

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL

April 6th, 2021

broadcast.iu.edu

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

Members Present: Karen Banks, Jonathan Brauer, Dan Bullock, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, John Carini, Barb Cherry, Dakota Coates, Paul Coats, Rachael Cohen, David Daleke, Allen Davis, Constantine Deliyannis, J Duncan, Ann Elsner, Kelly Eskew, Pnina Fichman, Lessie Frazier, 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, Sameer Patil, Eliza Pavalko, Chuck Peters, Linda Pisano, Angie Raymond, Cate Reck, Lauren Richerme, Lauren Robel, Steve Sanders, Elizabeth Shea, Marietta Simpson, Lisa Thomassen, Samantha Tirey, John Walbridge, Steve Wyrzynski, Jeffery Zaleski, Kurt Zorn

Members Absent: Karen Allen, Jim Ansaldo, Rachel Aranyi, Hussein Banai, Jackie Fleming, Linda Gales, Rob Kunzman, Jessica Lester, Pedro Machado, Miriam Northcutt Bohmert, Courtney Olcott, Ruhan Syed, Erik Willis

Guests: Toni Arcuri (alternate), Barb Dennis (alternate), Taylor Guba (alternate), Erika Knudsen, Moira Marsh, Mark McConahay, David Rutkowski, Alex Tanford

AGENDA:

1. **Approval of the [minutes of March 16, 2021](#)**
2. **[Memorial Resolution for Dennis W. Organ](#)**
3. **Proposed resolution of regarding the recent University of Evansville's academic changes (10 Minutes)**
Diane Henshel, Past-president of the IU Bloomington Faculty
Moira Marsh, Libraries
[Action Item]

[B40-2021: A summary of University of Evansville \(UE\) recent events explaining the BFC support resolution](#)

[B41-2021: Proposed resolution of regarding the recent University of Evansville's academic changes](#)

4. **Questions/comments on the proposed resolution of regarding the recent University of Evansville’s academic changes (15 Minutes)**
5. **Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)**
John Walbridge, Faculty President
6. **Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)**
Lauren Robel, Provost
7. **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
8. **Proposed amendments to BL-ACA-H10 Indiana University Bloomington Accommodations for Religious Observances (5 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-H10 Indiana University Bloomington Accommodations for Religious Observances](#)
[B33-2021: Proposed amendments to BL-ACA-H10 Indiana University Bloomington Accommodations for Religious Observances](#)
9. **Questions/comments on the proposed amendments to BL-ACA-H10 Indiana University Bloomington Accommodations for Religious Observances (10 minutes)**
10. **Proposed amendments to BL-ACA-D9 Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of Indiana University (5 minutes)**
Rachael Cohen, Parliamentarian and Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee
[Second Reading – Action Item]

[Current BL-ACA-D9 Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of Indiana University](#)
[B34-2021: Proposed amendments to BL-ACA-D9 Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of Indiana University](#) (proposed amendments begin on page 7)
11. **Questions/comments on the proposed amendments to BL-ACA-D9 Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of Indiana University (5 minutes)**
12. **Proposed amendments to BL-ACA-H28 Faculty Instructional Responsibilities to update the population of students required to receive early evaluation reports (10 minutes)**
J Duncan, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee

David Rutkowski, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
[First Reading – Discussion item]

[Current BL-ACA-H28 Faculty Instructional Responsibilities](#)
[B42-2021: Proposed amendments to BL-ACA-H28 Faculty Instructional Responsibilities](#)

13. Questions/comments on the proposed amendments to BL-ACA-H28 Faculty Instructional Responsibilities to update the population of students required to receive early evaluation reports (20 minutes)

TRANSCRIPT:

ROBEL: All right. Well, welcome everyone. Are we live? I can't tell.

SIMPSON: I believe we are.

ROBEL: Elizabeth are we on now?

PEAR: Yes. I think so.

ROBEL: Okay. Well, welcome everybody. It's wonderful to see you all. And particularly on this absolutely glorious spring day. I mean what a gift today is. And we have a few things I think we're taking out-of-order today, but not the approval of the minutes, which always comes first.

AGENDA ITEM ONE: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 16, 2021

ROBEL: And for that, I would like to ask for a motion and I will just let everyone know, Rachel Cohen is watching the chat and the raised hand's function. If you want something on the record, it should be spoken out loud because the chat is not actually the record. So, can I get a motion, please?

LION: I'll make the motion.

ROBEL: Thank you very much. I love your background, Margret. That's great. What a run they had.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: And I second.

ROBEL: All right. All in favor, please say aye.

BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL: Aye. Aye. Aye.

ROBEL: That sounds like a vast majority to me. I'll turn now to our Vice Provost Eliza Pavalko, for a memorial resolution for Dennis Organ.

AGENDA ITEM TWO: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR DENNIS W. ORGAN

PAVALKO: I met Dennis Organ on my very first day at Indiana University in the fall of 1986. I was visiting for my faculty job interview and Denny hosted me for dinner that evening. That proved to be a fortuitous meal for me as it was ultimately instrumental in my accepting the job at IU, and the beginning of a 33-year friendship and mentorship that has been among the most pronounced of my career and life.

For those in the field of organizational behavior, Denny's scholarly credentials are particularly well known. Indeed, he is probably the most prominent and influential scholar we have ever had in our Department of Management and Entrepreneurship at the Kelley School – and indeed among the most recognized OB scholars worldwide. He was the founder of the study of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and literally wrote the book on the topic. Thousands of studies and papers have now been devoted to OCB and it all stems from Denny's landmark work. He had an impeccable academic pedigree studying under the legendary Stacy Adams at the University of North Carolina, and he proudly continued Stacy's inquiry into matters of equity and job satisfaction and commitments to a larger cause. Denny had a particular fondness for working with doctoral students and served on over 85 dissertation committees.

But with Denny, it was never just *what* he did – but *how* he did it. He did not chase publications or opportunistically pursue anything. He explored what he observed to be interesting and important. He wrote eloquently and with grace and flair. Serving as editor of the Kelley School's professional journal, *Business Horizons*, his opening chronicles were always timely, provocative and engaging. He loved the written word and could be folksy and colloquial, but also erudite and refined. He had broad and eclectic tastes and many of his friends remember him as the single best source of their next great read. Indeed, upon learning of his passing, I sheepishly recalled that I still have a few books that he had loaned me – now to become some of the most cherished in my library.

One of our long-time colleagues here at Kelley, Dan Dalton, once aptly described Denny as a true “renaissance” man. To wit, he was an accomplished photographer, nimble ballroom dancer, and sterling slow-pitch softball player, renowned in Bloomington for his own crafted pitch called the “cradle” that bedeviled batters in a game where pitching is designed to be inconsequential. He cherished his rural roots in Roanoke Rapids, NC but also loved to travel and experience the great cities and destinations of the world. He thoroughly enjoyed a gourmet meal and cycling adventure in some exotic locale but was equally delighted to sit at home and watch an Atlanta Braves game with a good book, a chicken-salad sandwich, and a loving cat at his side.

Perhaps most consequentially, Denny was a man with great love to give and was a devoted partner to his first wife, Kay, and his subsequent partner JoAnn -- both of whom sadly passed away too young. He was blessed to find love a third time with wife Lynn, whom he adored and who survives him.

Theodor Geisel (Dr. Seuss) once magically noted that “... *in times of loss we should not just cry because it is over but also smile that it ever happened at all.*” Losing Denny saddens all who knew him. But I would also submit that for all of us in North Carolina, Bloomington, The Kelley

School and in the wider field of organizational behavior, we are also smiling today that there ever was a Dennis Organ and that he was ours. RIP.

Denny was born May 10, 1944, in Roanoke Rapids, North Carolina. He received his Bachelor of Arts degree from The University of North Carolina (UNC), Chapel Hill in 1966 and a Ph.D. in organizational behavior from UNC in 1970. In September 1970, he joined Indiana University's faculty as an assistant professor. Less than 4 years later, he was promoted to associate professor, and in 1980 he achieved the rank of full professor. For the 1998-1999 academic year, Denny temporarily traded IU's cream and crimson for Wake Forest University's black and gold. He joined the Babcock Graduate School of Management as visiting research professor of management.

Denny taught a multitude of management courses across all degree programs before retiring in May 2008. At the undergraduate level, he taught Human Resource Management, Organizational Behavior and Leadership, Models of Job Motivation, the Herman Wells Honors Seminar, and Managing Business Functions for the Liberal Arts in Management Program. At the M.B.A. level, he taught Management and Organizational Behavior, Organizational Behavior and Individual Performance, and International Organizational Behavior. Finally, at the Ph.D. level, Denny taught Methods of Research in Organizational Behavior, Theories of Social Influence, and Advanced Topics in Organizational Behavior.

Denny passed away peacefully on October 8, 2019, in Los Angeles, California.

Timothy T. Baldwin

Randall L. Tobias Chair in Leadership

Chairperson, Management and Entrepreneurship

Kelley School of Business

Indiana University Bloomington

Thank you.

ROBEL: Oh, what a wonderful tribute to Denny. Let's take a moment of silence to remember him. Thank you. And here right at the beginning of baseball season to get that through is just fantastic.

AGENDA ITEM THREE: PROPOSED RESOLUTION REGARDING THE RECENT UNIVERSITY OF EVANSVILLE'S ACADEMIC CHANGES

ROBEL: We're going to go a little out of our usual order today because we have a proposed resolution regarding the recent University of Evansville's academic changes. Diane Henshel and Moira Marsh, in a reprise appearance, are presenting this resolution to us. So, I'll turn it over to the two with you. Welcome back Moira.

MARSH: Thank you.

HENSHEL: So, umm Moira's on the phone. But on the other hand, this started out of Moira's work with the AAUP. And I'm going to leave it to Moira to introduce and when she has to get off because she has something else to deal with, then I'll take over. Go to it, Moira.

MARSH: Okay. Thank you, Diane. And hello possums. That's my name, Edna imitation for the day. I'm speaking to you from a parking lot in Indianapolis. So, the reason that I'm here is because I am the current chair of the committee on governance for the Indiana conference of the AAUP. And last fall, our colleagues at the University of Evansville got in touch with the state conference and asked for advice and help with the situation. And so, our committee was put to work on that. We started talking to them first week of December last year. And we have received a lot of information from the faculty in Evansville. I'm happy to say, well, it's not really happy, but they do have a AAUP chapter in Evansville now with 75 members, which is more than half their total faculty, in that chapter. We also worked with the national office of the AAUP. Our concern being not with necessarily any particular plan that might be devised to deal with the enrollment and budget woes of the university, but with the process that was followed or not followed in coming up with plans to deal with those issues. And we issued a letter to the president of the university laying out our concern. And the basic outline of events is in the handout that you have attached to the agenda. It's a one-page thing. I won't read it. Just to say that things have been moving after months and months of not much happening, things are now moving fairly quickly. It goes through till March 12th or March 17th was the last that we had information about what's going on there. So, we've been asked, as with other faculty senate around the state, to stand in solidarity with our colleagues at Evansville in terms of the and stand in support of the principles of shared governance, which we firmly believe still apply even in the most dire circumstances. So, there is a draft text of a resolution for your consideration today, and I appreciate the council's indulgence in listening to me and putting me early on the agenda that fit my schedule. So, I'm here to take any questions or anything that anything you'd like to know further about that.

ROBEL: Thank you so much, Moira.

HENSHEL: I think I'd also like to point out that the resolution really just, states that we are supporting our colleagues, our faculty colleagues in that we encourage a better, more inclusive approach to following faculty governance at the University of Evansville. So, at any rate, back to questions to Moira.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON PROPOSED RESOLUTION OF REGARDING THE RECENT UNIVERSITY OF EVANSVILLE'S ACADEMIC CHANGES

ROBEL: Are there question? Rachael, do you see any questions so far?

COHEN: No questions so far. Oh wait, Dakota now has one.

ROBEL: Okay. Dakota?

COATES: I just had a quick clarifying question. In the be it resolved section where it says the calls upon the President and Board of Trustees. Is that the President and Board of Trustees of IU or of University of Evansville?

MARSH: Of Evansville.

ROBEL: I see Steve Sanders has his hand up.

COHEN: Yep. And then John Walbridge.

SANDERS: Yeah. I'll just speak briefly and in support of this. I mean, my rationale is not so much that sort of we have a direct interest in what goes on at the University of Evansville, but I think we have a direct interest in the extent to which shared governance continues to be vibrant and effective in American higher education generally, I think that to the extent it is allowed to wither away at places like Evansville, it harms its future effectiveness. Here I think we're actually quite lucky and we may be approaching the point we were a throwback that are faculty governance traditions at IU Bloomington are still so relatively strong compared to other places. And so, because I think it's a troubling trend that shared governance is weakening sort of all over. I think that sufficient reason to support this resolution.

ROBEL: Thank you, Steve. John?

WALBRIDGE: It's a comment on my part, which is actually something little bit encouraging. I spent the first months of the pandemic in Evansville and reading the Evansville paper and then engaged to an Evansville alumni. But one of the things that happened was that there was a swelling of support for the faculty and for the university among the alumni in the community there, partly because one of the early targets was their music program which Evansville having been settled by Germans was strong and popular. So, there is support for this kind of thing in the community if we know how to look for it. But I strongly support the resolution.

ROBEL: Great. Any other comments or questions? Well, then let's call the question. Can I get a vote, please, on the proposed resolution?

BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL: Aye, aye, aye, aye, aye, aye, aye, aye.

ROBEL: Okay and opposed?

All right and Elizabeth, I'm taking it that from now on we'll actually use the vote function.

PEAR: People just beat me to it. Ya'll were too fast.

ROBEL: I think that that passes overwhelmingly. And let's just wait for Elizabeth for the next couple of things if we could. That would be great. All right. Thank you so much, Moira. And thank you. Diane.

MARSH: Thank you all. Ya'll have fun now.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

ROBEL: Thank you so much. Well, we'll return to our regular order. And John, I will turn things over to you for executive committee business.

WALBRIDGE: Well, thank you. There are a couple of things that I wanted to note. One is if anyone has missed the news, the new acting provost as of the 1st of July will be John Applegate. We will miss Lauren. I trust that he will be at least somewhere in the same quality range as Lauren has been. But I've worked with him over the last year or more particularly and have found him an admirable administrator to work for. Elizabeth's praise of him is positively lavish she having actually having worked for him for a time. So, I think the university is in good hands. Our campus for the next year, at least. Let's hope it continues.

The other thing, sort of take a point of personal privilege and comment on the loss of two of our colleagues we'll have memorial resolutions for them eventually. Patrick O'Meara, one of the giants of the university, has died since our last meeting. He was, for those of you who didn't know him and missed the privilege, essentially, Indiana University's Foreign Minister. He represented us to the world. He was a man of great polish and manners. Sort of the godfather of my school, Hamilton Lugar. He was a mentor to those of us working in international studies and area studies. As a personal matter, I think my first major engagement with him was when I was preparing a title six application for the Middle East Program. And he recommended I do it one way. And I decided to do it a different way and we didn't get it. And when I next met him, he just shook his head and said, well, next time. I was very grateful to him for not rebuking me as perhaps I deserved.

The other person who's passing, I just learned was Michael Dunn, who was the founding dean of The School of Informatics. My association with him goes back a quarter of a century to when he was the chair of the philosophy department. But for almost all of that period, I've been having lunch every Tuesday with him and several other faculty members, most of them older and most of them from the Department of History and Philosophy of Science. These people played a big role in my life in the university and mentoring me and supporting me at times when I needed support in various ways. And I have to say that this now is purely personal and has nothing to do with the Executive Committee, but I think it's important for us to maintain these kinds of relationships, to have the have social connections to meet with these kind of little groups that meet for breakfast or for lunch or go to basketball games together or whatever. These play, I think a role that we've neglected in recent years in the university and holding us all together as a real community. And I have to say that as my older IU friends pass away and I have lost several in the last couple of years. At least for me, it's been slightly bleaker place. These are these are people not easily replaced.

Well, on that morbid thing, I think I'll move on to something looking to the future. A taskforce of the University Faculty Council that effectively, it's been led by Diane Henshel and by Laverne Nishihara from IU East has just put together a draft of a proposal for a climate action plan for the university. This evolved from proposals made at IU East and that resolution that we adopted a couple of years ago. But its goal is to have a plan by 2025 to make the university carbon neutral by 2040. So, this goes to the UFC in a couple of weeks, if you have questions about it either now

or later, Diane is the person to talk to. So, with that I will turn, unless someone has a question about any of this, I'll turn it back over to Lauren for other business.

AGENDA ITEM SIX: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPROT:

ROBEL: Well, thank you so much, John. I too will. I have to start out by remembering Patrick O'Meara. He was one of the lights this university. He just brought light wherever he went and humor. I always thought of Patrick as somebody who embodied, in every possible way, everything you'd want in a diplomat. You know, somebody who would think at every turn of how to be most welcoming. And he just embodied hospitality. And he was a joy to travel with. Patrick came from a family of inn keepers, I'll put it that way. And he had a very good, very fine sense of what a hotel should be. So, if you ever had the luck to travel with Patrick O'Meara you knew that you weren't going to be staying in your usual shabby digs. It's hard to even imagine the university without Patrick. And so, I, I hope all of you, if you have a chance will donate to the scholarship fund in his honor at the IU Foundation and perhaps drop a note to the Office of International Services, which has been hit very, very hard by this particular passing. I had not heard about Mike Dunn. We have many, many, many things to thank Mike for the founding of the school that is now Informatic, Computing and Engineering. And really, he was the connection to Indiana University that brought Michael McRobbie here. Michael's first connection with us was through Mike Dunn. That's another big loss. I'm trying to think of how I can go through the things I have to tell you in an ordered that will end on an up note.

So, and then finally, commenting on John's remarks, you are definitely getting an upgrade in John Applegate. You have nothing to fear from the faculty and shared governance standpoint from John for sure. His academic values and his integrity are stellar. So, I'm very pleased that John will be stepping into this role, and I have complete trust in him to work with the BFC and exactly the same way he has worked carefully with the UFC for many years.

I guess I'll start with the somber and move to the hopeful. Although the somber is also something that I think that the university should be very proud of. When I became provost, one of the most surprising things to me was when Sarita Soni told me that the university had thousands of human remains in its possession. It's not the first thing you would think of when you think of a university, but when you think about it for even a few minutes and you think about the work that anthropologists do and the possibilities of what's in museums, you would understand that, in fact, we do have, have had thousands of human remains and funerary objects that are subject to the statute called NAGPRA, the Native American Grave Repatriation Act, I believe. That statute requires universities to work with the tribes in the United States and elsewhere whose ancestors were names that we have and to repatriate those remains in accordance with both federal law and with the wishes of the tribes. Very soon after I came into this office, Sarita Soni, who was then the Vice Provost for Research, commissioned a study of human remains on the campus and brought in a renowned legal scholar from Berkeley, Dick Buxbaum, national expert in this area, with an interesting connection I'll tell you about in just a bit to IU. But he did a study, and we opened an office to comply with the NAGPRA's requirements and it was a heavy lift. It has involved Sarita Soni. It has involved Rick Van Kooten when he was in the office. And of course, of course, Jeff Zaleski and our wonderful office for NAGPRA compliance. I'm going to fast

forward now to a week ago when we repatriated 750 human remains to Angel Mounds. The Angel Mounds site is one of the largest archaeologically important sites in the United States and we had a very large collection of human remains and funerary objects from that site. We've been working with the tribes on repatriating them for some time. And under the supervision of the tribes, our NAGPRA office and Ed Herrmann, who is the head of our museum of archaeology and anthropology, took the remains back to Angel Mounds, but they did more. Typically, when remains are repatriated universities give them to the tribes, hand them to the tribes. Four reasons that are cultural some of the tribes could not accept them in that way. And so, our staff actually replaced the human remains, reassembled them, replaced them in the burial site. Arranged them in the appropriate way. Replace the funerary objects and reburied them all. It's a very somber, very important step on behalf of the university. And I wanted to take a moment to recognize it because it is an important step in recognizing and repairing a, a wound to the Native American peoples whose ancestors we, you know, we have used for study. All right. I guess I'll just stop there on that except to thank deeply everybody who was involved in that effort. And to say that I'm very proud of our university for doing it. And to recognize that it is something that I'm quite confident will be with the people who were involved, for the rest of their lives given how sobering that whole experience was.

I will, on a more hopeful note, I'd like to just say the vaccine clinic at Simon Scott is going great. We're giving, I think upwards of 500 vaccines a day. By the time we're done, we will have given over 70,000 vaccines. And we've got two mask backs clinics coming up in May where we'll do mask vaccination. And in the meantime, I'm just very, I'm very, very happy and thrilled that we are at the point where we could be vaccinating our students and our faculty and our staff without any limitations except the ones that are imposed by physics. On that note, I'll stop and ask if there are any questions.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

COHEN: Dakota has a question.

ROBEL: Dakota?

COATES: Hi. I was just wondering if you'd be able to briefly touch on the potential for fall break or wellness days going into the fall semester. I know it's been a pretty hot topic amongst both graduate undergraduate students. So, I just didn't know if there had been any progress or movement there.

ROBEL: You know, I don't actually know. We will have the usual Thanksgiving break in the fall and fall break. Fall break is a single day. So, it's not I think a make or break, a break for the for the students and spring break is back on the schedule. And so, I will check on that fall break day, but I feel pretty good about where the schedule's going for next year.

COATES: The reason I was asking is because I know some graduate programs have a week-long fall break and so I didn't know how that was going to fit into the system but thank you.

ROBEL: You bet. Okay. Any other questions? All right. I'll turn then to Rachael. And Rachael, I'm hoping somebody will be watching for you this time while you're while you're talking about the proposed amendments to BL-ACA-D9.

SIMPSON: Yes. I'll be watching for her.

ROBEL: Thanks so much Marietta.

COHEN: Alex Tanford is actually going to present. So, I'm actually good.

ROBEL: Oh, I'm so sorry. I think I've moved forward; past something I shouldn't have. That's the Bloomington accommodations for religious observances. And that is Israel and Steve. My apologies, Israel, and Steve.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BL-ACA-H10 INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON ACCOMODATIONS FOR RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCES

SANDERS: Oh, no, that's okay. We may have been asleep at the switch as well. So, Israel, I'm happy to defer if you want to say anything about this, but I think this is pretty quick. We had the first reading at the last meeting. There were no questions, no objections, no advice to the committee. As I mentioned at the last meeting, one of the Faculty Affairs Committees tasks this year was to work with Eliza Pavalko's office to do a review of both the written the actual faculty policy related to religious accommodations, as well as the guidance that's given on the vice provost's website related to how faculty should handle religious accommodations. And so, what you have as part of the attachment for the meeting is simply something that requires a change in policy requires BFC approval because it is a policy change and that is one where we're doing some terminology change. We're changing reference from religious holidays to religious observances. But then the most significant thing is the clarification that whereas now the policy requires that students give notice to faculty members during the first two weeks of the semester. We are being somewhat more flexible. And the sort of baseline rule will be that a student has to give notice to the faculty member at least two weeks before the need for the observance. And so, I think that the change in policy is fairly self-explanatory, fairly simple, as I say there didn't seem to be any questions or reservations expressed last time. So, your Faculty Affairs Committee presents this with a recommendation for your approval.

AGENDA ITEM NINE: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BL-ACA-H10 INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON ACCOMODATIONS FOR RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCES

ROBEL: All right. Are there any further questions about the religious accommodations policy?

COHEN: John?

WALBRIDGE: Yeah. One, two questions actually. One, is it clear that the list that the vice provost's office prepares is not exclusive? I've had time with minority religion, so.

SANDERS: This is the list of holidays that is sort of acknowledged by the university or the list of observances.

WALBRIDGE: And it does not exclude other possibilities?

SANDERS: I think that's a fair statement. I'll ask Eliza if she wants to add something, but that is one of the things we did discuss that Eliza and Kim from her office discussed with the Faculty Affairs Committee. I think it is fair to say that that is not intended to be an exclusive list. In fact, one of the things that Eliza's office is planning to do as a follow-up to the Faculty Affairs committee's work. And this isn't something that would be BFC needs to approve or needs to be brought legislatively. But Eliza is or was planning to convene as essentially a committee of experts, of faculty members who could essentially help guide the office in a determination of whether a particular religious holiday or observance which hasn't previously been noted, should actually be allowed under the policy. And I think probably as a practical matter, I might go so far as to say is if a faculty member wants to approve a student's request, the faculty members free to do so. Usually, it only even gets to Eliza's office and some kind of determination like this where the faculty member is sort of standing pat and declining to get the student an accommodation. But yes. Eliza's office was planning to do a review of that list. That's one of the things she talked about. Eliza, anything to add on that.

PAVALKO: Yeah. That's exactly right. One of those things that kind of got it looking into policy was feeling like it wasn't clear that there is a mechanism is those holidays don't capture what students need. But also having a committee, not only that can advise us on what the base list should look like, but also can advise if a student does requests something that we know, a holiday we aren't familiar with. So, we definitely want that expertise in there.

WALBRIDGE: Just out of curiosity why is the language being changed from holidays to observances? It's not going to affect my vote.

SANDERS: We went around and around about that. We probably spent too much time on that. You know, what is the difference between a holiday and observance? We actually did have some interesting semantic discussions. I think the only thing I can say, and Israel or Eliza chime in and correct me if I'm wrong, is most people had a kind of instinctive sense that observances was broader than holidays. That there may be some religious traditions which require or expect a particular kind of duty or observance in some part of an observant person. But they don't use the term holidays. And so, I think our thinking right or wrong was that holidays are encompassed within observances. That observances is simply a broader term and perhaps a somewhat more neutral term, than holidays, holidays ultimately sort of does have its roots in the idea of a holy day, and that may not be consistent with all religious traditions.

WALBRIDGE: Okay. Thank you.

ROBEL: Any other questions or semantic observations?

COHEN: Dakota?

COATES: Yeah. I just wanted to say as a student that I really support these changes and I really want to applaud the committee for I would agree that the use of observance ever holiday is a broader and more inclusive terminology. Um, but I also think that the change in the reporting structure both reflects more aptly the practice that students seemed to have to follow and that they do follow and also grant students, I think, flexibility that they need throughout the semester. So, I fully support the resolution. Just wanted to applaud the group for pursuing this change.

ROBEL: Terrific. Any other comments? Elizabeth, I'm giving you warning. I'm about to call a vote. There you go. Please cast your vote.

All right. Thank you. And we'll hear from Elizabeth in a moment. It looks like it's unanimous. And I am aware that I left you hanging on that story of Dick Buxbaum, and his connection to the university. But I will use the Paul Harvey privilege to come back to it at the very end of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM TEN: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BL-ACA-D9 BYLAWS OF THE BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY

ROBEL: So, all right, with that, I'll turn to Rachael Cohen for the proposed amendments to the bylaws. This is a second reading. So, Rachael, you might if you could remind us of what we're amending and then I'll open it up for discussion.

COHEN: Yeah. And I'm actually going to turn it over to Alex Tanford to present this.

ROBEL: Oh fantastic. Welcome, Alex.

TANFORD: Thank you. I'm also on the Constitution Rules Committee and since Rachael has to worry about all this sort of parliamentary things. She assigned me this task which shouldn't be difficult if I can find my button. There it is. Oops that wasn't it. This is a second reading of a proposed amendment to the bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council. It occurs down here under the duties and function of the Executive Committee. And it gives the executive committee bylaws authority to create and appoint ad hoc committees and task forces, and also to make recommendations of faculty members to serve on administratively created committees. Which comes up sometimes during Executive Committee meetings where there's a need for a faculty member on a university committee. This language is borrowed from verbatim; I think from the parallel provision and the University Faculty Council bylaws. And it corrects a strange and inadvertent oversight in our bylaws, which as far as I've ever been involved in faculty governance. The Executive Committee has in fact appointed and created ad hoc committees and task forces and appointed people to university committees. But it's never actually had the authority to do so. Under Robert's Rules of Order, which we are otherwise supposed to follow, an ad hoc committee or a task force is classified as a special committee. And a special committee under Robert's Rules of Order is to be created on the floor of the body during debate as a vehicle to which to refer pending matters before the body. That's clearly not what we're doing and it's not workable. So, this simply gives that power to the Executive Committee. I will remind you this is a second reading. And on a second reading, a proposed amendment to the bylaws can reduce or

narrow the scope but cannot change it or expand it. It can, but then it has to go back to yet more readings.

COHEN: Steve, I see your handout, but I'm not sure if that was from that time.

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

SANDERS: I did have a question if this is the appropriate time.

COHEN: Alex are you good for questions?

TANFORD: Yeah, Sure.

SANDERS: Alex, does this take away from any current authority that has been typically exercised by the Nominations Committee, for example, there has been a what we've called it a taskforce which working through Eliza's office, in consultation with the Faculty Affairs Committee, to develop a new set of procedures and guidelines for the promotion and NTT faculty. I think the Executive Committee created that taskforce, but I thought that the Nominations Committee had actually come up with the names of members. Is this sort of making clear that when it comes to truly ad hoc task forces and committees, basically the nominations committee doesn't play a role? The membership is determined by the Executive Committee, is that accurate?

TANFORD: No, it's not. It doesn't say one way or the other and the Executive Committee may delegate anything that it wants to any other committee. But having been on the Nominations Committee, there are times of the year when the Nominations Committee is meeting once a week and is overwhelmed with the staffing of ordinary or standing committees. And they are times when the provost has come to the Executive Committee meetings to ask for a nomination for a fairly fast-moving administrative committee where there may not be time. So, this says the Executive Committee may create and appoint. It does not say, for the reasons you specifically mentioned that it does not say that the Executive Committee is the only body that can nominate people. I think in many situations, I think it would be appropriate to send things onto the Nominations Committee, which is picked in part because it has broad campus representation of all sorts of units and levels and things like that.

SANDERS: We're sort of intentionally maintaining a little bit of ambiguity and not saying either the Nominations Committee or the Executive Committee has the final authority?

TANFORD: Correct.

SANDERS: Okay. And just one other thing, just to be clear, the kinds of administratively appointed committees assume that also refers to things that are just essentially created on an ad hoc basis. So, we are not talking about the kinds of campus committees which are listed on our website, such as the Rec Sports Committee or Student Conduct Commissions or student media board because those are kind of established standing campus committees. I think those things

typically go through the Nominations Committee again, these administrative appointed committees are again, kind of special ad hoc, short-term committees.

TANFORD: That's right. That is true. It is not designed to change anything like that. It is designed under two principles. One is to make clear that the Executive Committee may also exercises authority in situations it deems appropriate, and B, to comply with the usual rule of bylaws and things like that, that you don't micromanage process in a bylaw. It seems to me that personally, that that's fluid, depending on the situation, that is designed to preserve that kind of judgment and discretion.

Robel: Are there any other questions?

COHEN: I thought I had seen some hands go up. Oh, Israel has got a hand up now.

ROBEL: All right. Israel?

HERRERA: Alex, all right. Yeah, Thank you. Thank you, Alex. Thank you for working on this. Just a question regarding the recommendations from faculty members. So, this would be just campus recommendations or are we talking about any recommendation university wide? A member representing BFC?

TANFORD: There are a handful, maybe fewer than a handful, of university level policies that delegate down to the campus, Faculty Council Executive Committee, a nomination, or a particular role in a university policy. But those are already pretty much covered by university policy that specifies, for example, on a multi campus, like the financial exigency policy. So, it specifies how each, where you will get people from each campus and whose responsibility it is. So that this is only intended to apply at the BFC level. And that would mean when it says administrative newly appointed committees, if the provost were to go to the Executive Committee and say there's a university task force on x being put together by to know the vice president for research, for example. And the vice president asked me the provost, to supply one or two faculty members from Bloomington to serve on this committee. I, as the provost, don't feel comfortable making my own recommendation is to the faculty. So, I'm coming to you, the Executive Committee to name a faculty member or two that I can pass on to the vice president for research. That would be a situation again where this would simply, it doesn't say the Executive Committee must supply those names. They could say, we're uncomfortable doing this as well and would like to refer to our Research Affairs Committee. There's nothing that requires that the Executive Committee to do this. But right now, it is frequently in a position where it is uncontroversial and expedient for the Executive Committee should do this. But they don't actually have the authority to anywhere in our bylaws.

HERRERA: Thank you, Alex.

ROBEL: All right. Any other questions or comments?

COHEN: I'm not seeing any.

ROBEL: All right. Alex, if you could take that down then I'll call the question and ask for a vote, please. All in favor. All right. While, Elizabeth, that looks like it passed or is in the process of passing, overwhelmingly.

AGENDA ITEM TWELVE: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BL-ACA-H28 FACULTY INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES TO UPDATE THE POPULATION OF STUDENTS REQUIRED TO RECEIVE EARLY EVALUATION REPORTS

ROBEL: All right. Let me turn then to J Duncan, co-chair of the Education Policies Committee and David Rutkowski to talk about proposed amendments to the faculty instructional responsibilities to update the population of students required to receive early evaluation reports. That's a mouthful, J.

J DUNCAN: Well, you know, these procedurally generated titles will get you. So. All right, I'm gonna go ahead and share my screen in just a second. But I wanted to ask people's indulgence in something, which is that this is a first reading. And we've had a lot of discussion about it going on. There's been discussion at EPC, there has been discussion at Exec. And we've also had people in the background getting some data that we had requested. As such, I actually have two versions of this to share with you today. And neither of them is exactly the version that you received in the circular for today's meeting, although the change for the first one is very small. I will take full responsibility for this being the case. We just were working under some short deadlines, and this is in no way, shape, or fault of Elizabeth's for putting together the agenda. So, I'm going to take you through the first one, which is the one that received a few changes at the Exec level, explain what we're asking and go through the data that we received. Then I'll explain why there's a second version and where some additional information comes in. And we can take a look at that also, since it's a first reading, people have plenty of time to give commentary on this. I would request that anyone who has more than a word or two of wordsmithing they'd like to do please send that to myself and to David as a comment in perhaps an email that we could take the EPC rather than trying to do a 60, 70 person editing session at a first reading.

So, I'm going to go ahead and share my screen with you for this first document. All right, so hopefully everybody can see this. What we have here is a proposal to change the population targeted by the early evaluation policy. It does not change what early evaluation is. Although we have already discussed that this year. The rationale for this is that the population currently targeted is probably not the best population. It captures some students that don't need to be evaluated. It does not capture a lot of students that do need to be evaluated and it is inconsistent. So, this policy is designed to solve those problems. There's some background in the document that you received about the nature of this policy and to whom it currently applies. I'll highlight this section right here, freshmen or university sophomores and students enrolled in General Education Common Ground courses. So those are our current population. And this is what we're proposing to change away from.

So, the idea here is to move this to a population called beginning students, where beginning students are in their first year of enrollment. The term first year is used intentionally here instead of say freshman or sophomore or something like that. Because we're looking for people who are

new to the university experience. Those students may come in as something other than freshmen. In fact, as you'll see in the data, they often do. Likewise, they may or may not be in a specific general population of some kind. Some of them are increasingly direct admits. By tracking these students for their first year of enrollment when they're in their most vulnerable acclimation period. We're looking to provide a more comprehensive picture to the students themselves and to their advisors about what's happening academically with their performance. Instead of targeting specific classes say gen ed classes, were looking to target all of the courses that the students are enrolled then during that first year so that the students are coming in in their first semester as fall, this would be fall and spring. If the students are coming in in their first semester, spring, this would be spring and the subsequent fall. So, a full year of their academic performance would go to their advisors, and they can see comprehensively across the board what's happening to the students.

In section 4, there's some discussion of why the old population is less appropriate now than it used to be. The first one has to do with a variety of ways that students can enter with more credit hours than they used to have. You can see here a table that contrast fall of 2011 to fall of 2020. And you can see there's a pretty significant difference in the number of freshmen, which is decreased, and a pretty significant increase in sophomores and juniors so students increasingly have so many credits by the time they already get to us that defining this population as freshmen may not be suitable to capture people in their initial experience with Indiana University. Additionally, we can see some information about demographic changes, in direct admissions here. So here for example, you can see that university division sophomores is a category that has significantly decreased. As we see more and more students being directly admitted into programs. This is also no longer the way to comprehensively target students who are in their initial experience.

So, the next section I want to take you to is actually section 5. And in the document that you received, these two tables unfortunately, are in just like a very sad kind of page break. Please bear with me here for a second. Using our current policy, this initial table right here shows as we currently perform early evaluations, the unique students that are targeted for this, the unique instructors of record, unique counts of class sections, the average number of students per class, and the number of required early evaluations. This is contrasted with the same information under the new population that is being proposed. The things I think you'll see that are most dramatic here. Let's look at the unique students, this is 24,000 under our current policy, but only a little over 8,000 under the proposed policy. So, this is a pretty drastic change in decreasing the number of students given an early evaluation but making it a lot more targeted. The number of unique instructors of record actually goes up significantly. But that's because we're targeting a lot of smaller classes now that the students are taking in their first year of experience at IU, the average number of students per class that is being targeted by this goes down significantly. And the total number of these early evaluations also from 71,000 to 49,000. So basically, we're suggesting here that this is going to be smaller and better targeted to actually getting the data that these students and their advisors need to be able to help them succeed in college.

The last section of this document is the textual changes to the policy. The lines that are in red here are the same as the document that you received in the circular. The lines in purple are differences that were added during discussion at Executive Committee. I again apologize that I did not get an updated version of that to Elizabeth. And therefore, the circular you received was slightly outdated. Things that we discussed in Executive Committee that made changes here. The first one is explicitly putting in, that's, this is students who have first attended Indiana University, Bloomington. For reasons that I'm going to discuss when I move over to the second version of the document, there were a lot of questions about transfer students and what we didn't know at the time that EPC discussed this document and at the time that this was put into the circular is whether or not transfer students also showed the same kind of patterns of being at risk, compared to the average student population that first year students did. As it turns out, the data does support that. So, I'm going to show you a second version of this document that highlights transfer students as members of this beginner population that we're identifying.

The second thing was a slight change to the language here. This is language that already exists in the policy. As you may recall, earlier in this academic year, we made some changes to what we were proposing to evaluate during early evaluation. That change was specifically to not require letter grade evaluations, but to leave open the option of evaluations that we're in other forums. We missed one little piece of language here that Exec felt might overemphasize the notion that letter grades were still required in some way. So there was a suggestion to strike that. Additionally, there was a suggestion to move this sentence before this sentence right here, so as to provide additional context that the evaluations are observations and recommendations rather than specifically letter grades.

So, this is the proposal with these small changes that you received in the circular. As I mentioned, there was some discussion on EPC itself about whether or not transfer students should be included. I want to specifically thank Kurt and his office for getting that data. It did take a little bit of time. But based on that data, I have a second version of the policy to share with you. And this is the one I would recommend that we move forward with consideration. The majority of this remains exactly the same. There are some additional tables to show us how many students would be included if we brought in ICT (Inter-campus Transfer) and transfer students. And you'll see those numbers here in this table that's in red. So, we have 218 ICT students and 788 transfer students. If we then bring them into the population of beginners that we're proposing to recenter early evaluation around. This gives us this second table, which again in comparison to the first table, our current policies allows us to see that we would still be targeting fewer students. We would be targeting students on average that are in smaller classes. The overall number of these evaluations would significantly decrease but be more focused. Aside from that and the inclusion of language about transfers, this version of the document otherwise remains the same. So, at this point, sorry for the large info dump, I will open the floor to questions.

AGENDA ITEM THIRTEEN: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BL-ACA-H28 FACULTY INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES TO UPDATE THE POPULATION OF STUDENTS REQUIRED TO RECEIVE EARLY EVALUATION REPORTS

ROBEL: Thank you so much, J. Are there any questions? That looked like it was a tremendous amount of work. Thank you.

J DUNCAN: I have to thank Kurt's office. They had been fantastic working with us on this.

ZORN: Well actually Mark McConahay and Erika in his office, did a lot of the heavy lifting preparing these data. Most of this data.

COHEN: Peter?

KLOOSTERMAN: Yeah. I'm just curious. You said that the data for transfers were similar. I mean that surprises me a little bit because I think transfer students had seemingly succeeded someplace else. So they wouldn't be coming here. So, I'm just curious as to, you know, are they really very much like the freshmen or sort of like it? Can you say a little bit more about what's happening with transfers?

J DUNCAN: Sure. Before I turn that over to Kurt who has the actual data analysis on this, I just want to explain why we wanted to ask that question to begin with. A lot of the faculty on EPC wondered whether, although these students have succeeded in another institution or another IU campus. What we were really trying to get at here with this beginning population was the inherent difference in attending an institution like IU Bloomington specifically versus attending some other institution like a regional campus or a community college. And from the analysis that I received from Kurt, it does seem that there is some statistical evidence that the students are, again, a little bit more at risk when they enter our campus and our system, by virtue of it being a much larger institution. Kurt, if you want to speak more specifically with the data there or if you think that I've summarized that, I'll turn it over to you.

ZORN: I think you summarized it well J, if people are interested, I mean, I have the data. We did analysis on first term GPA by the various student category, new student category, beginner ICT, transfer. And it turns out that the GPA of the ICT, the intercampus transfers, I'll just give you an idea of the mean for beginners with 3.18 in the fall semester for ICT was 2.71. And for transfers, what we call external transfers was 2.9. So, you can see they perform actually in terms of mean GPA, worse than what you recall, the traditional beginners.

J DUNCAN: Thank you, Kurt.

COHEN: Diane?

HENSHEL: Okay. So, I just want to clarify. J, you've got two well essentially three possibilities. But can you propose which one you are going to be asking us to vote on or are we going to be voting on them one at a time? How are you proposing to do this voting?

J DUNCAN: Thank you for asking the question. Given how I think straightforward looking at the ICT and transfer numbers was, I would like to propose that we move forward with the last version of the document, the one that includes ICT and transfer students in this population. Now, if there is strong objection to that from the council, I would certainly be willing to work with the other version, but I don't think there's a good reason at the moment not to include them in this

population, given that the evidence shows their also vulnerable when they enter their first year here.

HENSHEL: I support your last proposal to include the transfer students, but I'm just one of many. But I'm going to vocalize my support.

ROBEL: Great. Other questions?

COHEN: Colin.

C. JOHNSON: Yeah. I just had a question for Kurt. I know you use GPA as the kind of data point to analyze this, but am I correct in believing that transfer students, their GPAs are calculated differently, don't they actually exclude the GPA, like credit earned, you'd get the credit, but their GPAs don't necessarily transfer credit earned on other campuses. Is that correct?

ZORN: Yes, that's right. That's correct.

C. JOHNSON: So, in some way it's the GPA that's being calculated for transfer students is reflective usually of work being done in the major, right? Or at sort of the second- or third-year level, not necessarily introductory level?

ZORN: It depends what level are coming in.

C. JOHNSON: But I'm saying that a lot of that's actually excluded from their GPA is a kind of relevant relative comparator.

ZORN: It's possible, yes. But I think it still indicates that this is a population that wouldn't hurt to do this evaluation.

J DUNCAN: So, Colin, what I would suggest is that given that the students who have not previously attended another institution, their GPA is only IUB classes. And then as you just pointed out, that's what we're calculating for the transfer students. It's a lot more apples to apples than it might seem. Especially if that work is being done in a student's major, that should be the student's strongest point.

C. JOHNSON: Right? Yeah. I just wanted clarification on the nature of the comparison being made.

ROBEL: Perfect.

SIMPSON: Lisa has a question, sorry, Lauren.

ROBEL: That's okay, Lisa?

THOMASSEN: Hi. Thank you. First of all, yeah, as Lauren said, I really want to commend Kurt and his office for pulling together all of this data. It's really tremendous. And J for writing this report and giving us such a clear presentation of it. As somebody who's dealt with, you know, early warning and went through the student engagement roster and seeing the benefits of having that added, I think it's really great to see that there's been so much sensitivity to diverse populations that can be served by this. So really being mindful about catching all the folks who might be vulnerable and new to our campus culture

and maybe struggle with some of those issues on entry. And also, as an instructor who teaches large gen ed classes. And I'm going to be doing a lot of this reporting anyway through the student engagement roster. I was really happy to see the numbers go down significantly. I think that's really a great thing. So good job folks and I also support this.

J DUNCAN: Just to comment. So, to clarify, I did not write this report. I want to make sure that's very clear. I have the privilege to represent the EPC here and to move forward what I think is a very helpful change. But this really belongs in other people's courts as having originated this. And I want to make sure that recognized for their work.

MCCONAHAY: Let me if I could just add. Erika Knudsen did the heavy lifting on the data and the writing of the report.

J DUNCAN: Thank you, Mark.

ROBEL: I don't, this is a first reading, so it's just a discussion item at this point. Is there any more advice for the committee? If you do have more, you can, of course, send it directly to J or any member of the EPC. And I think that gets us to the end of the agenda. And so, I'll finish my story. I told you that I was surprised to find that we had so many human remains on the campus when I became provost. And we asked Dick Buxbaum, a faculty member, a distinguished faculty member in law from Berkeley, to come and do a report for us, which he did. And it has organized all of our activities ever since. Wonderful report that led us in every direction we've gone so far. It led us to hire the, the wonderful Jayne-Leigh Thomas, who heads our NAGPRA office. The two people who were I think, most responsible for the repatriation that happened last week were Jayne-Leigh and Ed Herrmann, who runs the museum. And Ed Herrmann is Dick Buxbaum's, son-in-law. So now you have the rest of the story and I think we can adjourn if in our usual way perhaps. Thank you, everybody.