

Indiana University
Bloomington Faculty Council
February 21, 2023 | 2:30 - 4:30 p.m. Presidents Hall - Franklin Hall

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ashley Ahlbrand, Chelsea Brinda, Damir Cavar, Rachael Cohen, David Daleke, Kenneth Dau-Schmidt, Allen Davis, Anna Deeds, Constantine Deliyannis, Danielle DeSawal, Kelly Eskew, Seth Freedman, Constance Furey, Karen Gahl-Mills, John Gibson, Anthony Giordano, Israel Herrera, Elizabeth Housworth, Ann Huntoon, Colin Johnson, Ben Kravitz, Patricia Kubow, Ashok Lalwani, Sabine Lammers, Gerry Lanosga, Margaret Lion, Annete Loring, Paul Logan (for Chase McCoy), Jonathan Michaelson, Bell Pastore, Eliza Pavalko, Cate Reck, Christopher Sapp, Kyle Seibert, Ron Sela, Jeremy Siek, Katie Silvester, Alison Sinadinos, Kashika Singh, Dubravka Svetina, Alex Tanford, Christi Walton, Stephen Wyrzynski

MEMBERS ABSENT: Toni Acuri, Sofiya Asher, Hillol Bala, Jack Bielasiak, Shu Cole, Kristine Eaton, Lessie Frazier, Hank Green, Dennis Groth, Nandini Gupta, Olga Kalentzidou, Pete Kollbaum, Miriam Northcutt Bohmert, Courtney Olcott, Massimo Ossi, Brea Perry, Chuck Peteres, Angie Raymond, Jim Sherman, Rahul Shrivastav, Katie Shy, Marietta Simpson, Wyatt Smith, Thomas Sterling, Dan Tracey, Cale Whitworth, Jiangmei Wu

GUESTS: Lisa Thomassen, Mike Carroll, Judah Cohen, Pat Williams Coleman, Susan Coleman Snyder, Dave Snyder, Heidi Coleman Burton, Beth Coleman Valdetaro, Ed Valdetaro

AGENDA

1. Approval of the minutes of February 7, 2023
2. Memorial Resolution for Thomas Coleman
3. Memorial Resolution for Robert Thomas Glassey
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 bfcoff@indiana.edu. Questions should be submitted no less than two business days before the meeting.
7. **Annual Report on IUB General Education** (15 minutes)
Dennis Groth, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
Lisa Thomassen, Teaching Professor and Director of Undergraduate Engagement, Psychological and Brain Sciences
Michael Lundell, Senior Assistant Vice Provost, General Education

8. Questions/Comments on Annual Report on IUB General Education (10 minutes)

9. Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-B10: Bloomington Faculty Council Committees (5 minutes)

Rachael Cohen, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee
[Discussion Item]

10. Questions/Comments on Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-B10: Bloomington Faculty Council Committees (10 minutes)

11. Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-H21: IU Bloomington Academic Calendar Principles and BL-ACA-H29: Examinations (15 minutes)

Kelly Eskew, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
Lisa Thomassen, Member of the Educational Policies Committee
[Discussion Item]

12. Questions/Comments on Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-H21: IU Bloomington Academic Calendar Principles and BL-ACA-H29: Examinations (10 minutes)

13. Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-D6: Review Procedures for Administrators on the Bloomington Campus (15 minutes)

Colin Johnson, President-elect of the Bloomington Faculty Council
Cate Reck, President of the Bloomington Faculty Council
Marietta Simpson, Past president of the Bloomington Faculty Council
[Action Item]

14. Questions/Comments on Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-D6: Review Procedures for Administrators on the Bloomington Campus (10 minutes)

AGENDA ITEM ONE:

RECK: Right. Good afternoon. We have finally reached quorum, so I'm going to start today's meeting. Provost Shrivastav is not here today. He's up in Indianapolis, so I don't know who gave me the allowed me to hold the gavel. It's kinda like Thor's Hammer. I kinda think we should name it. We're starting the meeting. We've reached quorum. May have a motion to approve the minutes for February 7, 2023. Elizabeth, Thank you. Is there a second? I'm going with Margaret. Fantastic. Thank you. All in favor of approving the minutes from the last meeting. Great. Any opposed? Fantastic. Thank you so much. Next order of business Eliza Pavalko will read two memorial resolutions, one for Thomas Coleman, and one for Robert Thomas. Thank you, Eliza.

AGENDA ITEM TWO:

PAVALKO: Thank you, Cate very much. First memorial resolution is for Thomas F. Coleman. Thomas F. Coleman passed away on March 30th, 2022. He was a professor of graphic design in the former School of Fine Arts and the College of Arts and Sciences. Now the Eskenazi school of art, architecture and design. Coleman enlisted in the United States Army, Navy in 1952, following graduation from high school and served for four years. He then received a bachelor's degree in graphic design from Minneapolis College of Art and Design in 1961 and attended Yale and received a Master of Fine Arts in 1963. He worked for the General Motors styling, excuse me, upon completion of his MFA, he worked for the General Motors styling staff as graphic designer. Then IBM, where he was staff graphic designer, manager of the graphic design and photo lab office and Senior Graphic Designer at the Design Center.

Coleman came to IU as Associate Professor of Fine Arts in 1971, serving as the head of the graphic design area. He was a steadfast advocate for intelligent, compelling design. Design was not about aesthetics alone, rather aesthetics and service of the message. If used responsibly. Design had the potential to have a social impact, improve, improve the quality of life. This can be seen throughout his teaching career and in his design practice. Upon his arrival thugh use School Fine Arts, Coleman redesigned the curriculum to bring it up to date and make it socially relevant. He was a believer in the proponent of the importance of civic engagement and social responsibility. And student projects in his classes were replete with assignments for various offices, departments, and programs within the university, as well as numerous non-profit entities throughout the community. Coleman had extremely high standards as an educator, and he demanded the very best from our students. His students have excelled and design practice and teaching positions throughout the country and their workers garner recognition and innumerable awards from the graphic design community. As Peg Faiman, the founding dean of the school, says, "Tom was my mentor and teacher and the IU graphic design program and into his connection to the IBM, the lead me to a transformational internship experience. And then later to Yale for my Master of Fine Arts. He was a great influence on my life and he was for so many in Bloomington and beyond".

In the mid-1980s, the graphic design profession began its transition away from an analog to a digital activity. While always maintaining that graphic design is essentially a thinking and problem-solving activity, Coleman realized the effect that computer would have as a tool in the discipline and incorporated it into the curriculum. He also understood it's far-ranging impact and served on university committees, including the Academic Computing Policy Committee, chaired the Student Technology Fund project review committee. These are two of the many examples of Coleman's tireless service. He served the university, the design and art professions, and the community throughout his career. Nationally, he served as a member of the National Endowment for the Arts design evaluation committees and received the outstanding contributions award from the National Zoological Park in Washington, DC.

Coleman was an active designer with a long list of clients. Professional involvement included a work for and with educational institutions, healthcare, the arts, the environment, and communities, but also included large corporations such as IBM and John Deere. His work was included in various prominent national and international design publications and exhibited collective locally in Bloomington across the US and internationally. After his retirement, Coleman grew a handlebar mustache and beard. And mustache particularly would often attract compliments. It softened what could be for some a

gruff exterior. He was intense and his dedication to design, he was deeply committed to the idea that graphic design is a tool for the common good. And designers need to be engaged, involved, and responsible. He was also warm-hearted. He welcomed students to his home, especially international students during the holidays. He befriended students who might be having a family crisis. And he would give a potential student of boosts psychologically or logistically to enroll or apply to the program. He will be missed by many. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM THREE

Our second resolution is for Robert Thomas Glassey. Bob Glassey graduated from Franklin and Marshall College in 1968 and received his PhD in Applied Mathematics from Brown in 1972. Bob joined the math department at IU in that same year, and the next 37 years, he was a mainstay of the group of partial differential equation or PDE, rising quickly through the ranks.

Bob's thesis advisor at Brown, Walter Strauss, inspired in Bob a keen interest in the study of nonlinear wave equations. Accordingly, a big part of Bob's early career research focused on nonlinear wave equations and nonlinear Schrodinger equations. Later in his career, Bob shifted his focus to the notoriously difficult Vlasov-Maxwell system of PDE, a model for the behavior of charged components in plasma. In both areas, he emerged as one of the most highly regarded researchers in the world, producing over 60 articles in top journals. He also wrote two books, one on kinetic theory and one on numerical computation using C. Bob was a giant in the world of PDE. His landmark 1977 paper showing that solutions to one of the most important PDEs, the nonlinear Schrodinger equation, could 'blow-up,' that is, could become infinite in a finite amount of time, stands to this day as a prototype for this kind of result in the field. In recognition of his status as an international leader, Bob was elected as a member of the inaugural class of Fellows of the American Math Society in 2012.

During his four decades in our department, Bob served as graduate director, managing editor of the IU Math Journal and chaired the department in the mid-1990s. In the classroom, Bob taught the full range of courses during his time at IU, from freshman calculus up through advanced graduate courses in nonlinear PDE. He also directed nine Ph.D. students during his career. While Bob was also so always self-effacing with his colleagues and to those who worked with him or studied under him, he was tough, clear, doggedly determined, but also warm, utterly unpretentious, and unfailingly kind. He will be missed by all of us. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR

RECK: Thank you, Eliza. For all those who are able to stand, please stand for a moment of silence. Thank you. So let me continue with some BFC Executive Committee remarks. I just want to preface this. I am not a meteorologist, but I play one on TV. {laughter} No, I'm not a meteorologist, but I think that spring is definitely here. The beginning of February Punxsutawney Phil saw his shadow. So supposedly we have six more weeks from February 2, don't believe it. I think that spring is definitely here. Scientifically speaking, the spring will come on the spring equinox, which is March 20. So please don't think I believe in a strange Dutch superstition. But welcome to spring. It finally feels like it.

Today. I actually wanted to start by addressing the horrific shooting that was at Michigan State University. And this was last Monday. I believe I can speak for the entire IU community that we hold these victims, their families, and the communities impacted by these horrific murders in our thoughts and prayers. While we grieve the loss, along with the rest of the country, for those who, who, of us who've chosen the profession of higher education. I think this hits us all too closely at home. I encourage all of us to take a moment to show our appreciation and support for when each one another, this time, the Center for Teaching and Learning. So CTL has excellent resources on how to approach sensitive topic in the classroom. And I myself who teaches sciences, appreciate any kind of resources that help me teach difficult topics at this time.

Our diversity equity and inclusion committee has opened nominations for the 2023 Indiana University Inclusive Excellence Award. The award recognizes faculty who contribute to the continued enhancement of the diverse campus community. To learn more or to apply, you need to access the IU Inclusive Excellence Award form. I'll ask Danielle to obviously link that in the secretary minutes so you can find it. The form will remain open until March 10, 2023. Please let me know or the co-chairs for DIE. the DEI Committee, if you have any questions. Speaking of the diversity equity inclusion committee, they sent the Bloomington Faculty Council Executive Committee a nicely written statement in response to the anti-Asian hate crime that occurred earlier the semester. While everybody on the Executive Committee supported the statement and its sentiment, we felt, it was best to not to distribute a statement specifically about one isolated event. So instead, we have returned that to the DIC Committee, asking them to think about maybe a more global statement that actually addresses...a more holistic statement against...denouncing hate crimes and supporting our student population.

Last week, you were sent an invitation to participate in the COACHE survey of faculty job satisfaction. As you may be already aware of the surveys does end to enhance our understanding about our experience as faculty members at IU. Eliza, do you mind taking a moment just to maybe explain more about the COACHE survey and try and encourage people to participate and encourage their colleagues to participate.

PAVALKO: Yes, the happy, happy to do so. And hopefully you're, you've gotten or you will soon be getting a follow-up message from Cate and I of the COACHE survey. As you all know, we do every three to four years. I really do want to encourage you to fill it out and to encourage your colleagues to do so. This really is, is the number one way we identify what things faculty feel we need to do more of; what things are working, what things are not. So it really does shape the future. The future investments are things that we think that need more development. And to just give you one actually, really important example, much of the work that Kim Geeslin worked on came originally from information we got from the 2016 COACHE survey that identified underserved areas and the faculty associate professors, women faculty, and series of work with faculty committees and then developing that led to much of what she did in our office. So it really does shape in important ways the directions where we put our energy. I also want to mention a couple of other things. Certainly reassure everybody, there is, there's actually no way for us to find out individual responses. So we cannot do that. In fact, we don't, we don't get those. It's collected by Harvard and we don't have the individual IDs. And even in reporting, we make sure that we never report any data to anybody in groups that are so small that you can identify those individuals. Then the other thing I want to mention is we've worked and we will continue to work to make sure that you all have as much and our faculty in

general, have as much access to the data as possible. So our website and we've talked before, there's now dashboards where you all can see the same data that we use and look at. And we will continue to do that so that, so that everybody knows what we're hearing. That further, so please encourage people to fill it out. I think, I think it's very useful to be able to hear what everybody is thinking and where are you think the gaps are. Thank you.

RECK: Great. Thanks Eliza for making an impassioned plea. I'm going to ask for a second person to make an impassioned plea. Self nominations for the next year's BFC are open and they're open until Friday. So please try to encourage your colleagues to run in your respective units for these positions. And then I'm going to ask Colin. Colin, do you have as next year's president an impassioned plea to try to get people to run for BFC positions?.

JOHNSON: Why yes, Kate, I do! {laughter} It would be really great if you asked all of your colleagues to seriously considering, consider nominating themselves to stand for election to the Bloomington Faculty Council. And also just as crucially, perhaps even more crucially, to volunteer to serve on the many standing, elected, and campus committees in which most of the actual work of policymaking gets done before it comes to the floor. I don't think it's any sort of surprise to anybody that particularly next year as the strategic planning process moves from the conceptualization phase to the implementation phase, that there's going to be a considerable amount of change on this campus. And the faculty council is necessarily going to have to play a significant role in facilitating that change. It is really important that we, that the faculty have a voice and what that actually looks like, what implementation looks like, what our kind of interpretation of those priorities is. And the best way to do that is to have a faculty council that is fully populated with engaged colleagues who are willing to sit down and make sure that our ideas are given space in the context of those conversations. And that are both their prerogatives and responsibilities are exercised thoughtfully, actively. So I really cannot stress enough how important it is. I know everyone's exhausted. Everyone's on 5 million committees. People are burnt out in lots and lots of ways. But the tradition of shared governance on this campus is really central to who we are. And it's really important that we do everything we can to remind our colleagues that it's important and essential to us sort of remaining who we are regardless of whatever changes happen at the institutional level.

RECK: Beautiful, thanks so much for coming out of your shell and willing to make an impassioned plea. Nominations? I do, I do honestly appreciate that. Last part of my remarks are the president-elect candidates for next year are Danielle DeSawal and Alex Tanford. They're in the process, I don't know if they've written their statements or gotten them to Lana and they're in the process of getting their statements to Lana and those will be revealed shortly. So congratulations to both of them and thank you very much for participating in faculty governance.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE

This is kinda strange, but since the provost is not here, I've been sent some remarks. So I'm going to read as if I am the provost, I have a few remarks that Rahul wanted to share with you and not wait for two more weeks. So Provost Shrivastav shares his regrets for not being able to attend today's meeting. He is in Indianapolis participating in the University budget meetings and looks forward to learning more about the outcomes of this meeting this afternoon, which I will be sure to discuss with him directly. He asked that I share his thanks for the hundreds of community members who came together at last week's Town Halls to share

perspectives on the IUB 2030 strategic plan. The feedback is now being incorporated and ultimately the draft plan will be aligned with the IU 2030 framework and plans from other IU campuses as it's finalized in the coming weeks.

The provost also shared a few updates on ongoing search processes. The Kelley School of Business international interviews are finishing up this afternoon. Campus visits are on target to begin in early March. The Media School initial interviews are scheduled for mid-March, about one month from now and campus visits, visits should begin in early April. Grad school search. The position posting closed yesterday, so February 20th, and then committee review is scheduled for later this week. Initial interviews should begin very soon thereafter. Optometry school search, the position posting will close on March 1. Initial interviews are targeted for mid-March with campus visits following in early April. And then finally, for the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs. Again, we express our gratitude for Eliza, but we're moving ahead quickly with the search for the VPFAA. We're working to finalize the search committee right now, hopefully by the end of the week and hopefully the official launch will be either late this week or early next week.

AGENDA ITEM SIX

So those end the short 30-second provost's remarks. Normally we would then shift to a question and comment period. Are there any questions or comments that either I could try to address or take back to the provost, or we could dance. {laughter} I thought that was perfectly timed. It was perfectly fine. If you have any questions like normal though, please do send them along. It doesn't have to be this ten-minute period, so thank you.

Alright, another interesting, today's turning out to be very interesting today, uh day. Next on the agenda would have been the annual report for the IUB general education. Unfortunately, Vice Provost Groth is out ill today, so we're going to actually skip that part on the agenda and will fit him in at some point later in the semester. We hope. With that, we're gonna move to the proposed changes for ACA-B10: Bloomington Faculty Council Committees. And this is a discussion item, and Rachel Cohen will lead. Does someone have the keyboard. Perfect. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM NINE

COHEN: All right. Just as a reminder, the ACA-B10 additions is the last step of creating, recreating the SAAAC committee and so on. This is the policy on committees. And so we had to add a couple of things here to finalize that process. First off, we had to add a charge, which is a charge listed for every committee. We just took this one from the website, which was already an approved charge and added that to number 14. Then the second edition is the last sentence on this. It was agreed that the Student Academic Appointees Affairs Committee shall have three co-chairs, one NTT, one TT, and one SAA. And since that goes quite different from all of our other committees, we felt this was important to stress and write out in the policy. And that's it. That's the last step we need for the SAAAC and it will be considered a live Standing Committee. Any questions?

AGENDA ITEM TEN

RECK: Any questions, discussion?

Alright. Thank you. If you have anything, feel free to send it to me or to CARC.

AGENDA ITEM ELEVEN

RECK: Fantastic. Thanks, Rachel. Excuse me. Next on the agenda is the proposed changes to BL-ACA- H21. This is the IU Bloomington academic calendar principles and BL-ACA-H29 examinations. This is going to be led by Kelly Eskew, who is the co-chair of the Executive Policies Committee. And then Lisa Thomassen, who's a member of EPC. Today, this is a discussion item and we will vote at a later time. Thank you.

ESKEW: Thanks, Cate. So I want to talk about the proposed revisions first to H29, which is the examinations policy that I'll touch on H21. And we've already received some comments, most of them constructive. {laughter} So am I might've liked a different tone and tenor, but I will also, we're, we're glad to receive those. And I want to show you how we're already thinking about those as we go forward. So everything you see in red here is new. And we'll start with the policy statement. The policy statement doesn't change anything about what is true about final exams. We have academic freedom to give final examinations or not give them to do different types of final assessments, etc. So this is a clarifying statement. The next two go together, the headings, timing and location, and final exams one through five. I want to go through one through five, one at a time. But in general, it's easier to look at a schematic that was developed by Mike Carroll from the registrar's office, Registrar's office. And I'll show it to you in a second. If you have an exam that starts in the morning, your exams during finals week under the baseline revised policy, would be scheduled for the morning in the same classroom at the same time as classes met for the previous 15 weeks. If you have a class that starts in the afternoon, excuse me, I've had this all day. I knew this was going to happen. Then you will give your exam on Wednesday or Thursday afternoon at the same time in the same classroom as your class has met for the previous 15 weeks. But you can request an exception to this baseline policy.

So again, if your class starts before 01:00 P.M. and we modeled this through the registrar's office and with Dennis Groth assisting. If your class meets, e.g. I, have an 11:30 A.M. Monday, Wednesday class that meets in Hodge Hall 1034 11:30-12:45. My final would be in Hodge Hall 1034 at 11:30 on Monday morning and I'd have 75 min. I have a Tuesday, Thursday class that meets at 03:00 P.M. for 75 min. My final under number two would be on Thursday afternoon at 03:00 in the same room, et cetera. This is what it looks like. When you model that out, you'll see that there are 16 blocks for two-hour exam is included here. 16 blocks.

Number three, instructors that are going to use this baseline policy that are going to give a final exam will opt in. And this doesn't mean you have to call Mike Carroll and wait on hold to speak with Mike directly, but he will send out an email. And he has suggested he'll do this first in the mid-summer and then again closer to the beginning of the semester where you just say, yep, that's what I'm gonna do. I'm gonna follow the baseline policy. I'm gonna be giving my Monday, Wednesday class its exam on that Monday at 11:30 in Hodge Hall 1034. So it is an opt in policy. If you're not going to give a final, you don't have to opt in.

Next comes this. If you need an exception, you need to give a longer exam, you need a different space, then you will seek permission. And I think people are bumping on the word permission, and I can understand that. But you will notify the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and the Registrar that you're going to need that to our block. Cate and her

department all give to our exams. They're going to request an exception for tons of the exams that they give all of Cate's orgo would request this. And so that's all it requires is that you request that two-hour block. And then I know people are upset about this. And I just want to say that this language that the final exam period, not the exam itself, but the period for the final exam be no longer than 2 hours. That's actually the world we live in right now. This is, this is the world we live in. This is not new. But this is upset some people, and we don't want people to be upset. We want to try and do something that helps students and helps faculty. So we have taken into consideration some comments that we've received and we're still sorting through them and we'll continue to look at them. And I look forward to talking with you today.

But in blue, this is not final language by the way, we need to add something that clarifies what you don't need an exception for. So you don't need an exception if you have a DSS student that needs time and a half for an exam, you don't need an exception if you're giving a take-home exam. I mean, we all know if you'd give students 72 hours to do a take-home, you don't actually expect them to spend 72 hours doing it. You might wish they would, but there are things that don't require exceptions and we need to clarify that. We'll add clarifying language that's more eloquently set out than what we have right here. And then this two-hour thing, let's cross it out. We don't need it. It's not important to us. So that gets rid of that. If you need an exception to using the baseline, which is the amount of time you have for class normally, then you request that exception and go forward from there.

Let me quickly look at the rest of the H29 exams policy just to show you what else we changed, want to make sure I'm accurate on this. Where it says free week used to say final examinations periods slash free week. I don't know why my colleagues decided we need to shorten it, but it makes sense to me. And free week is so much more cheerful than dead week. And then the last thing that's been changed is that the student needs to notify you if they have more than three exams in a day and they want you to work with them to accommodate them. It used to say by the halfway point in the semester, that was changed to the 10th week of the semester. I think that's because of the drop withdrawal considerations. So just thinking about what the calendar is. So that's H29.

The only other policy that relates to the final exam period is H21. And this is a laundry list of things for the academic calendar. I had no idea existed. I'm sure most of us didn't. But number ten, currently, the world we live in today says the final exam period for semester courses shall be two hours. Lawyer language shall means yes. That's what you do. The revised language is shall be no longer than two hours. Now, Lisa is going to give me the stink eye right now. But she and Brian wrote this language with Con, and I don't understand how these two things are different, but I am assured that they are. But nonetheless, here's what we propose. Let's just get rid of that. Okay, because people don't seem to want to live in this two-hour world. But I think most the longest exams people are giving are two hours if there's something longer than that, I'm not aware of it. There may be a good reason for it. If you've got a good reason for it, then you can share that with Dennis Groth.

So this is my last slide. We consider this to be a step one. We have done modeling on this. Mike Carroll's looked at how many students under the new plan would end up with three or more exams on the same day out of 45,000 undergrads, about 250 currently. Might have three finals, more than three finals in one day under this plan, 255. And that's assuming everybody, all faculty give a final, which we know they don't. So with that, I'm going to stop. We would like to

see it implemented. I think we have. I want to make one more comment. Going back to the policy statement about academic freedom to give finals, one of the comments we received seemed to indicate, well, Eliza's office, the VPFAA, says we have to give a final and you're saying we don't have to give a final? This weakens us because we're not assessing stringently enough. So I reached out to Eliza and I said, Do you know where that's coming from? I said I think it's from the beginning of semester letter which I promise you I read from top to bottom. But she shared with me the language of that letter that does say final exams are important, indeed essential as a part of the pedagogical process. And every course should contain a final exercise of some kind. And then it references H29. And as she and I chatted, we agreed that this is something that we can talk about and potentially revise the standard language that's been used in the VPFAA's letter. And now I'll stop and we would be glad to take questions.

AGENDA ITEM TWELVE

RECK: Thank you, Kelly. Kyle.

SEIBERT: Yeah. Thank you. Thank you so much, Cate. Thank you so much, Professor Eskew and your whole committee for working on this. I think that it's for me, it's a no-brainer, right? I don't think that this specific policy will cure students' mental health concerns and issues during the last stressful week of finals, right? But this is one of those, I think, small things that when we look at it, if we change a bunch of small little things, that it affects students' perception and students' ability to get their finals and things done. So I think this is a this is, like I said, a no brainer. I appreciate the work that the committees done on this and I would encourage you guys to vote yes on this too. Once we get to that point.

RECK: David.

DALEKE: I wanted to work the committee is put to this too. I just have a question about whether or not this policy should just be labeled for undergraduates only. I noticed that the graduate courses are really listed under exceptions to be addressed to the dean. And I would imagine that most of our graduate courses don't fit into this model very well. I don't know the data off the top of my head. So we'll be seeing many, many, many requests to each of the academic deans about this. And maybe there's a way to simplify that by maybe having a separate section for graduate final, finals week practices and make it be just pretty open that it's determined by individual school and discipline. The other point I wanna make is about the free week. The free week is a free week for all students except for our associate instructors who also have work to do during that period of time and they're not free to concentrate on their semester end projects or examinations. And I would urge the committee to consider putting language in the free week section that addresses that. And I'm not sure what that would be, the top of my head, but I think it would be essential.

ESKEW: Great, That's very useful. Thank you.

RECK: Alex.

TANFORD: I want to reiterate what David said about this needs to be for undergraduates only or it, because everything about it from start to bottom contradicts the way the law school, for example, runs its examinations. They're not on the same day, they're not in the same classroom there. It just because we have to model on our exams the kind of scope and complexity and

length that the students are going to encounter when they take the bar exam. And those are four-hour essays, three-hour essays, and five-day period. Morning classes start in the morning from top to bottom. None of this applies. Well, not the free week. We have a free, we have a two-week exam period instead of one because we have longer exams. So again, I would urge us to simply to say that the policy applies to undergraduates only, leaves it up to individual, graduate, and professional units to determine their own practice with respect to exams. And I don't see any problem with that.

ESKEW: As a law school graduate, I think 50-minute exams on Tuesday mornings sound great. But since since I went through it, I think they should go through a rite of passage. You're right. {laughter}

RECK: Jeremy

SIEK: I have a basic question which is just, what are the what are the reasons for the proposed changes? I wasn't involved with any of the development of the proposal, so I'm just curious. Thank you.

THOMASSEN: Yeah. Thank you for that question and thank you for that. Comments which are very helpful, particular pertaining to undergraduates, I think absolutely. So, thank you colleagues for that. The reason for this policy was many-fold. I think there has been some discourse it suggests this surround some recent events related to graduation. It does not. This has been discussed in EPC for more than five years through to registrars with Dennis's participation. And really, what this is intended to do is, as has been mentioned, to really alleviate some of the stress associated with final exams were changing schedules on students who, for one thing, DSS accommodations puts them outside of the hours for DSS, making this very disruptive for students. It's very stressful for everyone, including instructional faculty, TA's, people who are grading a lot of exams and you just moving outside of the regular schedule. This actually rationalizes and makes more reasonable some of the scheduling concerns that the registrar has had and gets exams done actually earlier. So the registrar's office has worked very hard to create a grid that works better. The opt-in thing is one of the ways that we can make this work better.

But with all these comments, I think we can have a great policy that will actually make things less stressful for students because there's more predictability. Students are taking exams in the situation that most of their exams occur for some of the exceptions that we're seeing for these large sections, for example, chemistry, biology, mathematics, students that are already testing in an irregular outside of office time that will continue. Which means that there will be very little change for those students, which makes things a little bit better for those students. So really this was motivated to alleviate a lot of this trust for the registrar's office, not the least of which is deciding who's graduating and the people who have to grade these assignments. I mean, not everybody has one or two small sections. Some folks are really grading a lot of work at the end. And by moving things further to the front of the week, it actually alleviates some of the stress on Friday, which makes things a lot easier for faculty.

It makes things easier for students and it makes things easier for the registrar's office and people who were doing administrative tasks. So it really seemed like a win-win-win and an opportunity just to show some real leadership. I mean, the original policy that it changed things

to the kind of random grid that went back to, I think it was 1980. Cell phones weren't invented until 1983 and they were like a big brick. I mean, we really advanced and so I think it's time to update our policy and it just seems to work so very well.

ESKEW: It also allows us to collect some data on how many exams are being given, what the room availability is. I think that the reason my last slide is, this is step one, is let's be data-driven and let's see what we're doing. And then let's try and improve the policy again. I think that we go ahead and we count. I put on my calendar to remind whoever is co-chairing EPC, better not be me. In two years. I've served two sentences. But whoever's chairing in two years to tell them that they need to revisit it because I don't want us to lose the institutional memory of the discussion that we're having today, the concerns that we have, and to make sure that we addressed them with us.

THOMASSEN: I might also add that it's important because a lot of folks don't get final exams but haven't reported now there are a lot of there are some programs that are very good about it, but many don't. And some of it maybe this misconception that we're supposed to do it and if we're not doing it or somehow skirting the law, so I think it's really beneficial adding that. And so having folks report, we do get this data. It gives us a better sense of what's going on.

RECK: Elizabeth.

HOUSWORTH: The transcript is October 7, 1980, if you'd like to read it. It contains a lot of what I think is some of the impetus for this change. I don't know about the rest of you, but my constituents and some people outside of my constituency are extremely alarmed by this. So basically I'm going to be voting no, because they've told me to vote, no.

Objections to the current language, I think you've already said include the permission having to request permission to give a two hour exam when in the fields that I represent, a two-hour exam is the standard, seems demeaning. And like, what are we going to do if it's not granted? I'm a little worried about whether this really solves all the problems because if there is a lot of demand for two-hour exam, so all those Friday slots will be used. Although maybe that will be more in first-year and second-year courses than in senior level courses. So it might solve some problems. Other problems include that I mean, I'm a professor in the math department and we still work Monday, Wednesday, Friday. 50-minute classes don't allow for enough time for a comprehensive final. Even if some of my faculty believed that a 75-minute final would be okay. It puts a weird kind of pressure. I've already had one professor in statistics tell me that if this goes through, he's going to request only Tuesday, Thursday classes and he's the only one in my department willing to teach Monday, Wednesday, Friday. So I think he didn't understand that you could request for 2 hour slots, but the permission thing is a little bit off. The other suggestion I would make with the policy is, right now, there's a clear person who yields. The fourth final of a day yields. And there won't be, if people give their exams during their regularly scheduled time for class, there won't be conflicts so much. But if there is a high demand for the two-hour time slots, it would be better if policy clearly delineated which faculty member yields.

I'm sorry, I'm going on at length. I have two other things to say. I'm shocked you're crossing out the two-hour limit. So although I am about, my last sentence is going to be an ode to, to our exams. But while I'm going to give that ode, I am deeply concerned. So I would like it to be that any of us can request a two-hour time slot. But I am alarmed that a colleague could

ask for four or six hours for a regular exam. And obviously you've made that change because you've heard from people. But, I think it's, I think there's a limit. And if somebody wants to give a six-hour exam, they should do it as a take-home. I'm, uh, I'm kind of more concerned that longer than 2 hours might be allowed under the change.

And finally, I'm sorry, I do have to do my ode to the two-hour exam. It's not an assessment issue actually. The one of the largest joys I had learning when I was in college was when on well-written exams, I was able to piece together parts of the course to solve a problem that I didn't, that the exam gave me the experience of doing that and it was a wonderful learning experience on a comprehensive final exam. And I understand that may well be discipline-specific. It might be specific to me as a person and not to students generally. But there's, there's a learning aspect to a two-hour exam in some disciplines that I value. And I don't really want to request permission to be able to provide it if I'm as good at writing exams as my professors were.

ESKEW: Thank you for all of those comments. I wrote them down. I hear you on the permission language and I hear you on the two-hour thing. I mean, I'm baffled. I don't know if anybody who is here represented represents constituents who were upset about the two-hour thing, but we did hear it. But just to note that this crossing it out, that that is just coming from the comments. This is not in the first reading and may not be in the second reading. If the sentiment is, we should not get rid of it. Because I see Cate making ugly faces.

RECK: I'm I'm trying to be patient and let everyone else go in front of me because I have my own comments, but I'll be I'll be quiet. Seth. How about you go first? I don't know which one are you headed.

FREEDMAN: So a couple of concerns also from my unit, my constituents is around the two-hour not the maximum, but around the default being not two hours. And I worry, I guess I also did not understand when I first read the policy that there would be these two hour blocks that people could request. And my concern is if most faculty requests the two-hour blocks, then we'll be in a worse position than we were previously. And I think, at least in my school, I think that would probably be the default for most faculty would be to request the two-hour block. If they don't, if people stick with the default schedule, another concern is that since students tend to schedule their classes consecutively, they're going to have a lot of exams consecutively. And if a lot of this is geared towards making the student experience during exam week better. I worry that that might go in the opposite direction. I could be wrong about that empirically, but it would be something that I feel like you could look into as well in your modeling.

RECK: Con.

DELIYANNIS: Is it okay if I ask Elizabeth question?

RECK: I think so. Parliamentarian? I'm going to say, Well, I'm holding the gavel, So I say yeah.

DELIYANNIS: So regarding the first issue that hesitancy to request permission, how would you feel and your constituents feel if instructors instead simply chose whether to use the class time or a two-hour exam. If you're, if all the instructor has to do is specify a choice, are you and your constituents okay with that?

HOUSWORTH: There are two parts to the question. Me and my constituents. My understanding of my constituents is that they do not like change. {laughter} They are also completely, they are also completely unwilling to serve on this body, which is why I as chair of statistics and director of business statistics this year, am serving on this body. So they would definitely prefer and prefer our usual default of two-hour periods. But I think that, personally, just getting rid of the permission language, it's the it's that I might be denied permission. It doesn't, like asking permission just doesn't seem right. On the other hand, demanding of four or six or eight hour time block seems like cruel and unusual punishment to me.

DELIYANNIS: Okay. Thank you. I'd like to make one more comment with regards to the expectation that final exams will be given that still appear on the beginning of a semester of memos. When I first arrived here a few years ago. Well, okay, late 90s, I received the faculty handbook, which I dutifully read through, believe it or not, and the expectation was written in there. And for a number of years my colleagues have received these and developed similar expectations. And in more recent times, perhaps because I'm also on the committee and I have discussed and debated these issues. I did some research and could find nowhere any policy that states that final exams are expected. And if somebody is aware and I went back to the 1930s digging through policies. If somebody is aware of such a policy, please bring it to our attention. We need to know this. But in the absence of such policy, what Kelly said holds true that we all have academic freedom to choose our mode of evaluation and examination. But because so many of our faculty have perhaps this, how should I say this politely, are misled into thinking they have to give exams. We need to explain, to state this very, very clearly that there is academic freedom until the policy changes. And that's the purpose of having this first paragraph here clear and explicit for everybody to know and see. And of course, the beginning of semester memo probably needs to be altered if this were to pass. But even if it doesn't pass, the default is academic freedom. So we can't be telling people they're expected to give exams.

RECK: Thank you. Damir.

CAVAR: Just the general comments to the exceptions to this require prior permission from the Vice Provost? Apparently, this is, as Jane McLeod told us, it's just in the beginning, the exception to time and location. Jane McLeod told us that in the policies that have been written apparently in the '40s, this is already specified. But the interesting thing is that our colleagues either don't know or don't care about that. So usually everybody would schedule exams, even in their own office with some students and at some time and location that the students agreed to. And so in principle, I think that this is actually good. We should have a {intelligible} type of approach to that. And we might actually change that part and say that the professors can agree with students on a specific time and location, for example. Through also reduce the bureaucracy around the head because the poor provost will have a lot of communication.

RECK: thank you. Jeremy.

SIEK: I want to express a concern about point three, which was about that you have to notify the registrar that it's an opt-in thing. So I guess this makes it a default be that we have no final exam for a course as the default, then if I understand that correctly,

ESKEW: Well, I would not phrase it as the default is that you don't have a final exam. I would phrase it as the default is you're not reserving a time in a room. So if that means it's because

you're not having a final exam? Yes. But the purpose of telling the registrar is for them to track room usage and who is giving finals.

SI EK: So I guess what? I just kinda thinking about my colleagues, maybe even myself, that we're gonna be really busy the first week and we're not going to send out that message. And then at, during finals week we're going to need the space and time to give the exam and we're not going to have it. And so then we'll just have a giant mass at the end of every semester. So I mean, like we have to send a lot of email out already, right? So this is adding another email to the 50 emails that we have to send at the beginning of semester.

ESKEW: I'm sorry, Mike Carroll isn't here today from the registrar's office, but I do have confidence that Mike would send out several reminders starting in mid-summer? It's not unreasonable. I don't believe I don't believe that it's unreasonable to have faculty report whether or not they're going to have a final exam and need a room for final exams at the, at the beginning of the semester or prior to the beginning of the semester, you should know before you send your syllabus out and open your Canvas site, right?

THOMASSEN: So we actually have to do that already. Yes, I'm sorry. I laughed a little bit because I said that would only happen once that situation afterwards. But I agree with you. It's a reasonable thing to expect in a small thing. I can appreciate the concern. We're all very busy, but part of this is because we haven't known and then register actually does. We do need to know where people are. So I think there'll be again, I'm sorry, Mike also isn't here, but we'll be very careful about making sure that the rollout of this goes as smoothly as possible to avoid the oversight.

RECK: Con?

DELIYANNIS: So I've heard from a number of people express a similar concern. I think the timing is the part perhaps that worries you, but please correct me if I've misunderstood. The concern that I've heard is students need to be handed syllabi that are very definite about when and where their exam is this whole procedure. Whether you take the classroom time, call it default if you like, or you want a two-hour exam. This procedure needs to be completed well in advance. The registrar needs to schedule this where well in advance. So that's syllabi that students receive will have all that information stated correctly and it's too bad Mike isn't here to comment on that. But a number of people who've told me this and that was really their only objection to the plan. Other people had more {unintelligible}. If I've addressed your concern, I don't know if I have, but I thought it would be good to share this idea here.

RECK: Svetina.

SVETINA: I'm not really sure if it's relevant, but could you speak maybe a little bit about to the classes that are taught online and how any parts of this policy would be impacting that, in particular, with the time allocated to the final exams. Thank you.

THOMASSEN: Yeah. So this relates to the use of classroom time. It's presumed that typically it would be as assessments are generally offered within the class. So, you know, as you offer your online classes, if you offer take-home exams and so forth. This is really about scheduling rooms and times. Thank you.

RECK: Eliza.

PAVALKO: I'm going back to the opt opt in. I share the concern knowing this is a large and complex university. And when we think about, I think when we think about these things, we think about our full-time faculty in kind of putting together classes. We have a lot of adjunct instructors, we have, there's a lot of variation in it. And certainly like you said, they might only make that mistake once. But I particularly worry about the students who are relying on that, on knowing if there's an exam, no relying on that end of semester evaluation and the chaos that would bring even, even if it's just the 1% of instructors who might not pay attention. So I do, I think that needs some more thought on the opt-in because again, even, even one or 2% of instructors could create a lot of chaos for our students.

RECK: Elizabeth.

HOUSWORTH: I'm sorry, I'm running into your time for the timing. It like most people and most classes in most departments have an idea of who gives finals and who would want to give a two-hour final. So it might be something that could be done when the classes are being scheduled because it does tend to be something that like I'm directing business statistics. I'm going to be requesting or demanding or begging for a two-hour time slot. Which brings me to another small point or not so small, I thought that your revisions were going to include something about departmental exams. Like will a department who's offering Business Statistics be given one of the two-hour time slot so that all students in business statistics no matter when their class is, can take the business statistics final in one, two-hour slot.

THOMASSEN: Yeah, it's too bad. Dennis Dennis isn't here and the registrar, but we already have these things that happen and they are in the schedule of classes that these, these are already scheduled. And so certainly folks who know that they're gonna be offering these, you have the opportunity to get that onto. Those are already exceptions. And so there's certainly a mechanism for that. So this policy is really, I mean, it's just beautiful how many slots there are for these two are exams given how many spaces we have to I appreciate the concerns about the rollout and that really does have to be done carefully and with notification, perhaps confirmations of everybody who's teaching about where your exam is and when your exam is for students having access to that as well. The goal of this really is to make it easier for students who have to work to schedule their work to be less disruptive of schedules, to add more predictability, to make it actually more routine in those things. So I think a lot of these concerns are valid and certainly not insurmountable, including departmental exams and program exams, which we expect are things that are sort of known about and discussed and different programs or different sizes. And some have offices that are already doing this kind of reporting and for others, but I think ultimately this will lead us to a very good place when we have a lot of these pieces put together. So it's good to hear these questions and concerns as we work our way through this.

ESKEW: There is not an intention to try and roll this out in the fall. Just FYI. That makes anybody feel any better. But in the spring.

SELA: Just to clarify, classes that meet three times a week for 50 min are allowed a 50-minute final exam. Classes that meet twice a week for 75 are allowed a 75. Even though

ESKEW: You could request an exception to get a longer class period.

THOMASSEN: Certainly in many classes, the final exam is given not always though. Some prefer a cumulative exam or a more exhaustive examined in many instances, it's how most of the

exams are given. So I teach Monday, Wednesday, Friday classes, I teach Tuesday Thursday classes. I teach a lot of classes. And I make adjustments accordingly. The way I run my class. I've made decisions to do 50-minute exams, even in my 75-minute class, and then we start new material. Different people have different solutions to the problem. But I think folks are not routinely giving outside of the hours exams if you teach two sections. One thing that departments are different because they have different schedules, but they have departmental exams. And so the departmental exams are one answer to the discrepancies in class size, even though the same material is covered. And students know that they're taking those exams at that time and it becomes a much more predictable thing and less of a stressor and less of adjustment required. But yes, you're correct about that. So in your typical exam time, it would be by default your class if, unless you chose to request something else to opt into a different exam format for say, you felt like your Monday, Wednesday, Friday people need more time like your Tuesday, Thursday people, and that would certainly be something that you as an instructor would be able to do, make the choice, or choose to assess in another way, if you chose to have a take-home exam and online exam, whatever you prefer.

RECK: Okay. I'm going to try and keep my comments brief. I've had a lot of thoughts going through my head during this discussion. I really enjoyed it. I think it's important. I think my first and major concern, I want to preface this by saying I have examined four hours for 560 students for two hours. So I'm very used to the two-hour exam, so I'm in the two-hour exam camp. For all of our chemistry, we would do that same thing.

So I was Director of Undergraduate Studies for 15 years. I've done schedule builds out the wazoo. There was a year I was the scheduling officer because we couldn't hire our scheduling officer. So I'm actually quite used to like what would take to actually planet. So I don't want to answer for Mike Carroll. But it really isn't that hard because of when you put the schedule building, you could actually build into it that this class, when a department chooses, could actually just historically have a two-hour build. So for chemistry, I would always have a two-hour build. I think for math, you would always have a two-hour build, that may be the same for a lot of science classes. I don't know. I don't see that from a logistic standpoint to be an obstacle. I think we could actually ask it well in advance when they're actually scheduling the rooms. Like I think this could be done because like right now this is spring, we're building for next spring right now. So you can just ask the instructors. So I don't have a problem with that. Secondly, we already asked for e-texts and we have to do that well in advance. And although some people don't put it in their e-text requirements in the appreciated time. You could still parallel it where you're asking for that kind of classroom information at the same time. So I don't see those as being obstacles.

I do wonder though I am against taking out the two-hour limit in our department was guilty of this last semester. We had a faculty member who taught to who's used to teaching graduate level classes. And he taught one of our undergraduate classes, I think for the second time in the 22 years that I've been here. So this is an exception. But he had a four-hour final exam and the students didn't know enough to understand that maybe you didn't need all 4 hours, but that's not the point. If this is an obstacle for this student to get into medical school, they're going to sit there for the whole four hours because then they're going to feel like they short changed themselves because they didn't do all they could do. I would like to see the language say that there'll be no, shall whatever the, not the first sentence but the new no longer than 2 hours. From my science background and from being here for 22 years and

watching my science colleagues and then pulling graduate faculty to come do things. I would like to have that safety net. I feel pretty strongly about that. My last question I think is, I'm assuming Mike Carroll has taken this color-coded schedule and then taken whatever this semester's final exam grid looks like and mapped it on here and said, this has about an 80% fit. I'm assuming that something like that has already been done.

THOMASSEN: This has been based on historical data, yes.

RECK: Okay. I'm curious, do you have the data about how many people how many classes in general have final exams fall on springs that are probably slightly different based on cohort effects because he has he ever shared that data?

ESKEW: I don't know, but I don't know how he'd have reliable data.

RECK: Well, it may not be reliable. I know we report it. Yeah. But I don't know what other departments do.

ESKEW: My department reports that, but I don't think that's consistent for the whole Kelley School, but I'll ask.

RECK: I just didn't know if you haven't had the demo. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Thanks.

FUREY: Thanks so much. Just a couple of things thinking about from Arts and Humanities and just marking just for the general audience, the distinctiveness withing the College, arts and humanities. First of all, I think there's no way there'll be reliable data. Because in general, I think most arts and humanities departments people don't, they just have their exam slot ready, but they don't necessarily use it. And just also to name especially in situations and departments and fields where there is a lot of, especially at the upper levels, developing new courses or amending one's courses is sort of a standard thing to be doing a lot. And it already feels like a tremendous amount of pressure to even schedule a year ahead what your course is going to be, and to have to make decisions about the final exams a year or so ahead. So just to name it, to put out there the way in which the sort of fields I think, can really change the sense of what the what requesting entails for people and when that, when it's required, it's gonna get a lot of different responses from people depending on their backgrounds obviously. But I think it's such an important thing about this policy that it reminds everyone not to assume that exams are required. I remember also believing, and the wording is perfectly clear. But I actually when I came in 2000 it's the, it's the main thing I associate with Bloomington faculty council was that in the beginning semester memo that all exams all classes should have a final exam or a final project. The way that line reads, if you read it clearly, as it stands, it's already clear. You don't have to have a final exam, but I had understood that to be, oh wow, this is a university where they've thought carefully about how we should evaluate people at the end of the semester. And that should include something equivalent to a final exam, something cumulative. And so one of the main things I think in terms just to say about why people maybe are having, and I certainly, it's the first thing from constituents about why people are having strong reactions to it? Is it in some sense? So even though one of the very valuable things about it will be to help people see that they don't have to pretend they're having a final exam when they're not, that it's in fact appropriate and right, in terms of academic freedom, not to, that it feels a little like a 180 that now you have to request permission. And even if we've started to talk about taking the language of permission out, still a language of request is getting used a lot. And so that feels like a

curtailment of academic freedom strongly. I think, I think that's what's been the impetus for the people I've heard from at that just affective level. Something I thought was actually kind of expected of me is now something I have to actively request.

ESKEW: Thank you. That's helpful.

RECK: Rachael.

COHEN: I'll start off and saying, I have no skin in this game, {laughter} so it doesn't actually matter. But I will note that this seems to shift the schedule of finals towards the end of the week. And I think students are going to have some problems with that if all of their final sum of their finals all end up,

THOMASSEN: Let me, let me address that. That actually is the opposite. It actually shifts things to the forward part of the week, which makes it easier for students and graders. And that was part of the impetus for this is by apologize, didn't mean to interrupt you, but that's one of the reasons that the optimum is necessary to think about the time. But in the modeling, it became apparent that this was very desirable, which is why the registrars, two registrars have been on board with this is because the importance of moving things towards the front of the week.

COHEN: Yeah, that's fine. I think that it goes off the assumption that people don't all request a two hour final though. And that's where I'm seeing to our finals towards the end of the week, where I think students are going to not be super happy about. By Friday in Wells Library, you have no one. So that's the only thing is I worry that we've shifted all the 2 hours towards the end of the week. When students are expecting to leave.

THOMASSEN: I can appreciate that concern when you hear people talking about wanting to our time periods. But a lot of the most heavily enrolled classes are these large classes, which is why they have evening final exams. And I just wanna give a shout out to chemistry and biology and some of the programs that have been really forward thinking in working with students to help them with some of these large enrolled classes. I think their work has been exemplary. A lot of the faculty involved with this are recognized for their excellence in doing this, working with our undergraduates through facet recognition and so forth. We hear people talking about wanting them, but these are really a lot of spaces available for this. Since the most large, the largest enrolled classes are actually sort of already accounted for if that's any kind of reassurance. This is certainly something that was data-driven by the registrar's office thinking about some of these things, though I recognize the concern folks have. It really actually does shift things toward the front. Even though when you look at this, we're looking at 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 of these time slots are before Friday versus six that aren't.

RECK: So thank you. Eliza did you still have your hand up?

PAVALKO: I was just going to mention if we have questions for Mike Carroll, he's actually back here, {laughter} so that's new. Or just thank you for all the good work.

RECK: That's fantastic. Actually. Mike, I don't know how long have you been sitting there, but if you've heard this whole conversation, Thank you. Do you have anything to add to it in order to try to dissipate any kind of issues now versus waiting for emails, right?

CARROLL: Thank you. Is that better? Alright. I don't really have anything to add. Forgive me. I really wasn't sure the protocol for inserting myself in the conversation. We did do modeling and there was one question about knowing how many exams are given. The comment I have to that is, we get responses from somewhere between a third and a half of the departments on exams that are not taking place. So we really don't have good data on who's giving exams and who is not. And as was mentioned, if we have that information, we can do a better job. We believe we can develop the tools to do a better job to reduce the number of conflicts that students have, reduce the number of students that have four or more in a day, at least when it comes to the exceptions by this model. That is part of our plan if this would be approved, is to work on those tools and have those in place hopefully by the spring of '24 final exam period.

RECK: Great, fantastic. I just have one last question. This is kinda for Constance. When I heard Kelly actually talk about it verbally, she used the word notify and I actually liked the verb just notify the registrar that you're having it not request it. Not I mean, to me the word notify was Hey, I'm having it and you don't have anything to say about it. And so that seemed to me like just kind of doing it. Make sure you've got a room for me. Does that at least seem better to people.

FUREY: I totally think it does. Requests just did also come up again, but also doesn't it? I think notify as effective rhetorically. It does in some sense still have to be a request because there has to be an assignment of the slot.

RECK: Great. Any other questions on this very deliberative topic, Elizabeth?

HOUSWORTH: Sorry, just one more question more for Carroll. I believe so. I believe that requests for two-hour time slots likely to be discipline-specific. So is Friday exams, for instance, going to happen much more often in this science? Plants or in other disciplines that are going to use two hour time slots? It's a question. I won't be an answer now. Just this scheduling problem might be discipline specific. Well, I don't know, Cate when are chemistry exams.

RECK: So if you've never had a two hour exam and then have to spend eight hours grading it with 20 graders, which I have every semester, it is basically when the registrar gives us a final exam time of Friday night at 07:00 P.M. Then I go to graduation on Saturday and then I'm grading all day Sunday to get my grades in by noon on Monday. So for class like mine, having a late week is disastrous. And then especially if international graduate students who are graders who want to fly home. They want to go live their lives like they should be able to. And then that puts the onus on the people who aren't flying away to go anywhere to then grade more because of course you're going to let someone to go to India because that's the ticket and they've bought the ticket and they bought it months ago.

So the final exam schedule is a very sensitive topic from a science perspective. We want it as early in the week as possible so I can make sure that I have greater so that the onus doesn't fall on me to grade so much. So I'm hopeful...little plug here...I'm hopeful that some of these science classes, I think it's also different whether you have multiple choice versus handwritten, right? If you have handwritten, to me, that should always be actually something that's put into the build because that actually should have some precedent or some preference, I should say, unlike when you give it, if you have to hand grade it, you have to then put that in. If all I'm doing is a Scantron, I honestly don't care if it's on a Friday or not because, I mean,

scanning it takes no amount of time. Very little. So I think it matters a lot, and whether it's on a Friday or Monday, 100%. Con?

DELIYANNIS: So not all sciences are the same. And in astronomy we do things a little differently. We teach huge numbers of Gen Ed students, 2-3 thousand a year, if I remember correctly. And our 100 level courses have been shifting to doing final exams online increasingly. And this was really pushed forward when disappeared, it was nice to have students come into a room, fill out forms, have them graded quickly and efficiently. But with .eparting. I think just about everybody in my department who teaches these large Gen Ed classes does online exams. I'm not saying there are 100% multiple choice, mine are, but others may also have other types of questions. The point is, all of this is irrelevant for these classes. We're talking about scheduled classroom exams. So if more departments are like mine, there may be very few scheduling issues. And the only way to really find out is to do this or do a mock-up of this. Ask everybody if we were doing this policy, what would you do and see what the responses are? We need data. I completely agree with Kelly in her earlier presentation that data would be very valuable.

ESKEW: Can I just I had this thought at the beginning of the meeting and I wish I had it sooner, obviously, but I wonder if we could, Mike, do a mockup in the fall and see what the requests are for regular classroom time versus two hour exams. And analyze that before implementing the policy to make sure we're not doing back to back to back to our exams for students in the sciences, etc. At the end of the week.

RECK: I think you have everyone's attention such that if you sent out a form now I think now would be the best time to actually gather data because everyone's mind is on this topic. So you're right, people aren't responding all the time. I think people would respond to this because they would be really interested in what the data is saying. Ben, We haven't heard from you today and I'll get Alex next.

KRAVITZ: Yeah, thanks. I totally agree with data gathering. Even I don't give final exams in my classes and nobody has ever asked me if I do. So. That seems like an oversight.

RECK: Our scheduling officer asks all the time in a very scheduled way. Alex.

TANFORD: I want to reassure you and other people who worried about the backup of exams on Friday and the weekend of grading. That last year, the University Faculty Council changed the due date for exam grades to four days after the end of the examination period, not to the campus policy reviews special committee today and is taking the university policy and going to be prevent presenting at one of our next meeting is a revision of our campus grading policy to make it consistent will also extend the deadline for grades from all weekends. You can get them in on Monday too. If the exam period ends at 10:00 Friday night. You got it, please till 10:00 Tuesday. It's not a great relaxing weekend, but at least it's an extra two days.

RECK: No, Thank you, Alex. I actually had forgotten that, but I was actually there for that vote, but thank you. Any last comments? I appreciate the conversation on this is why we exist. This is exactly what BFC is for, it was for us to actually talk to our constituents and then come back and have this conversation. So I've really enjoyed this because I think this is why we're all here. Anything else? Okay.

AGENDA ITEM THIRTEEN

RECK: Thank you both. Thanks. So our last order of business is to today is an action item. This is for the proposed changes to BL ACA D6 review procedures for administrators on the Bloomington campus. This could be This is brought to you from the executive committee, but it's gonna be lead again by Colin Johnson, president elect.

JOHNSON: I don't think this is going to be nearly as much fun as that was. I'm sorry for that, but important nonetheless. So just to remind everybody, these are proposed changes to the review procedures to deal with administrators on the Bloomington campus. This was presented at the last BFC meeting is a discussion item. I will say just in advance that in the context of that discussion, we receive Tuesday, I thought very thoughtful suggestions for potential revisions to this policy before it was brought back for a vote. And I want to address we discussed those in the context of the executive committee. I thought in fairly significant detail, and so I just wanted to address why we decided not necessarily to integrate those into what we're putting forward for a vote today. And then just remind people that if people feel strongly about those suggestions and their centrality to this, then that can also be addressed on the floor by way of amendments or proposed amendment.

So in any case, the gist of this proposal or the proposed revisions is to remove a very, from our perspective, overly elaborated set of questions that originally appeared in the policy governing the review of campus administrators. On the theory that this is the list of the questions that were written into the policy previously. And to replace that with more broadly articulated charge to review committees themselves, to essentially author review reports that accord with their sense of what needs to happen. What would be most productive to happen in the context of the actual units that are being reviewed. So rather than having that long list of questions, we are suggesting or proposing that that be replaced with the following language, which basically charges review committees to provide a final report to the provost. This is the red language that contains a frank, evidence-based assessment of the review is real or perceived strengths and weaknesses as a unit leader, including an assessment of how the reviewee has impacted the unit's performance, along with a constructively framed set of recommendations for how the reviewee might address any real or perceived shortcomings in their performance moving forward.

The two suggestions we had received, one was to stipulate that people under review, administrators under review given the opportunity to submit a formal written statement. Since though we understood the impulse behind the suggestion was that to the extent that the purpose of this is actually to give review committees latitude to design procedures that makes sense, that they believe makes sense in the context of their units. That stipulating a written statement might or might not be the best way to achieve the ends of those particular committees. So we have units on campus for example that are very small where we suspect review committees might actually feel that sitting down with the dean and having a conversation would end up being considerably more productive for the purpose of their collecting the information they need to conduct a sensible review than asking that dean who they may see every single day in the context of the hallway to author a statement that would essentially only be delivered to the people on that committee. So rather than adding an additional requirement for the purpose of doing so, we felt that it was better to leave it open, bearing in

mind that it would be within the purview of committees to request a statement or anything else if they felt that it was necessary to the task at hand.

The other suggestion was to provide concrete examples of evidence. So the provision here that requires evidence-based assessment are concerned with stipulating specific metrics. Although Rahul was very happy, I think you may remember Rahul was very happy to jump up and offer suggestions about what those metrics might be or what evidence might be. Our sense is that the provost already is collecting information and has a clear sense of what metrics will be informing his approach to this review process. We see this as the opportunity for faculty review committees themselves to determine, to articulate what kinds of issues they want to address. And to the extent that they have broad latitude to define those things, we thought it made more sense to leave, to leave unanswered in some regard or unspecified in some regard, the kind of evidence that would need to be offered because the nature of evidence that's needed to substantiate a particular claim is obviously determined in part by the nature of the claim or observation being made. So our concern was that if you put specific examples in that, that could be read as kind of a mandate rather than that could distort the process and actually in some regard, incentivize people under review to really prioritize, like upping those metrics or producing evidence of that sort relative to anything else. So we agreed with the spirit of those, but felt that kind of keeping them out of the final language in that we put before the floor probably made more sense.

I think I'm trying to think if there are other the other suggestion the other proposed change is actually to bring the language describing the administrative structure of the College of Arts and Sciences, which is more complicated than other units because it actually is comprised of four separate deans into alignment with reality. And I think that's it.

AGENDA ITEM FOURTEEN

RECK: Alex.

TANFORD: There's nothing worse than someone who doesn't go to the committee with a proposed change, but makes it for the first time on the floor. I'm gonna do that anyway. {laughter} I do have a reason there's a parallel process going on right now at the UFC for how to revise the language on the review of senior university UA officials. And in that context, I met with Todd Richardson, the VP for Human Resources. And one of the things that he said about rewriting that policy was it was important to review the person and the office in part because administrators, deans and things can turn over. Yet the institution that they have created and are responsible for continues on. In the first, in number one, in the first line of this, we say quite clearly the office, the following administrators who are part of the provost, shall have their performance and that of their offices evaluated on a regular basis. In this proposed language, the word and their office does not appear. So I would move to amend to try to not change any of the way the language is written, to amend that section, to insert the words "the office and" after the word evidence-based assessment. So it would read, "the final report to the provost contains a frank, evidence-based assessment of the office, and the reviewee's real and perceived performance".

RECK: Okay. So parliamentarian help me out. We need a second they need a second for that motion to carry.

DAU-SCHMIDT: I'll second it. But I think you mean that it goes after assessment of the office.

TANFORD: I agree and I hate lawyers. {laughter}

RECK: That's discussion on that amendment only. Thank you. Elizabeth.

HOUSWORTH: It seems minor, but there are a few different assessments in that red part. So is this including an assessment of how the reviewer has impacted the unit's performance or is this the earlier evidence-based assessment of the review is real and perceived strengths and weaknesses.

JOHNSON: The earlier one. I think it's the first that you're proposing, correct?

TANFORD: Yes. My proposal was that it is impossible to distinguish the two. The person from the office?

HOUSWORTH: No, no, no, no. It's where it's where my question is. Where. You emphasize the word assessment. That assessment comes up in a couple of places and I wanted to know which assessment you are modifying.

TANFORD: What's on the screen. It's the 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 line in the document that was that was sent to us. It is in the fourth line. It is the first time the word assessment appears in red. So they did it. So it would apply to everything following that would be the the office and the review.

RECK: We were still in a discussion period. The proposed amendment for this amendment only. Okay. I'll call a vote for this motion. Sorry. For just this amendment. Changing the language. If you agree, please show by show of hands and then keep them up so that Rachael can count. Oh, yeah. Okay, great. So the motion to amend the language passes. Any other comments before we actually vote on the language itself, the actual changes? Con.

DELIYANNIS: So regarding statements, what I had suggested was a bit different than apparently the executive committee discussed. I was not suggesting that review committees request or require statements from the candidates. What I had said instead was that every reviewee should have the right to provide a statement of accomplishments if they so wish and to put it differently, no review committee shall deny such a right to any reviewee. And I think that's an important right to state explicitly, and I don't know if you guys discuss this or not, but it doesn't appear here.

RECK: So Con we did actually discuss it in that exact way. David.

DALEKE: This is just a very minor point, but is the title of the President, the President of the Faculty of the Bloomington Faculty Council, or just the President of the Bloomington Faculty Council.

TANFORD: It is the President of the Faculty, period. Period. under the Constitution. One of the other provost in the presence of the faculty.

RECK: So my understanding is you're making an amendment to remove,

DALEKE: I guess I am. the Bloomington Faculty Council and moving the strike of the Bloomington faculty council. Okay. That sounds ominous. I'm sorry.

RECK: So now I know where we stand. I got it. And keep my eye on you, David. Okay. Seconded. So for all those in favor of striking down means in language, the Bloomington Faculty Council, so it will read “the Provost and the President of the Faculty shall convene”. Please show by waves, show of hands who's in favor of change in that language. It sounds more periods. Okay. Thank you very much. We've had two very successful on the floor amendments. This is so exciting. Such a good day. Fantastic. Are there any other points to discuss? Please, Seth?

FREEMAN: Actually, this is just a clarification of something I think you said last meeting and maybe that Alex was mentioning. So there's a similar policy that's being revised that will cover core school deans, correct?

RECK: Yes. So that is ACA 11. And we met as the UFC executive committee last Tuesday if I'm if my dates are correct and we don't have an actual UFC meeting until April 24th, if my data is correct. And so in the absence of waiting till April 24th, the UFC executive committee met and vote voted to change, removing the same kind of questions, putting in a very similar paragraph. I think we might have used the same paragraph, almost unanimously voted through the executive committee. And then that will be presented at the USC meeting in April. Yeah. Thank you. Alex.

TANFORD: There is yet a third policy floating out there, which is the review of provost's and chancellors themselves. I believe that the decision of the executive committee was to at the request of HR and President Whitten to delay that into next year. So the UFC will be looking at a revision of the policy for reviewing essentially university vice presidents, the Dean of the Medical School, and a handful of other senior administrators with academic responsibilities, which is ACA-10. Chancellors, provost, and if anything is going to happen to core school deans. Of course, if there are any, will get taken care of.

RECK: Any other discussion points before we vote on this with the two amendments? I see none. Okay. I'm calling for a vote. Okay. Is everyone whoever is in favor of making the change to the language with the two amendments included, please show you by show of hands. I'll get better at this as I go. I promise. I got like four more meetings. It passes. Thank you very much. All right. In with that, this meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.