

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
April 18, 2023 | 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Presidents Hall – Franklin Hall

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ahlbrand, Ashley; Asher, Sofiya; Brinda, Chelsea; Cole, Shu; Daleke, David; Dau-Schmidt, Ken; Davis, Allen; Deliyannis, Con; DeSawal, Danielle; Eaton, Kristine; Eskew, Kelly; Freedman, Seth; Furey, Constance; Groth, Dennis; Herrera, Israel; Housworth, Elizabeth; Johnson, Colin; Kravitz, Ben; Kubow, Patricia; Lalwani, Ashok; Lammers, Sabine; Lanosga, Gerry; Lion, Margaret; Loring, Annette; McCoy, Chase; Pavalko, Eliza; Peters, Chuck; Ramos, Bill; Reck, Cate; Sapp, Christopher; Sela, Ron; Sherman, Jim; Shrivastav, Rahul; Siek, Jeremy; Sinadinos, Alison; Smith, Wyatt; Svetina, Dubravka; Tanford, Alex; Wu, Jiangmei; Wyczynski, Stephen.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Arcuri, Toni; Bala, Hillol; Bialasiak, Jack; Cavar, Damir; Cohen, Rachael; Deeds, Anna; Frazier, Lessie; Gahl-Mills, Karen; Gibson, John; Giordano, Anthony; Green, Hank; Gupta, Nandini; Kalentzidou, Olga; Kollbaum, Pete; Michaelsen, Jon; Northcutt Bohmert, Miriam; Olcott, Courtney; Ossi, Massimo; Pastore, Bell; Perry, Brea; Raymond, Angie; Seibert, Kyla; Shy, Katie; Silvester, Katie; Simpson, Marietta; Singh, Kashika; Sterling, Thomas; Tracey, Dan; Walton, Christi, Whitworth, Cale.

GUESTS: Dallis-Comentale, Diane; Winston, Wayne; Miles, Emily; Robinson, Jennifer; Ryan, Colleen; Sherwood-Laughlin, Catherine; Kellams, Dina; Schwier, Carrie; Ellis, Erin.

AGENDA

April 18, 2023 | 2:30 - 4:30 p.m.
Presidents Hall - Franklin Hall

1. Approval of the minutes of April 4, 2023
2. Memorial Resolution for Charles E. Greer
3. Memorial Resolution for Craig Woodworth Holden
4. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)
Cate Reck, Faculty President
5. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)
Rahul Shrivastav, Provost
6. Question/Comment Period (10 minutes)
Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to Provost Shrivastav or President Reck by emailing bffcoff@indiana.edu. Questions should be submitted no less than two business days before the meeting.
7. Statement on Academic Freedom and Shared Governance (5 minutes)
Cate Reck, Faculty President
[Action Item]
8. Report from University Libraries (15 minutes)
Diane Dallis-Comentale, Ruth Lilly Dean of University Libraries

9. Questions/Comments on Report from University Libraries (10 minutes)
10. Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-D9: Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of Indiana University (5 minutes)
Rachael Cohen, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee
[Action Item]
11. Questions/Comments on Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-D9: Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of Indiana University (10 minutes)
12. Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-D23: SAA Mediation Committee and BL-ACA-D28: Recommendations to Departments on SAA Grievances (15 minutes)
Danielle DeSawal, Chair of the Task Force on Mediation
[Action Item]
13. Questions/Comments on Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-D23: SAA Mediation Committee and BL-ACA-D28: Recommendations to Departments on SAA Grievances (10 minutes)
14. Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-D24: SAA Board of Review (15 minutes)
Catherine Sherwood-Laughlin, Chair of the SAA Board of Review
[Action Item]
15. Questions/Comments on Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-D24: SAA Board of Review (10 minutes)

AGENDA ITEM ONE:

SHRIVASTAV: Good afternoon. Welcome, everybody. The meeting is now called to order. As we always begin, let's begin with a motion to approve minutes for our last meeting. Is there a motion? Is there anybody to second? We have a second. All in favor of approving the minutes from last time, please raise your hands? Motion passes. Minutes are approved.

AGENDA ITEM TWO:

SHRIVASTAV: We begin every meeting with a resolution, and today we have a memorial resolution for our colleague Charles E. Greer, and Eliza will read that out for us.

PAVALKO: Thank you very much, Provost. Resolution for Charles E. Greer, written by Professor Scott Robeson. Charles Greer, faculty member in the Department of Geography from 1978 to 2006, passed away at the age of 80 on August 10, 2022. Fond memories of Charles have been shared by those here in Bloomington and by many former students from across the country and world. In late August, a memorial service was held in Fort Collins, Colorado, where he and partner Susan had returned after living in Bloomington for nearly 30 years. Born and raised in Fort Collins, Charles received a B.A. in geology in 1964 from Dartmouth College, where he also was a wide receiver on the football team. He and Susan then married and moved to Hong Kong where they lived from 1964 to 1966. During that time, Charles taught at The Chinese University of Hong Kong. Charles then enrolled in graduate school at the University of Washington in Seattle, receiving both M.A. (1969) and Ph.D. (1975) degrees in geography. His research focus was always on integrated human-environment interactions, primarily in China, but later elsewhere as his interests expanded. When Charles was hired at Indiana University, he had a

50/50 joint appointment in geography and East Asian Languages and Cultures (EALC). In EALC, Charles taught a popular course called Geographic Patterns in China. In geography, he was best known for teaching Environmental Conservation, where he had a following of undergraduates who loved his deep dives into classic works such as Walden, A Sand County Almanac, and Silent Spring. They also loved his Zen-like charisma. Later in his career, Charles moved his appointment to 100% in geography and had close ties with colleagues and growing cohort of graduate students to whom he became a mentor, collaborator, and inspirational lifelong friend. During that time, he traveled to Denmark and Kazakhstan for field work and co-authored several articles and book chapters on landscapes and tourism. Charles did field work in the US, Southwest and Mexico, and in the forests of Southern Indiana. With his focus on landscapes, conservation, and environmental ethics, Charles would have fit right in with the modern intellectual landscape here at IU and in the Department of Geography. He also had an unwavering commitment to diversity, mutual respect, and inclusiveness. Charles Greer's contributions to the department and university went far beyond what we would normally look for in an academic career. And we deeply miss his calm perspective and friendship, with most of us understanding that there's much more to being a scholar than publications and classroom instruction, Charles was an extraordinary example of someone who is influential in profoundly immeasurable ways.

AGENDA ITEM THREE:

Our second resolution is for Craig Holden, written by Professor Sreeni Kamma. Craig Woodworth Holden, finance department chair and the Gregg T. and Judith A. Summerville Chair of Finance at the Kelley School of Business, died suddenly on April 3, 2021 at age 65. Craig's departure has left a big void here that we are still trying to come to terms with. The Kelley School has lost a valued and collegial leader and mentor, and the finance profession has lost a leading scholar and stalwart supporter of research collaboration. Craig made seminal contributions to the field of market microstructure which was his passion, with a long list of publications. Market microstructure studies the operation of securities markets. Securities, such as stocks, bonds, and options are no longer traded in the frenzied pits colorfully popularized by the movies. Less than twenty-five percent of daily stock trading is done in the traditional venue of the New York Stock Exchange. Much of the trading is actually done in about thirteen electronic exchanges and innumerable 'dark pools' or private markets operated with intricate rules on how orders to buy and sell are submitted, executed and displayed. The infamous 'Flash Crash' of August 2010 drove home the terrifying importance of these questions even for ordinary investors. Craig made several important contributions to his field. His coauthored landmark paper in 1992 is one that most people think about, but he had other home runs as well. He received numerous Best Paper awards. His research received prominent media attention in such outlets as Financial Times. He also wrote two books on financial modeling and Excel. Craig served as associate editor of the Journal of Financial Markets since 1997, which is an exceptionally long tenure. He was also secretary treasurer of the Society for Financial Studies since 2012, in which role he assiduously sought to promote a fair and transparent editorial process for finance scholars. He also served on several program committees including those of the Western Finance Association and European Finance Association. But beyond the

publications, the awards, and the citations, the most important legacy of Craig and the one he would have been most proud of are the many students he mentored and turned into productive members of the finance profession. Craig chaired over 22 doctoral dissertations and served in at least 40 other dissertation committees. Many students owe their subsequent careers to him. Craig inspired not only a student's research, but trained them to be good teachers. His generosity in sharing research ideas, strategies, data and computer programs, teaching materials and other classroom skills helped jumpstart many careers. Over 50% of his published papers and 75% of his working papers involved the then current or former doctoral students. His students now contribute to the profession from virtually all corners of the globe. Their contributions are and will continue to be the most visible testament to Craig's legacy. Craig was unafraid of trying new things and taking a leap. His exemplary service at IU included serving on many campus and school committees. He led several major curriculum innovations in the finance department. His work was enabled by his unflagging work ethic. You knew he'd arrived in the office daily by the booming laugh you heard of the other end of the corridor. Partly through Craig's efforts, the Kelley School became a leader during the pandemic in presenting major academic conferences online. Craig refused to let the pandemic interrupt research collaboration and became a very effective proselytizer for conducting research conferences online. He designed an online format that today serves as a model for many other conferences. Its success established a playbook and gave other schools the confidence to continue virtually the intellectual community that is the lifeblood of our profession. In addition to his academic professional accomplishments, Craig's personal qualities and integrity will be remembered by many. Shortly after the sad event, a former colleague remarked, I never saw Craig get angry. He never carried a grudge or let it affect his working relationships. This made him ideally suited for his final role as department chair. He was eminently fair and unflappable and completely data-driven. Craig earned his MBA and PhD from the Anderson School of Management at UCLA, from where he joined the Indiana University in 1990. Craig will be remembered for his kindness, patience, wisdom and generosity. His joyful, uninhibited laugh was often the first and most lasting impression people had of him. He was an eternal optimist who chose to see the best in people. Thank you.

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you, Eliza. If you are able, please stand for a moment of silence. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR:

The next order of business is the Executive Committee report, and I invite faculty president Cate Reck.

RECK: Thank you, Provost Shrivastav. So, we're going to do things a little differently today. Since today is the last BFC meeting of the semester and the academic year, I'm gonna do my report at the end, because we can do the passing of the torch and all that. And it seemed to me kinda awkward to do this in the beginning of the meeting and then have a meeting. So we're going to do that at the end. I do ask that Kelly go ahead, and, um, she has one announcement that she'd liked to talk about, the faculty survey for final exams.

ESKEW: Thanks Cate. So, recall that about a month ago, I came in in my position as co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee to do a first reading on a revision of our finals policy. We had a robust discussion, to say the least. And because of comments, the EPC decided to withdraw that policy and start over by, first of all, gathering more data on what people are doing around final exams. That survey, which I worked with, I worked with Mike Carroll from the Registrar's Office on it, went out on April 12th. I have had feedback saying "I'm not [inaudible] There's nowhere for me to make comments." Everybody is welcome to email comments to me, because that's where they would have come anyway. But it's a, it's a quick survey. If you could please encourage people in your departments, your faculty colleagues, your constituents to respond. We have about a 25% response rate at this point. We cannot design a new finals policy without good data, and we're trying to be data-driven. So, I would appreciate your help. I will send an email to Lana to push out to BFC that you can share with your colleagues that just remind them how important this is. We don't want to create a bad policy. But I can't believe 75% of the faculty think that the way we do finals is super. There's gotta be a better way. If there isn't, we'll give up. But let's have data so that we can at least try. Thanks very much.

RECK: Elizabeth, jump in.

HOUSWORTH: Oh, it's just the survey only went to people who are actually teaching this semester. So, for instance, I didn't get one, so I can't fill it out. But I've already started thinking about changing the way I do finals based on our discussion. So thank you.

ESKEW: May I quickly just jump in. I would note that departmental, exams that are departmental, also did not get the survey. That's because the registrar assumes you want a two-hour block. So, if you didn't get one, that's what it means. And Elizabeth, if you want to e-mail me comments, if anybody wants to share comments with me or with Brian Waterman, my co-chair, we're very glad to receive them and we will consider them.

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you. I know we will come back to Cate's comments at the end.

RECK: Sure.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE:

SHRIVASTAV: So let me move on to the next item, which is my report, and let me get that started. So first of all. Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you again for coming. I know this is the last meeting of the year, which is always special, and I want to, first of all, acknowledge just how grateful I am to be working with all of you throughout the year. As special thanks to Cate, Marietta—she's not here today—and Colin, and especially congratulations to Danielle. You are all exceptional university citizens, colleagues, and I'm thrilled to have had a chance to work with all of you for the last year. And not just last year. I'm excited to see what will continue to do over the next year. Let me start with the exciting news first. And that is that since our last meeting, the Board of Trustees have now approved, and we have officially launched, the IUB 2030 strategic plan. We can now officially move forward with the implementation of this ambitious program. Before I go any further, I want to thank all of you who contributed to the creation of this plan. And a special shout out here to Cate and Carrie. I don't know if Carrie's here, who shepherded

the process over the last several months. Your contributions were tremendously helpful in constructing detailed reports and dedicating—and your dedication of time and energy has really made this plan what it, what it, has turned out to be. You trusted that this investment would yield powerful results. And I assure you that the research you conducted, the complex conversations you worked through, and the strategies you carefully designed will continue to inform every decision we make. As all the ideas that were generated, including those that were put in a folder that Cate and Carrie lovingly call the parking lot, will be shared directly with our implementation teams. So, they will continue to inform how we move the institution forward. In terms of implementation, we are currently assembling teams who will be accountable for directing progress towards our goals, and tracking the progress in a very transparent and metric-driven way. As we move into this implementation phase, it remains crucial that all of us stay engaged in the process. We will all have significant roles to play. And I think you'll notice that our implementation work is situated in the context of many developments that are already in progress. In support of our plan, I hope you've all seen today's announcement from President Whitten on the launch of our new initiative on innovation and entrepreneurship that's called IU innovates. We will be advancing a series of new efforts to bring students and faculty together to support a stronger innovation ecosystem and the creation of more new businesses through IU. As you may recall, this was a priority laid out in the strategic plan. In fact, it came from two different subgroups, both the service pillar, as well as the research pillar. So, I'm really excited to see us being able to move the needle forward on this particular effort. Um, let me give you some updates on various searches. First of all, I'm thrilled to have Ash Soni as the new dean for the Kelley School, at least for the next few years. He will lead in collaboration with two individuals, Pat Hopkins at IU Bloomington and Julie Manning Magid at IU Indianapolis or IUPUI, who have both been appointed as Vice Deans for these two campuses respectively. For the Media School and the optometry school, the finalist visits wrapped up last week. I think Friday was the last candidate. We are now in the final stages of the search process. I am meeting the search committees, gathering feedback. I hope to have decisions on those two dean searches made relatively quickly here. For the VPFAA position, we have two finalists, who will take part in hybrid town halls this week. Carrie Daugherty, on April 19th, and Judah Cohen, on April 20th. You are familiar with both individuals, so I hope you participate in those discussions. For VP for Student Life—that's a new position I had announced at the State of the University Address—State of the Campus Address. The position has been posted, and invitations have been sent out to individuals to participate in the search committee. The VPSL will report to me and serve on the campus leadership team. The position will also have a dotted line, reporting line, to VP for Student Success, Julie Payne-Kirchmeier, and will work with senior administrators across our campuses as our campus's primary representative for student life. Those of you who are following the news recognize this has been a very tragic weekend, when two of our students passed away, unfortunately, in an accident. And as you know, this isn't the first untimely death on campus. And we've had our fair share of faculty and students who've lost their lives unexpectedly. In response to some of the concerns I've heard and some of the challenges we faced, I had charged group called Honoring Hoosiers to help me and help all of us think about a way in which we can grieve, celebrate, and honor people who passed away unexpectedly at, in our community. There has been much to grieve. I appreciate the way our campus has come

together in mutual support at these times. Not just this weekend, but throughout the year, as different events have unfolded. I want to extend my sincere gratitude to the Honoring Hoosiers working group members, who spent the past semester exploring how we can collectively celebrate lives and grieve losses. Together, they have evaluated existing IUB programs aimed at honoring those we've lost, investigated peer institutions, practices, identified our needs and determined the desired outcomes. They've composed a report, including their findings and two high-level recommendations. One is an annual memorial event to honor the faculty, staff, and students that we've lost. And two, a physical feature on campus that invites reflection and facilitates gathering. Our campus currently hosts an annual event in April, which is intended for family and friends of students who have passed. Our plan is to have that event this year and use the next year to implement the recommendations of the Honoring Hoosiers working group. So more details on these recommendations will be developed and implemented over the next year. I know several of you were engaged in this process and I anticipate more involvement as we finalize those plans. But I think by this time next year, I would love for us to have a formal event and a space where we can come together, collectively, to celebrate all the people that we've lost. Finally, I want to acknowledge a recent topic of conversation on campus, which I believe has drawn some of the attendees here today, and perhaps some outside the meeting, as well. And that is related to compensation. As you know, a petition circulated recently calling for an eight percent cost of living adjustment for all IU employees, including faculty, students, and staff. I want to say first to all these colleagues and others in support, We see you, and we hear you. As members of our community, your perspectives are important and we will take them seriously now and as we move into the new academic year. In considering these issues, however, it is also important for us to provide some shared context. An 8% salary increase for all current faculty, staff, and student employees at IU Bloomington would cost roughly \$64 million. If we extend that raise to all of IU, the cost is closer to \$200 million. For context, that amount of revenue will require raising tuition by at least 12% or by making budget cuts in Bloomington equivalent to roughly \$64 million. For reference, 64 million is just a bit larger than the combined size of the Maurer School of Law and the Media School. And no, we're not planning to eliminate either of these two schools. We do have, however, have the ability to make progress for IU. Moving forward, our focus remains on implementing our new strategic plan and stewarding our resources to strengthen IU and foster a strong community and environment for our students, our faculty, and our staff. This includes affirming our commitments regarding stipends for SAAs. In addition to the increased minimums announced this year, the president and I have committed to reviewing stipend levels at least every two years to ensure our competitiveness with our Big Ten peers. Meanwhile, we have also gathered new discipline-specific data to ensure we are keeping pace not only at a minimum stipend level, but also within each given field. This is an effort Dean Daleke is intimately engaged in and we will continue to monitor and respond to that as necessary. Overall, we will expand our ability to gain external grants, raise funds for students through financial aid, we'll continue to prioritize initiatives that benefit faculty and staff health and well-being and strengthen graduate education. And through our new initiative and throughout the implementation of our new 2030 plan, we are committed to providing the very best employee experience possible. It's hard to believe we're already nearing the close of the spring semester. It has gone by way too fast. At this time. I want to remind you all to do two

things. One, take pride in all that we have accomplished so far, and to take care of yourself and each other as we push towards this intense final stretch of the semester. As always, thank you for everything that you do.

AGENDA ITEM SIX:

SHRIVASTAV: We had three questions submitted to the BFC for this meeting. I have addressed one about compensation in my remarks. Let me open with the second question, which basically says that CPC, the College Policy Committee, it was reported that the provost has vetoed eight out of ten "Faculty 100" hires that were recommended up to him. What are the reasons for these vetoes after they have been approved through a committee of one's peers. So, first of all, thank you for that question. Our expectation for the first round of "Faculty 100" wants to, to identify and recruit established, mid-career or senior hires with the research experience and connections to elevate our collective work. As of last week, we had approved interviewing 23 of the 36 candidates that were recommended to me for approval. The ones that were denied were denied for one of two reasons. One was when the faculty recommended did not have expertise in the area that was approved by the faculty committee that made those recommendations. The second was when the recommendations or the recommended faculty were too junior, were in the early stages of their career. While many of them were excellent candidates, they were not qualified for phase one of "Faculty 100" hiring. I have in most of those cases, however, encouraged the department or the school to consider hiring those individuals through the regular hiring mechanisms. Going forward, I want to urge departments and schools to continue to be aspirational about our potential and to pursue opportunities, including through Faculty 100, to strategically advance our scholarly ecosystem. The second question that was submitted was really more for you than for me. So, I will read it out and then open it up for discussion. And the question asks how do the faculty think shared governance can be improved? I think it's an important question and I welcome all of you if you have any concerns, any suggestions or thoughts to speak on it. And by the way, I also invite the BFC leadership to add their comments to it. So, anybody with a comment? Nobody, maybe it needs some time. Alex, you want to go first.

TANFORD: Yes. Shared governance is at both the university-wide level and the campus level. And I think that's important because some of the momentum seems to be going in opposite directions at those two levels. On the university-wide level, there has been a consolidation of policy authority in the university counsel's office and in the policy and compliance office. And as far as I can tell, because I work with those people--I'm Chair of the University, UFC Policy Review Committee--they are not always attuned to traditional academic principles and values. There are, they have a tendency to not consult the faculty before making decisions about policy and about the interpretation of policy. And there was, of course now the infamous incident last summer where somebody in the structure of the policy office, in the university counsel's office, determined that an e-mail was sent out inappropriately in violation of university policy. Now these are policies that were co-drafted, or in some cases completely drafted, by the UFC, by the faculty. And that act of implementation needed also to be in consultation with appropriate faculty and faculty leaders. And I think that for all of the policy discussions and cooperation and

collaboration that we have at the policy-drafting stage, needs to also be there at the policy implementation stage. And I think that would be an important change. And indeed, I would recommend taking the policy office and making it independent of the university counsel's office so that it can be placed under--it used to be, it used to report to the Vice President for University in Academic Affairs. That position has been eliminated. So, there is no single administrative structure at the university level to which this shared governance conversation can take place. And I would urge, I know that you are to some extent—his, John Applegate's office is now a committee or a group, or Working Group—I understand that. But it makes access to that by the faculty difficult because there's no obvious path. So, I think that at the campus level from my perspective, things seem to be working pretty well. But I think there are problems, I think, at the university level.

HOUSWORTH: So this was a question about how to make faculty governance work better. I'm on this committee because none of the faculty in the natural and mathematical sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences were willing to serve. So I would recommend that the faculty who want to make faculty governance work better step up to the plate so that the chair of the Department of Statistics and the Director of Business Statistics doesn't have to also be on the BFC.

JOHNSON: If I could just strategically echo Elizabeth's sentiment as the person who will relatively soon be ascending to the position of the president and will therefore take on the role of chief cat herder among other responsibilities. I do think, and I say that just as a logistical matter, I think there is a tendency, I think over the years there hasn't been a tendency among a lot of faculty to sort of start to become cynical about the durability and the utility of direct involvement in the faculty governance part of shared governance. I think there are lots of reasons for that. I think there are more demands on all of our time than ever before. I think it's not always clear exactly what the kind of recognition and value of that kind of service is relative to other kinds of demands on people's time. But it is really important. If the faculty themselves become cynical about the operation of shared governance, then nobody else is going to step in and make a case for its centrality. And it is complicated and it is messy and it is slow, and it involves having conversations with hundreds and hundreds of people. But my position is, particularly as we look forward to the implementation of a new strategic plan and in terms of being productively in dialogue with a fairly newly arrived upper-level university and campus administration, the best way that the faculty can exert, continue to exert influence, constructive influence, in areas where we feel it's essential that we have influence, and in some cases, determinative influence is not just to sort of be involved in faculty governance, it is to use the mechanisms available to us under the sign of shared governance in faculty governance, to answer the big questions through our own deliberative and consultative process in a way that produces enthusiasm and consensus on the part of our colleagues about moving forward together to make IU a more functional, a more satisfying, and a more humane institution. And if that is, feels like a tall charge, it is. But the alternative is to allow other people who are able to act unilaterally in the name of efficiency and in the, in the name of moving forward to make those decisions for us. So now more than ever, I think it is really important for us to do that. And my sense is frankly, that there will be a lot of people in positions, administrative positions, who have been charged with the responsibility of

moving IU forward as an institution in constructive directions, who, if they saw proposals from us and initiatives from us and policy language from us that really seemed to actually be well-thought out, visionary, ambitious, capable of producing a sense of consensus and shared purpose across whatever lines of division or whatever lines of jurisdiction govern our day-to-day thinking about our presence at the university, they would probably not only be forced to follow our lead, but they would be happy to do so. And so, I think the more we can collectively recommit ourselves to that project to sort of proving any skeptics wrong about our capacity to act collectively through our own interested involvement in this, the better off we all will be in, the happier everybody will be. So, I would just really encourage people looking forward to recommit themselves to that kind of project, bearing in mind that it's a complicated one.

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you. Ken?

DAU-SCHMIDT: I'll just briefly do the flip side of that. Am I on here? I think not only faculty have to commit themselves, but I think administrators have to commit themselves. And I've seen in my own time at the law school, what's happened in faculty governance is we've gotten more and more administrators, and they make more and more decisions, which makes the faculty involvement less and less important. And as a result, my younger colleagues don't go to faculty meetings anymore because they're basically reports by administrators as to what's going to happen. We don't make any substantive decisions. And unfortunately, I think that's happened at the university level too. So, I think I've told my associate dean, you need to nurture faculty governance by making them realize that their input has, has some impact. And right now we're not doing that.

SHRIVASTAV: Margaret.

LION: Hi, I'm Margaret. So I think I'll just bring it down a little bit. There are three things I want to quickly say. One, I think COVID has fried us all. And I think that we talk about how students need a lot of help with their mental health. I know a lot of my colleagues and I are feeling really the pressure that COVID has placed upon us. So, take a little moment of grace for ourselves and for our faculty brothers and sisters and non-binary people who are like, I can't do anything right now but cope. I think, I think I've recovered from 2021 nicely. That's about it than I can say. Second, if you want to have respect and love and appreciation for your colleagues across the campus, serve on this committee, serve, be here. Because I came in here and I come in here and I listen to my colleagues and I'm like, I am so lucky to know you all and to work with you all. It is always a blessing for me to hear the intellectual and heartfelt comments that come from everyone. So, thank you. This is how you learn to really appreciate Indiana University. And finally, my last comment, democracy people. It's messy, but it's awesome, so keep coming back.

ROBINSON: Hi. Yeah, Thank you. Well, I'm sitting in for Chris Sapp for Germanic Studies. Ben Robinson, and also speaking as president of the AAUP chapter here. I want to echo some of the things that have already been said. I mean, I think commentators have covered a lot of ground and they've mainly covered the main points. But I do want to emphasize two things really. I briefly want to talk already in this meeting of data-driven metric analysis. I really think is alienating for people. I think it's a sign of the sort of neoliberalism which has driven a market,

markets, to enormous inequality and have tapped out our public resources. I think if we focus discussions from the top on down throughout. So, I do think a lot of it is the leadership of the university, if we focused discussions on values and as, as Colin said, consultation, deliberation, reflection, the things that decide our mission, and we took our strategic plan which said, these are the metrics we want. We want metrics that retain our traditional strength, retain the share of degrees and areas where we have proven to be strongest, where we set out what sort of academic priorities we want. Then I think people would step up because they see it as a deliberative, consultative process. Number two, I would say, and Colin also mentioned this, is that faculty are really, really over-obligated with service. So, I know in my department, if you look at the credit, our productivity, it's gone way up as we've been facing increasing faculty attrition. And so, it's very hard to increase that productivity through general education, teaching through service, and at the same time be able to participate consultatively and deliberatively in the setting of university priorities. And I think it would be really important to understand how we can make that burden of job responsibilities more equitable across the campus. And I think that would also bring more participation. I mean, in sum, the point is to look at the change in participation. We used to have an extremely robust faculty governance with extremely broad participation. And over the last 20 years it's gone down. So there clearly is something we can do, and I think the reflection really does--and I'm not casting blame--I'm just saying, structurally, I think the reflection has to start at the top leadership and it has to be understood what can we do to bring back deliberation and consultation to set the mission of the university. Thank you.

RECK: So, just to augment what Ben just said, I've already had this conversation with the provost, but a few people on our council here have mentioned that in some of their P and T guidelines, service outside of the department isn't actually valued towards P and T. I might challenge everybody to go back and maybe look a little bit more deeply. You're here for whatever reason you're here and we thank you for being here. I think there's a lot of people who aren't here because it really doesn't. It's counterproductive for their own motility and effectiveness, and especially for promotion and tenure. So it's hard for me to figure out who these people are. Two of you have mentioned this to me. If more people would like to comment or send me emails about P and T guidelines, what problems that you see, what other obstacles that we can work to break through, I would like to hear it. Thank you.

WYRCZYNSKI: Yeah. Faculty governance can be complicated and can be time-consuming. And the word "messy" was used. In opposition to that, or in conjunction with that, we have a number of new deans on campus who are facing their own pressure to make change. I'm wondering if the new deans could be instructed or mentored in their pressure to make change and raise money to work with the faculty governance system rather than try to amend it or go round it or change it. I think the faculty governance and faculty participation is the most wonderful and democratic functioning think tank in the university, with everybody's diverse experience and expertise. But I kinda wonder about the pressure coming from the new deans, having especially the new deans not being from IU, not understanding the culture here and the resources of their own faculty.

SHRIVASTAV: We are running behind on time. So last one, Alex.

TANFORD: One quick thing. Shared governance, I don't think stops with the faculty. It includes the graduate students and undergraduate students being able to participate in the things that affect them. The next generation of faculty is there in the back of the room. And if they don't learn that the university welcomes shared governance then they'll become the kind of colleagues that don't participate later.

SHRIAVSTAV: Uh, do we have time? There's more questions or comments.

SMITH: Yeah. This is this is exactly the point that I wanted to bring up and I had a few follow-up questions from the question that I submitted previously actually, which nicely tied to this. So, it's more than just about building community among faculty for faculty governance, about bringing faculty to participate. It's about graduate students, graduate workers, people who have some buy-in into the community participating too, like, it's very difficult to have a community that works for everyone, where decisions are made which benefit the collective without input from a third of your teaching force. And one of your comments that you mentioned about review of SAA salaries, I sort of had questions about it which directly relate to this. So, who is doing the review of salaries, stipends? Is it going to be given an input from SAAs. Is it gonna be faculty, is it gonna be just administrators? This is one of the cases where you need to have input from all the people who are, who are affected by some decision that's being made and that needs to come from a collective, from collective group. It has to have buy-in from everyone. So, what are the current plans for that review? You said you mentioned it to [inaudible]. Is it possible that people, that someone somewhere, reviews salaries and it gets passed up, what's going to happen?

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you for bringing it up. David, do you want to comment on that? Because we need to move on to...

DALEKE: Thank you, Provost Shrivastav. Those are great questions. And one of the things about faculty governance that I think is essential is that you have the structures in place that can facilitate that, those types of conversations. I have to say that through the task force work over the past summer, we made some great gains on behalf of graduate students. But one of the things that I think was, could perhaps be the most significant one, is the committee co-chair, and that is the Student Academic Affairs Committee. And that's the body that I plan to report to on both the minimum and average stipend by discipline for students stipends across the Big Ten. And it's that group that I, I would hope is the one that we deliberate and have exactly the conversation that you just described, bringing in the viewpoints of faculty and students and administrators about where we should go with that data. So, I'm looking forward to those conversations. I am a big proponent of faculty governance, and I, and I think that's going to be the best pathway that we can follow to be able to make sure that we sustain those advances that we've made. Thank you.

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you. David. And I believe David was former president of BFC. So, you walk the walk.

DALEKE: Jim Sherman was also a former, but twice former. So, we have some great experience on this council.

SHRIVASTAV: Israel is this critical, because we are behind. But let's be quick then, right.

HERRERA: So, very quick. Regarding the town halls with the candidates for the VPFAA office. We know that we have the in-person possibility and also there's some possibility that will be just for people who might attend at noon. So, I wonder, if we have 72 hours to send the comments, the feedback, about the presentation or, or, or, or the reason why they are running for, for these key position. If there might be the possibility for those who are not able to attend to have a video recording. And then we can also provide that feedback that the website is given. In that case, we have 72 hours for people who could be there in person, but also for those ones who weren't able, because both of them at the same time.

SHRIVASTAV: Israel. I need to look. I don't have personally a problem with it. It is just a very different procedure than what we've done before. Let me look into the logistics. We can keep the survey period open for 72 hours. I have no problems with that. But whether or not we can make a recording and make it available, that's a different issue.

HERRERA: Two hours time to send the comments. Right? So that would be also for those, the same time for those who are not able to attend. Right? That's there. And the other very quick. It's if there was any rationale for reducing the number of entities compared to 2022 in this search?

SHRIVASTAV: No. It was trying to move, see who was available and we could move it quickly. I really wanted the search completed before we broke for the semester. That was the only urgency. The larger the committee gets, the more difficult it is to arrange times and schedules and things like that. So, there was no... It just so happened that maybe the number of NTT people were shorter. There was no purpose behind it.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN:

SHRIVASTAV: Okay. Let me move on to the next item on the agenda, which is a statement on academic freedom and shared governance. And this is Cate Reck.

RECK: All right, I'm going to try to do this in lightning speed to make sure we get through everything today. Let me give you a little bit of context. There we go. Let me give you a little bit of context. At the university faculty level, at the UFC, we created a statement on academic freedom and shared governance. This has been read, heard, either voted on in different senates and all the campuses across the state for IU. So, what we would like to do today is, I will read the statement yet again. I would like to do is actually vote and see if you agree with the statement, uphold it, and would want to show your support for academic freedom at the campus through a vote. So, here's the statement, yet one more time. Statement on academic freedom and shared governance. This is presented by the executive committee for the University Faculty Council and brought to the BFC.

Higher education in the United States is admired throughout the world for its pursuit of education and research as mutually reinforcing missions and for its unflagging commitment to academic freedom and shared governance as bedrock principles of universities' operations. Indiana University has a proud tradition of academic freedom and shared governance at both the campus and university levels, exemplified by the university's nurturing of excellent, path-

breaking research and the free expression of a wide diversity of academic opinion—despite the popularity or unpopularity of the subjects explored or the views expressed. On rare occasions, these commitments become a cause célèbre and the university's commitments are tested against external challenges to its integrity and autonomy. On a day-to-day basis, these commitments are manifested by following the policies and practices concerning academic freedom and shared governance that have been adopted and regularly confirmed by the University Faculty, Board of Trustees, and University Administration. The University Faculty Council reaffirms its commitment to academic freedom and shared governance, and it calls upon the administrative leadership of the university to continue to follow the letter and spirit of IU's well-established policies and practices.

So do you call for the vote?

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you. This is this comes from a committee and does not need a second. This is an action item. It will need a vote. Before we do a vote, are there any items, questions for discussion? Seeing none, I'll just call for a vote. All in favor of accepting the statement as it's on your screens, please raise your hands. I think the motion passes unanimously.

RECK: Fantastic. Thank you all.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT:

SHRIVASTAV: The next item on the agenda is a report from the university libraries, Diane Dallis-Comentale.

DALLIS-COMENTALE: Thank you for the invitation. Thank you for the faculty council for serving. For those of you who do not know me, I have been at Indiana University since 1997. I have served on the faculty council many times, as well as the University Faculty Council. And I just wanted to note that it is a very important way of learning about the university. And it's some of the most well-earned learning lessons that I've ever had. I wanted to talk a little bit today about the libraries, but I have to be short because the libraries belong to everyone in every discipline, and it is very difficult for me to share a broad view of the libraries that will be meaningful to everybody. So, I'm going to just focus on a couple of issues or concerns that people might have regarding the cost of materials and how the libraries are trying to manage the cost of materials. The libraries have many services that many faculty don't know about or don't use, and I would love to be invited back next year to talk more about those things. Or anyone can invite me to a committee meeting or a faculty meeting and I would be glad to share more information about the library. Let's see. So, talking about collections and trends, I just wanted to give some context for what I mean about the trends or what is growing. In this column that is in blue text, it may be hard for some to read, but it talks about what the library's budget and what our personnel are sustaining. We have physical holdings. You'll note that the top bullet is special collections and archives. And I might want to add to that both collections that are on the shelves that come through typical publishing routes, but there are also a lot of collections we purchase that are not from Western countries, that are products of scholarship from different types of leadership organizations, governments, and they're called areas studies collections. And these are equally important to the academic pursuit of many faculty on campus. And so, the libraries have

a multitude of film collections, microfilms, maps, books, all kinds of formats that we have to maintain and sustain. And it's not just in the branch libraries or the Wells Library, but there's also a fairly large auxiliary library facility that will libraries-managed to sustain the cost of print or physical materials. When we're talking about sustaining, there are also licensed digital materials. Many of those you use on a daily basis and probably are not aware that you're using library resources. These are journal subscriptions, journal packages, databases. They include newspapers, academic papers, trade magazines, trade journals, those kinds of things are there. Databases and data sets are also an essential part of the kind of collecting that we must sustain. And of course, e-books are something that we have been purchasing for quite a long time. But I did want to note that in somewhat of a tension--and I don't mean attention--tension here, is the hosted materials that we digitally hold and maintain and have to sustain, as well, and some of the consortium collections that we use library resources, meaning funds, to support, because it gains us greater access to content that we haven't purchased. So again, we host a lot of purchased e-books. We have them in perpetuity. We host purchase data sets, we're increasingly hoping to house more datasets, but I'll get to that later. We also have the big collection, is what we call it. We work with BTAA libraries across the country. And it will, right now it's 15 institutions, and we share the burden and the privilege of being librarians to big, major academic research libraries and R1 institutions. And we're really being mindful of what we purchased together and how we get the most out of the money that we're allocated. And how we share resources. Literally, physically, we have something called You Borrow. The way that we do a lot of Interlibrary Loan is if the IU Libraries don't have it, it's fine. We will get it for you from one of our 14 peer institutions. The IU Libraries are sixth in rankings of the BTAA libraries. And this is, this is in part because we actually sustained support from the university and we're incredibly grateful for that when you consider the cost of information. This is just a nice infographic that gives you a sense of where we've been growing and receding in terms of physical materials that the libraries have, not the digital collections that we have. So, you can see that there was a dip during the year of COVID. We've grown a little bit, but are not likely to grow far beyond that top 2022 line in terms of what we're purchasing that are physical materials. This and let me, I'm going to move this one. This is a little bit more context on the last slide that I shared, you will see that the blue line is physical collections. I'm sorry, digital collections. And the pink line are the physical collections. And so, you can see that we're only going to keep spending more money, more of the university and the Bloomington campus resources, meaning money, on digital collections. I'm going to catch up here. The next one, let me go back. So, this is something that is important for me to point out and it leads into some of the other part of the conversation I wanted to share. We look at what are basically inflation projections for collections costs, whether or not they're on the shelf or digital, and we can see that we will, we have been quite fortunate in receiving Campus increases annually for the cost of materials. But the inflation rate is far outpacing what the university can spend on these materials. And there is a reason that I'm sharing this very unfortunate graphic. I also want to point out that we have received support and we are fortunate, and that is most likely why we have a ranking of sixth amongst the Big Ten libraries. Because other libraries are being cut severely. And we are at least a little bit behind inflation is my point. The costs are tremendous. I'm going to go back, went back the wrong way. Sorry about that. So these are the, there's a company named EBSCO and they actually provide information to

librarians, research libraries, about they have a forecast about the cost of materials, particularly print and e-journals. These resources, this is the projected price increase or what inflation will be for this year, and we will not be able to keep up that pace. Information is incredibly expensive. And the only good news that I can share is that we have ways we're trying to combat these incredibly high costs of information. I wanted to share a little bit about this and I hope that some of you know about this already. The libraries have a program that's called open educational resources or Affordable Course Materials, is what maybe a better name for it is. And we work with faculty directly to create affordable and free, is what I should say--they're, they're actually free, course materials that faculty can use and assign to their students. We have cohorts that we publicize the opportunity to work with librarians. And they work with the librarians and they can use a library of digital content that is peer-reviewed content for basically textbooks, a lot of is textbooks, sometimes it's monographs, but there's a great deal of information out there that has been vetted and that is quite valuable. And with the faculty who we've worked with it, they've been very pleased with the quality of what is available. And they sometimes choose to adopt an entire textbook that is freely available, that has been edited by a group of peers. And sometimes they just take part of it and adapt the other part so that they're still using free materials. And so, we are prepared to help faculty with this, but we can't scale up. So, if you'll note that the second bullet describes that we can really only accommodate 36% of the people who apply this program. But I also want to really celebrate our first Open Educator Award. Wrong way. This is Dr. Michelle Faicos, and she has gotten our first award. We have been working with faculty for a long time. But she really has gone out of her way and she is one of the people who can attest to the value of making affordable materials or free materials available to students for their coursework. And she did it. And sometimes there is a monetary incentive and actually it does not require that you use the libraries, but we can help connect you with it. I'm glad to share more information about this, but I want to move on. So, on April 5th, we had a symposium of the people who use the open educational resources and we participate along with IUPUI libraries for this. Overall. We've had 23 total Fellows since the past couple of years. We've saved students just this semester \$375,000. And over this semester and I'm sorry, at the end of this semester, all total, we will have saved students just under \$1 million. We will continue this path. And this summer, we have we have a Summer Sprint of open educational resources. And if you'll see the slide, it just talks about what the incentive is for faculty to participate. We will continue to do this over the semesters, over the academic year, and definitely during the summer sprints. In order to help make college more affordable for students and more, more, more reasonable cost for the libraries and you all. The next opportunities, there will be these fellowships available in August 2023. We always do one-on-one consultations that can help faculty, but we may not be able to. Faculty don't always need us is my point, but when you want our help, we're here for you and will allow you to participate in the schedule that we have of people who can become a OER fellow. I also want to talk about open access and publishing. Another thing that the libraries are trying their best to do is to make what you all publish, and all academic libraries are doing this, but they're hoping to make open access content available, and it's academic content. It's the pre-preprints of what any faculty might publish in a journal or a preprint of a monograph that they have. These are kinds of things that we can do, you can, you can usually do it. And in fact, we have services at the library that will allow any faculty member to share their CV with us. And we

can review it to see if you can make some of your content available. Books, chapters, articles, delivered, papers. That you can make them open access even after the fact, so that your peers can see what you've done in your world. One of the things I think that is very important is that when materials are available open access, they are actually cited more often than when they're behind a paywall. And this is leading to a very important next bullet. There has been for a long time. It's a policy that federally funded research, that product of that research should be available open access. We all received last August, well it was made available--there's something called the Nelson Memo--and I can give you the URL for this if it's helpful for the minutes. But essentially, it's a memo from the White House and it's the Office of Science and Technology Policy, which is requiring by August of 2024 that all data, not just the content of a research paper, but the data used in research, created from research that's federally funded will be required to be open access. And if you saw there was a news release today, from the Office of the Vice President for Research that we have at IU launched the very early stages of, it's called the Research Data Commons, and it's a collaborative virtual space for faculty to work with the libraries, with the Office of the Vice President of Research, and also UITS and other collaborators to help faculty have a plan to make their data available. And it's not, it's not enough to make it available. It has to be findable, which means there's a requirement for metadata. It needs to be able to be machine read and used again, the whole purpose for this new federal policy is to accelerate research, accelerate knowledge. And so, this really does go along with our past practices of open educational resources and open access publishing. Because we're trying to remove the expense of academic information that is created by institutions of higher learning. This is a way to open up education to more people, open up the research we do, and accelerate the knowledge that we are able to achieve at R1 institutions like ours. See, this is something that data core, it's in the article that was published today. It is something we just launched. It's a pilot and it's a place where you can store or submit your data to be preserved for the future and made accessible. Because we're in the very early stages of this. We have a little while before the federal mandate goes into effect. But we're actually not that ahead of the curve; other institutions are ahead of us in their ability to support research data. And so, I just wanted to take the opportunity to talk about this because it's an opportunity for us to catch up with our peers. I'm sorry, this is actually, I already said all these things in my slides. Sorry about that. Okay, So that's it. I think that my, my, thank you slide is gone. Sorry about that. But I'm done. And I will take questions if there are questions about other things. But thank you very much for letting me come to talk about this today.

AGENDA ITEM NINE:

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you, Diane. This is open for discussion, Elizabeth.

HOUSWORTH: So all federally funded research has to have their data be open, be findable. How is this going to work with things that have medically identifiable components?

DALLIS-COMENTALE: Well, I think that there are, of course, privacy concerns that would prevent that from being, but I would say that, anonymized data findings will be required. And is John Donne over there? He's my IT Associate Dean. And John, can you speak to me about how we would handle medical data? Sorry, John.

SHRIVASTAV: I don't know that.

DALLIS-COMENTALE: Oh, I'm sorry. Did I, I can't do that.

RECK: No.

DALLIS-COMENTALE: I'm so sorry. Okay. Never mind, John. I will say this, that I know that the medical, medical school, the medical, medical library, has their own way of managing data that is any way related to a person's medical record or health. So, there are ways of addressing privacy, and that might even be a separate repository entirely with the medical school, or the School of Public Health. Has a better answer. I'm sorry.

SHRIVASTAV: I'd just like to comment that the Nelson Memo has very far-reaching implications. And in some disciplines, it may actually require us to collectively rethink tenure and promotion guidelines, because of how those disciplines operate. So, while the intent I think is good and generally we should as a society be supportive of data, particularly taxpayer-funded data being available widely, it does, it likely will require us to revisit our procedures, practices, and a whole host of other issues in the coming years. Yes. Question in the back.

FUREY: Just a quick question about do you all have some kind of taskforce about the implications of the new AI developments for all of these things? And I guess paywalls seem quite significant in terms of the information that's used by eyes for, like, Chat GPT. In other words, something like that. In other words those things now are making data quite widely available. And at least it seems that things behind paywalls are not part of the data up to this point. So, I understand this is a much larger issue in terms of the Nelson Memo and everything like that. But I'm just wondering if you at the library, you all have some sort of working group or have plans to do that, do something with that, to think about the implications of those developments for the library information.

DALLIS-COMENTALE: Can you tell me what you mean by, like, what are you asking about? What do you want us to do about AI? What is your expectation?

FUREY: I think we're all, I mean, it's a day-to-day emergence of thoughts that people are having. I don't know that anyone, I mean, there's a letter produced by CEOs asking for the government to regulate. I mean, nobody knows what we're expecting. I'm just wondering if you all are, have some context for evaluating what the implications might be for the libraries. I certainly don't know what the conclusion should be. I wouldn't imagine anyone does.

DALLIS-COMENTALE: I would say we're as prepared as any of you. And I'm sorry, that's the best I can do. It's not that it's not, we haven't seen it coming, but there are, as you know, and probably can agree, there are so many things we're trying to manage at the university level and our professional lives, but we are not well-prepared. I have to be sincere in that, but we do know that it's something that we have to be able to help faculty with, especially when they're talking about teaching and how do they even evaluate. Another thing that we want to do is to actually help create ethical standards for AI. We have library collections that are fully digital with the Hathi Trust, which is millions and tens of millions of volumes that are digitized that can be used to develop AI. But I don't know anybody who's doing that. I don't know, you know what I'm

saying. So, there are all these opportunities, but right now it's a lot of challenges and I don't have a better answer, but thank you for asking it.

AGENDA ITEM TEN:

SHRIVASTAV: Other questions. Seeing none. Thank you very much, Diane. The next item on our agenda is proposed changes to be BL-ACA-D9, the Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of IU. Rachael has enabled to join us. So, this will be led by Alex Tanford. Alex?

TANFORD: Thank you. Some of you have noticed I'm not Rachael Cohen. The, but I knew I was the one of a number of people who suggested that, after last summer, that an amendment to the bylaws was appropriate to make clear what I had thought was obvious, which is the elected president can speak on behalf of the faculty. It turned out that that wasn't stated anywhere in the bylaws or any policy. And it seems sensible to, to include it, to state it specifically. So, an amendment was proposed to Section 10 J. Section 10 is the duties of the president of the faculty. And it's, I think, a significant point that at IUB, the person elected as president is elected by the entire campus, all the faculty, and as president of the faculty, not just President of the BFC. And that seemed to cause some confusion in the policy office this summer, as to exactly what the scope of the president of the faculty, the scope of their authority was. And we thought we'd clarify it on behalf of the faculty by adding this change. Just one slight reminder that we operate under Robert's Rules of Order and under that, an amendment to the bylaws has to be done at two consecutive meetings and cannot be changed. If there is a number in it, numbers can be reduced, but the content of it cannot be changed. If it were, it would have to be put off to the next meeting. And of course, there is no next meeting, so it's kind of up or down.

AGENDA ITEM TWELVE:

SHRIVASTAV: This is an action item. It comes from the committee, does not need a second, but it is open for discussion. Seeing none. I will call up, call the group to vote whether or not to accept the proposed change, as you see on your screens. If you are in favor of accepting this change, please raise your hands. I think it passes unanimously once again. Thank you very much. Thank you, Alex. The next item is proposed changes to BL ACA D23 SAA Mediation Committee, and BL ACA D28, recommendations to departments on SAA grievances. This one will be taken by Danielle.

DESAWAL: Thank you. Alright, so this is our second reading. We didn't have any changes as a result. So, I'm just going to quickly go through what we presented two meetings ago as a refresher, so the changes that come forward come to the BFC with the support of the taskforce on mediation and then also the newly formed Student Academic Appointee Affairs Committee. They were considered as part of all of the SAA grievance policies, to align language and policy as we discussed before, to make sure that we were in consideration of how each policy impacted the different steps of grievance. The initial review by the task force was done starting in October, which is where we developed the website that I talked about before, that is now on the Bloomington Faculty Council page under policies and documents for Student Academic Appointee mediation and grievance. And so, you'll be able to see there a flowchart of the process, as well as all of the steps, including some guidelines that follow on how to think about

the process and really just establishing the transparency of a grievance process for our SAAs. The taskforce documents, like I just talked about, a mediation guide and SAA Board of Review uniform standards, and those provided insights into the changes that we made. So, recommendations to departments and units on Student Academic Appointee grievances. There's three policies that will have changes that go along with this. So, we'll need to do a vote for each one independently. So, focus of recommendations for the first. So, the current policy is written to provide recommendations for department unit policies on SAA grievances. So, what we did was we updated the language to focus on clear recommendations to departments and units. Remember, BFC does not control this policy; rather, that's why the language is about recommendations, including a statement on SAA rights to appeal actions or conditions that are affecting their role. And also, as noted, we have been working with the Graduate School to collect information on which department units have existing policies that are surrounding SAA grievance procedures so that we can also get a collection of what that looks like, and essentially just a nice inventory. The BL ACA D23, the Student Academic Appointee Mediation Committee policy. Changes to this included, most important that we wanted to make sure that mediation could occur without attempting resolution at the department or unit level. So, SAAs can go directly to the Mediation Committee to request mediation. They don't have to have gone through a process at their unit or department level. It provides context for mediation and what it means to engage in that process. It's a different process than the Board of Review. And so, this is really something that is more of an evolving process. And we wanted to make sure that the policy itself allowed for that process to take the time that was necessary for it to occur, establish that the outcome of mediation would be to establish a mutually agreeable resolution or a memo of understanding and the integration and clarification of content from BL ACA D29 to outline the procedure. So really, we just kind of streamlined that information and then also presented the procedures in a sequence again, to make it more transparent, easier for everyone to understand the steps clarified that mediation is voluntary and that both parties need to agree to participate. Again, mediation is different than Board of Review. Clarification of timeline. As I talked about before, we wanted to make sure that we were thinking about the process itself. So, policy changes focused on a timeline for setting up the mediation and establishing flexibility in allowing the dialogue to continue as needed for the process itself. We added in there to do a minimum of 3 hours. One of our discussions this last time was about: Why minimum of 3 hours? Because you just never know how long these things should take, and you should say a minimum of 3 hours so that you can expect that they might take longer. So, we don't want folks to rush a process because it's really a discussion and you're going to let that evolve. Business days were added to a line with a student code changes from spring 2022. I added that the BFC approved the definition as "days when the institution is open, when we can expect people are working to conduct business." BL ACA D29, Student Academic Appointee mediation procedures. We request to rescind this, since it's integrated into the content for D23 and D28, and the task force did not see a need to keep the policy. Next steps. So following our discussion, requests taken back, there was no additional feedback. The vote is, if the vote is affirmative after this, then we will update the flowchart and the contact content to reflect the changes and then work with the VPFAA office to update the SAA guide for fall 2023 appointments.

AGENDA ITEM THIRTEEN:

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you, Diane, This is the second reading. Sorry. Danielle. Diane's over there. I can see her, too. This is an action item. This is now open for discussion. So just to keep this sane, I will call for discussion on each item and then ask for a vote. So how about we start first with the BL ACA D23, SAA Mediation Committee. This is the first item, no, the second item you presented. So this is now open for discussion. Seeing none, I'll call upon a vote to accept the changes as proposed to BL ACA D23. All in favor, please raise your hands. Motion passes unanimously. Thank you very much. The second one is BL ACA D28, Recommendations to Departments on SAA Grievances. Once again, Danielle presented the case. It is now open for discussion. Seeing none. I will call upon a vote, all in favor of making the changes as proposed to BL ACA D28. please raise your hands. That is unanimous. Motion passes. With these two done, I assume there is a little discussion on rescinding BL ACA D29, but once again, I open this up for discussion. All right. There's no discussion. I call upon a vote for a motion to rescind BL ACA D29. All in favor of rescinding this policy, please raise your hands. Motion passes. We are done. Thank you very much. Thanks, everybody for your help with this one.

AGENDA ITEM FOURTEEN:

SHRIVASTAV: The next item is proposed changes to BL ACA D24, SAA Board of Review. This is Catherine Sherwood-Laughlin. Take it away, Catherine.

SHERWOOD-LAUGHLIN: It's not my, am I doing something wrong? This button right there. Alright. Let me back up. Just make sure. Okay, there we go. Sorry about that. So, I'm Catherine Sherwood-Laughlin, in the School of Public Health, and I had the opportunity to chair the committee that reviewed and revised the policy on Student Academic Appointee Board of Review. And I do want to acknowledge that we had two faculty members and three students with SAA appointments that also helped with the revision of these policies, along with working with Danielle's committee, as well. So, I wanted to thank all the individuals who helped with this, with these changes. So basically, the overview was to this, the second reading as well, to come to you with the changes in the policy which were distributed to the BFC prior to this meeting. And it was really to clarify the final steps of this grievance process to be more in alignment with the policies that Danielle also presented just few minutes ago. All right. So, what we wanted to do in these policies was make sure the SAAs could go directly to the Student Academic Appointee Board of Review with their grievances. Again, as Danielle mentioned, the students could bypass mediation and come directly to the Board of Review. And this aligns with the policies that you all just approved a few minutes ago. And this allows, again, this formal process and recommendations to the provost directly in case, sorry, in the option the Board of Review used to recommend the case to mediation before a formal hearing is conducted and provides more flexibility to identify the best course of action for the student. We did a clarification of timeline, which is exactly the same as what Danielle presented. Again, a little bit more flexibility to come to the Board of Review, acknowledged when the dates when we're open in terms for the academic institution and when we conduct business. And again, that minimum of 3 hours. Changes to the procedures were to be in alignment with, one, to remove repetitive language which removed a couple of paragraphs out of the original policy. We went along with preponderance of the evidence that goes again in alignment with student hearing procedures on

our campus. The timeline of care clarification for submission of materials to the Board of Review, the grievance respondents, and the provost, or outline, and the option of statement of consent to be included in the recommendations to the provost was added for a holistic view of the hearing. I apologize. I don't have the very last slide that Danielle had as far as next steps. But again, the next steps are to bring this to this committee for a vote.

AGENDA ITEM FIFTEEN:

SHRIVASTAV: Once again, this comes from committee. It does not need a second. It does need a vote. Before we vote, I open this up for questions, comments, and discussion. Okay. Yes, David.

DALEKE: I'm sure you've discussed this and, just for clarity, if a student brings a case directly to the Board of Review, do they also have the ability to go back to their departmental level, depending on the outcome of the Board of Review? In other words, does it bypass it completely and just short-circuit the process?

SHERWOOD-LAUGHLIN: You want me to go ahead? From my understanding, we could make that recommendation to go back, back to mediation or back to the department. But again, it would be a collective decision from the Board of Review. Is that your understanding, as well, Danielle?

DESAWAL: Yes.

DALEKE: My question, my question is more or less, does the student have the right to go back on their own if they so choose, or does it have to be the collective decision of the Board?

DESAWAL: Do you mean after a decision is rendered completely gone to the provost?

DALEKE: Yes.

DESAWAL: So, there's nothing in there that clarifies that for either direction. So, I mean, nothing says that any, nothing in any of the policies actually says that a case can't be reheard at any level. But it doesn't say that it has, and it doesn't say that it can only be heard once.

SHRIVASTAV: Other questions?

DESAWAL: You have thoughts on that?

DALEKE: No, no, no further thoughts. I just think in terms of clarity, if it is final, then it should say it's final, but it doesn't say that it's, the decision would be final if the student took it directly to the Board. So, there's still that option. The response. Okay. Thanks.

SHRIVASTAV: Other questions on this? Okay. Seeing none, let me call for a vote. All in favor of the proposed changes to BL ACA D24, please raise your hands. Looks like a pretty clear majority here. Thank you very much. Motion passes. The last item is our first item, which is president Cate Reck's report.

RECK: All right. Thank you all for sitting through our last BFC meeting of this academic year. Appreciate you being here. I'd like to start by recognizing the contributions of Teri Moren, the

head coach of IU women's basketball team, who's been named the national coach of the year. So, I admittedly, don't throw tomatoes, I'm not a sports fan, but even I understand how critical this is for our university. I wanted to make sure that she was recognized. Secondly, I want to remind people of an announcement that I made last time. The School of Education has an event coming up on April 27th. The topic is about creating culture of care in the classroom. In discussing what the new culture of students is, how they interact, how they might be different after COVID, just issues facing faculty in the classroom. So let me remind you where and when that is. That session will be in the Persimmon Room of the IMU, April 27th and 3-4:30. So we have someone from the communications department, or communications on campus, will be there just to listen and to absorb and understand faculty issues. If you think that you have faculty, let's say faculty who run big classes, faculty who have certain issues that you've heard them talk about.: What do I do in this situation? And things feel different coming back from COVID or things have changed in the last decade. If you've heard those kind of comments, which I think we all have, this session is for you. It's not scripted, there's nothing planned, no one's giving a presentation. It's more about faculty coming together and discussing the new normal. So, I want to leave us with some comments about the year and thank some people. So, I'll try to make this short, but I do feel compelled to make some sort of farewell address, following in the tradition of past BFC presidents. I'd first like, I would like to first and foremost take this opportunity to say thank you. Thank you. Especially in light of the conversation we had earlier today about faculty governance and service. Thank you for being here and participating. Without you, we can't get any of this done. I'd obviously like to thank past president Marietta Simpson, our president in waiting, Colin Johnson, our director of the faculty offices, Lana Spendl, and our newest addition to the office, Heather McDonald, showing up back there. Okay. So, working with this BFC executive committee has been a treat. So I'd like to thank each person individually. We have a co-chair for Faculty Affairs, Shu Cole, our parliamentarian, Rachael Cohen, who sadly is not here today, our secretary, Danielle DeSawal, Educational Policies Committee Co-Chair Kelly Eskew, and co-chair of Research Affairs Ben Kravitz, and our co-chair for Budgetary Affairs Jon Trinidad. I really thank all of you for new perspectives, having open conversations, I don't know, keeping me honest, keeping me inspired, keeping me going, and allowing me to be a more successful president this year. So, I wanted to thank all of you. And of course, I'd like to thank both Provost Srivastav and Matt Waller for the hours of conversations about the state of the campus, whether we've seen eye to eye or rarely agreed at all. My conversations with these two individuals have allowed me to better understand how the university runs and the complexity of tasks that we have at hand. So, over the course of this academic year, and I've had the pleasure of having an eagle-eye view of all the good things we do on campus while taking in many ideas on where we can improve, which is why we're here over the last academic year. I want to remind you of a few things. The BFC EC has helped shape over 20 search committees. I think the final number's 27 or something along those line. We reviewed 25 essential colleagues through Memorial Resolutions. Thank you, Eliza and Judah. We've seen the reinstatement of the Student Appointee Academic Affairs Committee, reinstatement of the SAA committee. We've had two town halls and one open house. We've had a very successful taskforce on research reorganization. We probably haven't thought about that since fall very much until this VPR search. So that's kind of in the distance, but it's really always there. A thoughtful report from the task force on the future

of general education That's going to come back again as we're presenting the strategic plan. That's not going anywhere. And I keep getting asked questions about that. And I wanted to just reassure people that we've just kinda been on hold because we've been waiting for the strategic plan and seeing how those two things would melt. We were making improvements to SAA grievances and SAA Board of Review through the task force and mediation. Hence, this is the majority of what we talked about today. In policy, we made beneficial updates to the Bloomington Faculty grievance and review procedures. Thank you, Shu. Updated review procedures for administrators on the Bloomington campus. Saw a strategic planning process develop and complete at breakneck speed. Helpful updates to university admissions policy, the official rolling back of the semester-dropped deadlines to pre-COVID policies. So, we can kinda feel like we're getting back to normal again. We've had a lot of updates on mental health for our faculty, staff, and students. I think this has been a topic. It's not going anywhere, as well. We've changed the bylaws. Heck, we've even changed the constitution. So I'd say we actually have done a lot of things this year. So, for me it's been lovely to witness what is possible when we come together in the hard, slow, and sometimes frustrating, but always, always vital work of faculty governance. But we can't take faculty governance for granted. All of us, regardless of our unit or rank, should throw ourselves into service work on our campus. Not just when there's an immediate action needed, and not just when our own interest is at stake, but over the full span of our career here at IU. If you're tired of hearing your colleagues venting, if you're tired of venting and you see something that needs fixing, I challenge you and I encourage you to bring you're A-game, contact this BFC leadership or the chairs of the committees, and present your ideas and be part of the solution. If you're disappointed by the outcomes of this year then I hope more faculty will step up and help us make this campus better. Our success depends on entire faculty participation at every level. Faculty meetings, policy committees at the unit level, and then these bodies, as well as the UFC. So, it falls on each one of us to be guardians of faculty governance to embrace the joyous task that we've been given. I'm going to use joyous in air quotes there. But joyous has been given to continually try to improve this great campus of ours. Because of all of our differences, we all share the same proud distinction of being part of the IU Bloomington campus. I suspect we all agree that we don't have a job here, but an actual profession. So, our profession in academia defines us and becomes part of our ethos of who we are when we leave this campus forever. So, it's been an honor of my life to serve you as faculty president, and I look forward to working next year and long-range planning to help implement the strategic plan. I look forward to working alongside the next leadership team and to continue making successful accomplishments into the next year. So, our final duty is to pass on a few items. So, this is just part of it. Let me. let me actually, Lana. Do you mind, can you grab me the bag, so I can actually read? So, there's three items that get passed on this. We definitely have some—

JOHNSON: Horcruxes.

RECK: They are the BFC Horcruxes. This is great. So, whose body and spirit are these? I really actually don't know. Maybe a little bit of David, maybe a little bit of Jim, maybe a little bit of Alex. I'm not really sure who's in these Horcruxes. So, the first one is, it's my honor to pass on to Colin what we call the asterisk of reality. Because as much as he wants to accomplish, the reality is it's a huge upward battle in, well, good luck. Here's the asterisk of reality. Okay. And then the

second thing I pass on to, the torch of wisdom, wisdom, wisdom, wisdom, wisdom. To help you govern wisely. Ok. I didn't actually try to turn it on. I didn't really want you to be wise, I just want tradition. And then finally, it is actually your duty, I never understood this actually before. So now I have clarity. So thank you, Elizabeth and Lana. So, it's Colin's duty to present our president-elect Danielle the tiara of power, power, power, power. Okay. Evidently this goes to the president-elect. How would you not want to be part of this? Like, I just don't understand how can you let this go? So, you want to be sitting up here, because you want to wear the tiara of power. You do. David Daleke is missing it. He's like, I don't think these traditions were here when. You missed your opportunity. And we're now done with that.

JOHNSON: Point of personal privilege. The presidential election was not resolved last year by the time that this happened. I was deprived of the opportunity. I know that I consider this to be like a crime against my status as a gay man, but anyway, I will now, in service of tradition, I will be, yes, now place this on the head of Danielle, the tiara of power. President—

RECK: Disney characters, come running in now. One last thing to give Colin. I would like him to read these out loud, so that they can see he has some well, maybe you really don't want to read them out loud. You can at least pass on the, my God, the spirit.

JOHNSON: Okay. It sucks, which is very exciting. Thank you very much. Can we do this for the public? I don't know. Okay. One pair of socks says, I'm going to get expletive done. So, there's that. Later. Another pair of socks says, Ring master of the expletive show, which I imagine is probably fairly applicable. Certified pain in the expletive. That's fairly, well, grumpy, old man. And that one I could just say, it's totally true, and that's it. I mean, I think you've really captured me and I really appreciate that. Thank you very much.

RECK: Thank you. Either of you have anything you'd like to share with the council? Alright?

JOHNSON: So we're going to team up. So, it's one of the, one of the traditions. One of the great honors and distinct pleasures. Presidents-elect and presidents-in-waiting, soon to be Presidents of the Bloomington Faculty? Yes, exactly. Right. To acknowledge the work of the sitting president of the faculty, which if you've ever, ever, ever done that work or watched people do that work, is an enormous undertaking and a position that gives you a really phenomenal access to people who are in positions that shape the future of the university. But also, I think this confers upon you an enormous sense of responsibility. And having worked with Cate all year in my position as president-elect and having certainly watched other people in those positions do this job before, she's shouldered those responsibilities in an absolutely exemplary fashion. So, the first thing to do to acknowledge the hard work is to confer a resolution on the soon-to-be past president. Right now, I just want to take an opportunity to read that. This is authored on our collective behalfs, and so it is a resolution of the Bloomington Faculty Council.

WHEREAS Cathrine Reck has served as President of the Faculty of the Indiana University Bloomington campus both ably and admirably throughout the 2022-23 academic year, and;

WHEREAS she has also served ably and admirably as *ex officio* Co-Chair of the University Faculty Council during that same period, and;

WHEREAS President Reck has undertaken both of these responsibilities and the many obligations they entail with care and conscientiousness during a time of enormously significant and consequential change at Indiana University Bloomington, and;

WHEREAS she has worked intentionally and tirelessly to ensure that the perspectives and counsel of Indiana University Bloomington's faculty, staff and students were actively sought and sincerely contemplated in the process of preparing for that change, and;

WHEREAS President Reck has been a vocal and consistent standard-bearer for the continued importance of the enterprise of shared governance in American higher education, and an especially vocal and consistent defender of the faculty's role as an indispensable party to that enterprise on the Indiana University Bloomington campus, and indeed across Indiana University as a whole, and;

WHEREAS her exemplary service as the first President of the Faculty to be elected from the ranks of the Non-Tenure-Track Faculty marks her service as particularly noteworthy—indeed historic—vindicating as it does the wisdom of Indiana University Bloomington's recent moves to actively embrace and more fully leverage the leadership potential of all its members, including that of its Non-Tenure-Track Faculty, and;

WHEREAS Cathrine Reck has managed to achieve all of these things without compromising one bit her sense of humor, her sense of personal warmth, or her stalwart commitment to ensuring the success of the hundreds of students she teaches and mentors each year;

BE IT RESOLVED that this body, the Bloomington Faculty Council, a body conceived in and dedicated to the ideals of shared governance, confers upon President of the Faculty Cathrine Reck these words of thanks and appreciation in recognition of her service, her collegiality, her decency, and her inspiring and profoundly consequential leadership.

Given this day, Tuesday, April 18, 2023, in Presidents Hall, on the campus of Indiana University Bloomington.

So, if I may seek my colleagues' endorsement of this resolution, I will be very, by show of hands, I will be very happy to pass it along to Cate. Well, fully endorsing the opportunity. When I was elected, when I was notified that I had been elected to the position of president-elect, our colleague John Walbridge sent me an email saying, Welcome to that, anyway, and saying I have one word of advice, advice for you, which is Cate and Marietta are phenomenally capable and incredibly smart. And if I've learned anything over the course of the year, they're almost always right. If not always, there's ever any circumstance where you disagree, think at least twice before cleaving to your position, because they are almost always right about everything and there's much to learn from them. And I can attest to the fact that that has been the case in my observation this year. And unfortunately, Marietta is not here. And normally we take an opportunity to thank the current past president into, is not like Obi-Wanish sort of disappearing into the ether. But Marietta will be with us... I will just say one of the jokes I started making it the beginning of the year is that among many other talents and gifts, and she is so incredibly full of them and incredibly capable as a leader and a thinker and a human being, I learned very

quickly and I told her that I said you're going to be my graciousness coach, among other things. An enormously thoughtful and compassionate person who from the time she assumed the presidency, counseled all of us to embrace civility and care and a sense of warmth and collegiality towards one another as a basic precondition for operating as a community. And I think her words of wisdom have never faded certainly from my mind, and as a human being, she's an exemplar of that. And so, I feel incredibly grateful as I know all of you to be able to count her as our colleague. I'm sorry, she's not here to see that recognition, energy or that, but she fully deserves it. And of course, Danielle has been a phenomenal colleague all year long in her capacity as secretary and I'm very much looking forward to working with the two of you and the three of you and everybody else next year when I will use these things. So, there's that. There's one final thing. And we also usually confer a gift upon the outgoing President... Oh, yeah, I know. Right.

DESAWAL: Okay, I'll do it. Alright, so we have to think, because now you have some more time on your hands, right? So, the first thing is, there is that launch of long-range planning, right? So inside is a gift from the executive committee to utilize for your home renovations that are underway. So we have that. Then. Colin's humor was that if we're going to let you play with power tools—

RECK: Who doesn't jump for joy for Lowe's gift card.

JOHNSON: I suggested as 16-foot inflatable unicorn floaty to use on the lake and I was shot down. So, you know,

RECK: Lowe's gift card.

DESAWAL: So you should not operate power tools while having that. Probably that after the year.

RECK: Excellent.

JOHNSON: Because nothing says, nothing says we love you and wish you well, like giving people the means to purchase power tools and drink at the same time.

DESAWAL: And then a little something special I made just for you and for your love. Animals.

RECK: Excellent, excellent, excellent. I knew his. Give me a puppy. If I can get an idea of the puppy shy. Shy. The puppy is shy. I have an IU dog that my dog Bentley, who's a Great Dane, would love to probably play with. I'll have to keep it secure.

DESAWAL: Well, you know, because yeah, it's not gonna last long with Bentley. So we want to thank you very much for all your care and attention and response to all of us on the executive committee because it was absolutely a pleasure. And we always laughed, which I think is super important. Every meeting we enjoyed the collegiality and so this are small gifts of our total appreciation.

RECK: Appreciate it. Thank you, everybody. I wanted to know where the cups are. Excellent.

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you, everybody. Thank you. Especially Cate, you've been a wonderful leader of the BFC and I look forward to working with the rest of this group next year. Thank you. And meeting stands adjourned.