC as to how to proceed. And we post three main questions to guide the feedback we're seeking. And before we embark onto discussion and it turns out we're deferred for another meeting anyway, but I will also provide a little bit of additional background here to support what underlies the reasoning for these three questions.

The three key questions are number one, should the Bloomington campus and the BFC adapt any policy in advance for purposes of implementing the procedure in Section 3 under the UFC ACA-41 policy for an IU wide financial exigency? A separate question, question two, should the Bloomington campus and the BFC adapt its own policy to address financial difficulties or problems at the Bloomington campus only? And question three, what should be the composition of CREM for purpose of addressing the above questions? Should individuals be added to reflect more areas of representation and/or expertise? And as you'll see, particularly if it's related to question two, if it might be more suitable to have some form of task force?

So let me then go into a little bit of detail to explain what's behind, for example, question one, when you review the UFC policy that was adopted in 2020 recall that it only applies to financial

exigency that's at a university wide level. And I've cut and pasted here, an important section of that policy and it's the policy that specifies a procedure in the event there is a declared financial exigency that exists and under procedure three requires that the UFC Executive Committee form an ad-hoc financial exigency committee to represent faculty interests during the financial crisis. It then specifies the types of members that are supposed to be on this ad-hoc committee, that the committee include members of the UFC Executive Committee but then we have this whole other category, the committee to include other faculty as needed so that the final committee includes, and they list a bunch categories. Now these categories include a member of the University Budgetary Affairs Committee, faculty competent to evaluate any units threatened by elimination, both tenure track and non-tenure track appointees, and then one member of the CREM Committee or it's equivalent from each affected campus. Paragraph three, additional faculty may be added, that means in addition to the above. And then importantly why I've highlighted here, how do you determine who these members are going to be that are not members of the Executive Committee of the UFC, it says members of Financial Exigency Committee who are not currently on Executive Committee should be selected from lists proposed by the faculty organizations on the effected campuses and/or units.

So, the question we're asking here is this, paragraph D indicates that the campus, the relevant campus, faculty government organizations have the responsibility of proposing lists of potential faculty to fill out the ad-hoc committee, so the question is, should CREM now be working on a draft policy that the purpose of which would be to implement paragraph D of this procedure? Should we prepare something in advance, so that if a financial urgency occurs, we know what process we're going to follow? So, this is what underlies this background is what underlies the first function I mentioned on the previous page here which then leads to this first question.

Okay, the second question, revies from looking more carefully at the IUPUI policy. In further researching an understanding this policy, what we realized is that the IUPUI policy was adopted in 1996, this is before they've even existed a UFC policy about financial exigency so in the absence of any policy in that respect that IUPUI developed its own policy for its campus. And the structure of this policy is quite, quite detailed and in this regard it's important to note that its structure is such that it actually contemplates three different types or levels of financial problems in an escalating hierarchy of severity.

The lowest level is something they referred to as financial difficulties that can escalate to a higher level of financial crisis and the third level is financial exigency which it specifies its effects that campus generality and it has very specific procedures for each of these three. So, it goes into quite a bit of detail. And if you look at the policy, I hope you had a chance to look at it in advance, but if you look at the policy what it's essentially noting is that you can perhaps locate or identify financial problems that occur just in a school or unit, and if you catch them earlier, you might be able to address them. And even if you try to address them, they may not arise to, or you might be working on it before they get to the level of a financial agency for the campus.

So, our second main question is, do you want us to work on a policy such as this, which goes much further, and this is looking at just Bloomington campus issues. This requires a lot more line drawing. A lot more detail structure and a lot more potential issues that can come to the floor that

people could reasonably disagree about how to do. And then finally, oh I think I opened the wrong document. I thought I opened the revised one. I'll stop sharing for a second. Paul, you want to put up the right one that has the proper short circuit.

COATS: I believe so. Let me quick grab it.

CHERRY: I must have pulled up my earlier draft.

COATS: That is an earlier draft as well.

CHERRY: A second. Just one moment. We modified it and I'm not sure what happened to it. Okay, there were additional items on this. Can you recall what they were, maybe we could verbally tell it.

COATS: Yes, I'm opening up my earlier draft right now.

Okay. Mine is missing one part but I'll share it anyways. Okay, so if you could stop sharing your screen, I'll do mine.

Okay, I believe you're seeing question here right now. Okay, so what we see here, so the questions that we have our kind of based on what we end up deciding for questions one and two. Particularly question two if we're willing as the BFC, if the feedback we get from BFC wills us to work on a campus policy which is more in depth. That will especially affect these questions as well, so essentially what the outcome of those are should individuals be added to reflect more areas of representation and/or expertise, depending on the needs. So, if we're looking at, given the financial nature of this policy related to financial exigency financial problems, etc. and also the far-reaching ramifications of this policy that it would essentially affect everyone on the campus and, in particular, as this body is concerned with the faculty as well as staff and everyone, essentially, but a lot of what IUPUI policy was looking at is the faculty.

So that's one of the questions that we have especially whether we should request volunteers, or even appointees to CREM to address these questions, to address kind of the ideas of breath, as well as to address the financial nature of this.

COHEN: I'm really sorry to interrupt you but I just wanted to remind everybody that we have a hard 4:30 end.

COATS: Yes.

COHEN: Unless there's a unanimous vote to extend the meeting, and we have less than three minutes at this point, and so if we do vote, we need to talk about it, or if not, I wanted to give everybody a chance, like a warning, we have about two minutes left so.

COATS: Thank you. Yes, no, no vote. I'll just take one more minute to discuss the third point, which is not present here that got cut off somehow. Essentially the kind of, in addition to this, should we if we're going to do a much more broad policy related to a lot of the details, similar to what IUPUI had already developed back in the 90's. If few wanted to do something like that, should we then have an actual task force possibly under CREM to do this and to work on this in a more substantial manner with a larger number of individuals to address all of the needs that we

mentioned. So again, we're not voting on this today and we're not, it's not a vote, we're more like trying to get feedback. So, at a later date hopefully, we will have time to get feedback from you, this is just the initial phase of sharing these questions.

CHERRY: And in the chat, I was asked, can we make this available? Yes, after the meeting we can post this on listserv. This was added to the agenda a little bit late, and so we didn't have time to distribute this in advance, but we can distribute this now that we've introduced it here, we can distribute down the listserv, so people have it handy.

WALBRIDGE: All right, and my understanding of this from the UFC is that financial exigency per se is something that applies to the system as a whole, not to the campus which does not mean that we don't have financial crises on the campus or that financial exigency might require closing a campus which we wouldn't like to be Bloomington but then have substantial effects on us, so those are the kind of scenarios you should be thinking about and that's clearly the sort of thing that you want to know what you're going to do before you need to it. All right, my apologies to Barb and Paul. And I want to thank all of you for your thoughtful discussion on the question of contract links. So, we are now out of time, and I guess following Laruen's precedence, we vote to adjourn by deserting the Zoom call so thank you everybody. Have a good week.