

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL

March 21, 2023 | 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.

Presidents Hall – Franklin Hall

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ashlbrand, Ashley; Bala, Hillol; Bielasiak, Jack; Bridges Jr., Chandler; Brinda, Chelsea; Cohen, Rachael; Cavar, Damir; Daleke, David; Dau-Schmidt, Kenneth; Deeds, Anna; Deliyannis, Constantine; DeSawal, Danielle; Eskew, Kelly; Freedman, Seth; Gahl-Mills, Karen; Giordano, Anthony; Groth, Dennis; Guerra-Reyes, Lucia; Gupta, Nandini; Herrera, Israel; Housworth, Elizabeth; Johnson, Colin; Kravitz, Ben; Lalwani, Ashok; Lammers, Sabine; Lanosga, Gerry; Lion, Margaret; Loring, Annette; McCoy, Chase; Northcutt Bohmert, Miriam; Ossi, Massimo; Pavalko, Eliza; Peters, Chuck; Reck, Cathrine; Seibert, Kyle; Sela, Ron; Sheldon, Rebekah; Sherman, Jim; Shrivastav, Rahul; Simpson, Marietta; Sinadinos, Allison; Siek, Jeremy; Singh, Kashika; Smith, Wyatt; Svetina, Dubravka; Tanford, Alex; Walton, Christi; Whitworth, Cale; Wyrzynski, Stephen

MEMBERS ABSENT: Arcuri, Toni; Asher, Sofiya; Cole, Shu; Davis, Allen; Eaton, Kristine; Frazier, Lessie; Furey, Constance; Gupta, Nandini; Kalentzidou, Olga; Kollbaum, Pete; Kubow, Patty; Michaelson, Jonathan; Olcott, Courtney; Pastore, Bell; Perry, Brea; Ramos, William; Raymond, Angie; Sapp, Christopher; Shy, Katie; Sterling, Thomas; Tracey, Dan; Wu, Jiangmei

GUESTS:

AGENDA

1. Approval of the minutes of March 7, 2023
2. Memorial Resolution for Kimberly Geeslin
3. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes) Cate Reck, Faculty President
4. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes) Rahul Shrivastav, Provost
5. 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.

6. Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-H32: Grades Given Upon Withdrawal from Courses-Undergraduates Only (15 minutes)

Rahul Shrivastav, Provost and Executive Vice President Dennis Groth, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education [Discussion Item]

7. Questions/Comments on Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-H32: Grades Given Upon Withdrawal from Courses-Undergraduates Only (10 minutes)

8. 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 [Discussion Item]

9. Questions/Comments on Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-D9: Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of Indiana University (5 minutes)
10. Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-H30: Grades and Grading (10 minutes) Rachael Cohen, Chair of the Policy Review Special Committee

Alex Tanford, Ex Officio Member of the Policy Review Special Committee [Discussion Item]

11. Questions/Comments on Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-H30: Grades and Grading (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 [Discussion 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 [Discussion Item]
15. Questions/Comments on Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-D24: SAA Board of Review (10 minutes)

TRANSCRIPT

AGENDA ITEM ONE:

SHRIVASTAV: I am told we have quorum, so let's call this meeting to order. Welcome back everybody. We start again today with our first item on the agenda, which is the approval of minutes from the March 7th meeting. I need a motion to approve. Moved, seconded, seconded as well. All in favor, raise your hands, please. Motion passes, Thank you very much. As always, we will begin with a memorial resolution to our friend and colleague Kim Geeslin, and Eliza will begin with reading that, please.

AGENDA ITEM TWO:

PAVALKO: Thank you, Rahul. Our memorial resolution today is for Kim Geeslin and the resolution was written by Laura Gurzynski-Weiss. Our beloved colleague, mentor, and friend Kim Geeslin, professor of Spanish and Portuguese and Vice Provost of Faculty and Academic

Affairs, passed away in January at the age of 51. Kim grew up in New Hampshire, and completed her master's and doctoral degrees in Hispanic linguistics at the University of Arizona in 1999. Kim joined the department of Spanish and Portuguese at Indiana in the fall of 1999, where she served as Director of Hispanic Linguistics Program, Associate Chair, and Interim Chair. She was also an adjunct faculty member in the Department of Second Language Studies and Cognitive Science before her untimely death. Kim recently took the role of Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs after serving as Associate Vice Provost for five years. Kim was a world-renowned scholar specializing in research in the intersection of second language acquisition and sociolinguistics. In the brief time she had, Kim wrote nine books and over 85 article-length publications, gave dozens of keynote lectures and plenaries, and wrote seminal state-of-the-field reviews that are and will remain cannon for those researching Hispanic linguistics, sociolinguistics, and second language acquisition. Her articles appeared in top-tier journals, and her books were published by top presses. Kim guided the field with her work on the editorial boards of several journals and book series. She was associate editor of several journals and co-editor of several book series. Her impactful scholarly production is widely cited throughout the US and internationally. Kim was equally exceptional in her teaching and administrative pursuits. She taught undergraduate and graduate courses on Hispanic linguistics, second language acquisition, social linguistics, and linguistic variation. Kim's teaching and mentorship was recognized by many awards including three Trustees Teaching Awards, two Department of Spanish and Portuguese Graduate Student Action Committee Outstanding Mentor Awards, the David and Cheryl Morley Career Distinguished Teaching Award and, just this past year, the Carol Hostetler Lifetime Teaching Career Award awarded by FACET. During her career, she directed more than 20 dissertations and served on 40 additional dissertation committees with her students. She was generous, open hearted, understanding, and motivated. She devoted time to foster well-crafted and original ideas for her mentees. She was rigorous and wholly supportive, willing to help each person who reached out for guidance, and her mentorship continued well after graduation. After recently stepping into the role as Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, Kim's title reflected what she had tirelessly worked on for decades, supporting colleagues on campus. She was particularly dedicated to ensuring minority colleagues and women faculty had more equitable paths to leadership. She advocated to ensure that all faculty were included, regardless of track. Before her role as Vice Provost, Kim served as associate vice provost and worked as campus liaison for the Big Ten Departmental Executive Officers Program. In her role as Associate Vice Provost, she touched the lives of so many colleagues on campus. Her advocacy and guidance were central and transformed careers for the better. She was also the director of the Initiative for the Advancement of Women Faculty, where she coordinated the Women in Leadership Series, and worked on initiatives to support mid-career faculty. Her leadership style was warm, inclusive, and unfailingly kind. She saw possible paths forward when others could not, identified needs, and fiercely advocated for meaningful support systems, and demystified the labyrinth that academia can be, creating a joyful and inspiring place to work. Kim was, for so many, the person you called when you had a seemingly unsolvable problem and didn't know where to start. She knew how to approach any issue and resolve conflicts with grace and incomparable skill for having every person involved feel better afterwards. Kim readily celebrated others' victories and generously shared encouragement and kindness. Her joy was genuine, her laugh contagious. Each interaction with Kim was a master class on how to be human. She validated your experience, asked about your life, and was always willing to brainstorm with you about how to make something better. Kim modeled leadership

where one can advance and lead an institution and also have a rich and joyful life outside of work. She showed up fully in all arenas of her life, cheering on her children at violin, track and field, dances, and hockey games; spent summer vacations on group trips with family; built homes each year for Habitat for Humanity's Women Build; ran regularly; and was dedicated to health. She gave love unconditionally to family, friends, and colleagues. Whatever Kim was involved in, you knew the task at hand would be exceptional and, more than that, you knew everyone involved would be a better person from having had the opportunity to work with and learn from her. It's impossible to put into words how much Kim meant to us personally and professionally in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese. She was the heartbeat of the department, the voice of reason, a human peace treaty, and the friend you knew would always show up for you. She was the voice in our head, and often while we kept going, when academic bureaucracy made things seem impossible, you knew better things were coming with her in charge. While it's inconceivable to think of this world without Kim in it, we will honor her life and legacy by striving to make others feel the way she made us feel—seen, heard, inspired, and advocated for. Kim, your kindness and your impact will live on in all those who had the privilege to know and learn from you. Kim is survived by her husband of 30 years, Sean McGuire, her teenage children Logan and Hayden, her mother Eileen, her sister Melissa, and her mother-in-law Patty. Thank you.

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you, Eliza. I know this is deeply personal to many of us. She has left big shoes to fill. If you're able, please stand for a moment of silence in her honor. Thank you. I now invite Faculty President Cate Reck to give her update.

AGENDA ITEM THREE:

RECK: Thank you. So welcome back everyone from spring break. I think we have about six weeks of a mad dash to kind of get this semester over with, I hope you have a successful time getting back on the horse. I know it's only day two coming back and I already feel like it's been a while since spring break. I don't know if anyone else agrees, but I think spring break is scientifically the shortest week of the year, but I don't know how to, I don't know how to prove that, but that's what it feels like every single time I've experienced one. So I just have a few things to make mention of today. First off, the ballot for next year's BFC members and president-elect opened on Monday. That will remain open for one week, so please make sure you vote and you help remind your constituents to vote. Lana will do her part to send those reminders out, so I encourage you and your constituents both. At the same time we've had the committee volunteer report or volunteer form open on the BFC website, and that's been open for quite a while. That will close at the same time as the BFC elections are over. So those close at the same time, because then shortly after that we will then have, right after elections, elected committees ballots go out, so we have a series of things that need to kind of be done in a certain systematic way. So if you have not signed up for a committee, or you know someone who'd be great on a specific committee and bring their talents there, please encourage them to use the nomination or the committee selection form. Secondly, I also encourage everyone to participate when and where they can in the candidate town halls this week. So we have obviously the Graduate School one was yesterday, one is tomorrow, the Graduate School dean. And then we also have town halls for Vice President for Research. So those start tomorrow also, and there's three of them over the next two weeks. So you can find those on a website. You can find them in in your email. Please make

sure you participate. While going through my emails, I also found that the Indiana University Climate Action Planning Committee has also scheduled the next series of open forums. So I know I get a lot of information or a lot of emails about the sustainability and what's going on with the Climate Action Plan. This will be another open forum. It's gonna be moderated and they will be introducing where the current proposal is for the Climate Action Plan. So they had one in the fall and now they're having one in the spring. And that, in case you did not see it, is Thursday, March 30th. It's from noon to 1:00 PM in the IU Auditorium foyer. In related news, the Office of Sustainability, or Sustain IU, wishes to recognize outstanding campus sustainability efforts with their annual Campus Catalyst Awards. There are four of these awards given every year, so please nominate someone who you think would be good for this. The four areas are excellence in teaching, staff innovation, student leadership—and this goes to an undergraduate or a graduate—and then outstanding mentor of undergraduates and graduates. So I'd also like to acknowledge the 2021 Excellence in Teaching went to our own Kelly Eskew. So congratulations. {applause} Yay! Exactly. So these nominations are accepted until March 31st, and then they have a sustainability symposium for their recipients on April 17. And then lastly, I've mentioned this a couple times. The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee had sent me a statement or sent the Executive Committee a statement and we've kind of gone back and forth on what that statement would look like. It originally was the genesis of that came originally after one specific hate crime on campus, and we returned it back to the committee and said please make it not so specific to one hate crime, there's many, there's many things that that are issues on campus, so let's make it a little bit more global in its spirit, and so they have done so and they've sent me back this statement to read before you and have it be on the record for BFC. “The Bloomington Faculty Council, on behalf of the IUB faculty, unequivocally agrees that racial violence and hate crimes in any way, in any form are unacceptable. We recognize that we have a responsibility in society and as educators to actively oppose harassment and violence against individuals from all backgrounds. We encourage thoughtful engagement from every faculty member on campus to work against racism and other forms of prejudice within ourselves and to be proactive in supporting communities on our campus and beyond. The Office of the Vice President for Diversity, Equity, and Multicultural Affairs provides the Inclusive Campus Environmental Toolkit, and this will be hyperlinked when the minutes go out, to serve as a reference guide to information and resources to support university community members as they address situations, while also offering strategies for action and suggesting steps you can take to help build safe and inclusive campus communities. As part of this training, as part of the training resources, the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning provides also a variety of teaching resources for diversity and inclusion. Another hyperlink will be provided for you specific to classroom instruction, and these include increasing sense of belonging and trauma-informed teaching. Further, mental health support and counseling remain available through the Support Link Employee Assistance Program any time you need it. If your students need extra help, please urge them to connect with the mental health professionals at Counseling and Psychological Services, most of us call that CAPS, and submit a care referral. And if your students have experienced a bias-related incident, please encourage them to submit a bias incident report for additional support. So many of the things I just said actually will have hyperlinks that will then direct people to the resources at the appropriate time. To our fellow faculty members impacted by recent racial violence and hate crimes on campus and in our community, we support you and your needs. Your safety and mental health are paramount and must be prioritized if we are support our students and provide a positive example of self-care. Please reach out if you if you

would like to bring a concern to the Bloomington Faculty Council by visiting our website or obviously you can contact me at any time. With that, I'm going to conclude my remarks for the Executive Committee today.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR:

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you, Cate. Let me give my report really quickly here. So good afternoon everyone again. And since you've already talked about spring break, I'm gonna take a different strategy and say welcome back in spring because we are officially in spring.

RECK: Okay!

SHRIVASTAV: I hope you all did get some chance to catch your breath and relax over the holidays. Over the spring break. Not the holidays. And, just like Cate, I know the last few weeks of the semester are a massive rush. As busy as it is, it is also a time for a lot of joy and celebration, commencement, students graduating, a lot of end of the year activities, and I know I'll be seeing many of you at several of these events in the coming weeks. If you're like me, you're probably not a big fan of Miami right now. {groans} Oh, you got it. But I do want to say congratulations to both our men's and women's team and the coaches for an excellent season. {applause} Boy, last night was disappointing though, but I'm sure we'll be back again soon. As you may have seen this morning, I am excited to join President Whitten in announcing the launch of a highly collaborative new initiative in the AI space called the Accelerating Imagination. We, this, this comes about following the launch or the opening of the Luddy Artificial Intelligence Center earlier this month, and this initiative is designed to position IU as the leading partner for ethical, human-centered AI research, education, and workforce development efforts to improve both the state and the global society that we call as our backyard. Accelerating Imagination will enhance the external visibility and impact of IU research, catalyze collaboration amongst IU's AI researchers and those from partner institutions, and advocate for diversity, equity, and inclusion in AI through education and outreach. It is designed to bring together people and resources from the Luddy School of Informatics, IU Libraries, research, UITS, and many other interconnected interdisciplinary areas across campus. In addition to nurturing key connections within IU, this effort will include a streamline entry point. For our external partners, this will help expand partnerships with a wide range of industries throughout the state, including NSWC Crane, and accelerate IU's entrepreneurship and commercialization efforts. You can find more details about this initiative on our, on the Provost website, or if you have very specific ideas or want to explore AI for your own research or other applications, please reach out to Professor David Crandall, who's the director of the Luddy AI Center, about potential collaborations. I'm really excited to see where this will take us. I think we are approaching the opportunities with AI in a very unique manner and I do think we have a lot of room to run on this particular initiative. As we approach the launch of IUB 2030 Strategic Plan later this spring, we are beginning to align our efforts on the three key pillars that are shaping the strategic plan so far. You may recall we have officially launched efforts towards new faculty recruitment, accelerated master's degrees, staff development support, graduate student support, instructional space improvement, and this is our next item in that effort on artificial intelligence. In the coming weeks, you can expect some additional new efforts connected to our new emerging strategic plan. We are working to honor our historical strengths and strategically build on them to ensure

IUB is sustainably ahead of the curve in creating a distinctive student experience, doing innovative research and creative work at our university, and serving the communities throughout the state. I know there's a lot happening, but I'm grateful to have your collaboration in these efforts and I'm excited to help keep IU moving forward to make it a better place to learn, grow, and to work. I also want to give you some updates just to add on some things Cate said. For Kelley School of Business, campus visits are scheduled to begin this week and will continue into next week. I hope many of you are able to participate in those. For the Dean of The Media School, initial interviews are scheduled for later this week. These are what we used to call airport interviews. They're on the airport of Zoom these days, and we expect campus visits to begin early April. For the School of Optometry, initial interviews are concluding today. And again, campus visits are scheduled for early April. For Bloomington Graduate School, as Cate mentioned, the first town hall was yesterday and another one is scheduled tomorrow. These are in hybrid format, so I hope you can attend those either from your desktop or in person and in the rooms. The VP FAA position is now posted. We are in the final stages of confirming the search committee and we will be moving forward as quickly as possible. As a reminder, once again, this is an internal search and I hope to have this finalized very quickly so we lose no momentum in our efforts moving forward. For VP for Research, as Cate said again, two town hall sessions are planned, one in Bloomington, one in Indianapolis, and I hope you're able to participate in these as well. These two are hybrid so you should be able to attend in person or on Zoom. In closing, thank you for all the work you continue to do and particularly for the next six weeks of a busy period on campus. I hope despite all the busy schedule, you're able to enjoy some sunshine. The weather is starting to turn. Today is a big difference than yesterday and I hope it's a trend, but we look forward to seeing you throughout the semester at various events.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE:

SHRIVASTAV: I had two questions submitted, so I'll read those out. One is pretty long and the other one's short. The first one was probably submitted before the minutes went out last time because it addresses, it asks for something I had mentioned in response to a question last week, as well. But let me read this out directly: In light of the issues raised by Steve Sanders reporting on the misapplication of policy GR01 to suppress academic speech, many faculty members are concerned to have our campus leadership make a robust public defense of policies UA14 and ACA32, ensuring the protection of academic freedom and First Amendment rights at IU. I would like to invite the Provost and the council leadership to go on record with their sense of the scope of application of GR01, with regard to the case addressed by Professor Sanders, with the Provost and council leadership understand public speech characterizing the negative effects of the SB1 abortion ban on the IU community to be "lobbying, contact with government officials, or advocating for a party or candidate." Would a public defense by representative of shared governance of a faculty member under likely illegal and clearly, politically motivated attack by the State Attorney General be considered "lobbying, contacts with government officials, or advocating for a party or candidate"? Would you interpret the GRO-1 as barring representatives of IU shared governance or professional organizations from identifying themselves as such when communicating on matters of public concern? Would you consider communications of BFC representatives with their constituents to be the legitimate exercise of shared governance or mass emails requiring permission under BL ACA I23? So to respond, first of all, I'll let the BFC elected leaders speak for the council, on behalf of the council leadership. It's not my place to say

that. From my perspective, as I said, I addressed the related question at the last BFC meeting, so I only want to add here again that both the President, both President Whitten and I, strongly affirm the academic freedom of our faculty, the First Amendment rights of our faculty and staff, and our commitment to the integrity and public trust in Indiana University as a public research institution. Faculty leaders are freely encouraged in their roles and as private citizens to speak on the issues of the day as they see fit. In this particular instance from last fall, the university received and responded to formal complaints following a message sent by seven faculty leaders to the Bloomington All Faculty listserv specifically. And once again, I will repeat, no disciplinary action was taken in that case and I have no intention of doing anything beyond what that memo indicated. For all practical purposes, that issue is, from my perspective, is resolved. Do you want to add anything Cate or if I can add more to it?

RECK: I guess I would say, I think I can speak for the seven of us who wrote, who signed that letter, we did not feel like we were in violation of GR01 and we don't, and I still, I will just personally say, sitting here, even after all of the events since last August, I still do not believe that we were in violation. I think it's like reading most things. There's policies and then there's different interpretations of that policy. And so I think both sides have said whatever they're gonna say. We do not think that we were in violation. Other people think we were. I think that's about all I can say.

SHRIVASTAV: The second question was: Has IU done a systematic after-action report on the COVID response, preferably with a list of things to do in case of Disease X, as the WHO calls the next pandemic? And again, this continues with a comment here saying, IU did pretty well, but there were also a fair amount of improvising on the fly. I think, for instance, of what happened when IU ordered everyone out of the dorms, and no one thought about the international students. There was also a large stash of masks bought for swine flu that everybody had forgotten about. So is anything being done? To respond to that, first of all, thank you for bringing that up. We have learned many lessons throughout the pandemic and are committed to making the most of this opportunity to prepare for the future. I'm pleased to share with you that we did start work on an after-action review last summer. Several of you, some of you, were probably involved in that effort, and the Office of the Chief Health Officer is handling the evaluations and next steps. Emergency Management and Continuity will be updating the infectious disease plan throughout the next year, and we will be working on business continuity planning with departments and divisions so that directions can be clearly and reliably implemented by everyone involved. I was part of some of these meetings. There was a fairly large group. I think it was a whole day long after-action report evaluation completed late last summer, and I do know a lot of lessons were learned, challenges were identified. And I think we've all sort of learned how adverse situations like this can create problems, obviously, but also opportunities for us to learn and move forward. So yes, I feel we are better prepared. I would never, having lived through the COVID, I would never say we are fully prepared. I don't think we can ever be fully prepared, but I think we are making good progress on that effort. Thank you. If there are any other questions from the floor, I'll give it a minute. If not, we'll move on. Yes, Dennis?

GROTH: Thank you, Provost, and President Reck. I just wanted to follow up on the BFC president election. Just a couple of comments. This is me as a faculty member and not as the

Vice Provost. I want to thank the nominees who are running. It's a big step to do that. I want to thank both the past presidents and the president-elect for doing this important, important service. I would ask, if at all possible, for the nomination committee to start earlier on the process, get a bigger pool of candidates. This is not a statement against or for any of the candidates, but it's hard to get people to agree to do this. But I think we need to have bigger, bigger pools of candidates to have opportunities, to have good possible leadership representation in the on the BFC. That's really my comment. Thank you.

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you, Dennis. Elizabeth.

HOUSWORTH: So there are two, aren't there usually two? Can I ask what the rules are for the president?

COHEN: It's not 100% specified. I think historically we have gone with the top two who agree to. Which is done by the nominations. They look at the nominations and then take the top two, but there isn't anything 100% specified of how many candidates we have to have, so.

RECK: If I'm not mistaken, it says at least two. And so in in recent memory, I can remember us having three. So, I mean, I know that we've had more than two.

SHRIVASTAV: Israel.

HERRERA: Yeah, just to double check regarding the search for the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. So, right now there hasn't been the search committee confirmed. It's, and the other thing that the new Vice Provost will start this coming May.

SHRIVASTAV: The position is posted, search committee finalizing. I should have it done hopefully tomorrow or day after. And yes, I'd like the next VPFEEA to start as quickly as possible. Can I say Eliza wants me to start that as quickly as possible? Thank you. Let's move on to next business, which is proposed changes to BL ACA H32, grades given upon withdrawal from courses for undergraduates. This is a discussion item, and Dennis will walk us through this policy.

AGENDA ITEM SIX:

GROTH: Okay. This came up, really over the over the course of the academic year here where. Don't bother trying to read it. I can't see it at all. Pull it up on your, on your website. This is the policy that describes withdrawal from a course and when students can do it and what are the, what are the rules about that. This policy has been around for a long time. And we've had the concept of Auto W in place for many years. During COVID, there was a decision to extend it, the withdrawal with the grade of W to the last day of the semester. And I'm sure there were, you know, good reasons for that to be, you know, more cautious and in how students were proceeding in the post-pandemic years. But beginning last fall, we started hearing both questions about was this gonna be permanent—because as you see from this particular policy that the policy was augmented, wasn't changed, there was an addition to it that says, oh by the way, during the pandemic, this is what we're gonna do. So, I started getting questions and the provost started

getting questions in the fall about what are we gonna do about this? Is the pandemic over, a. And, b, is it gonna be permanent? Or, c, should we report back to the others? I think first of all, as I look at this, the Education Policy Committee should look at this, not what we're talking about today, but should look at the concept of withdrawal, probably with an open mind and think about does the original policy stand, and stand still, for what we want to do? What we're really talking about now is backing off of that pandemic statement, reverting back to the withdrawal period, the Auto W at the midpoint of the semester. I did some data analysis to look at, is this gonna be, what's the materiality of this kind of change? The history is about 5% of our grades are W. All grades, all classes, 5% are W. Since this was implemented it increased to almost 6%. So while there's no doubt that that's an increase, my assessment, knowing student data, is it's not necessarily a material increase. There still remains in the policy a late withdrawal, you know, handled by the Dean's office under appropriate circumstances. That hasn't, that doesn't go away, by reverting here. We're just trying to get back to the normal operations on this and then recommend to EPC that if they wish to look more broadly at how our policy perhaps compares to our peers there could be work to do there. But we're not suggesting that at all. Now we're just really looking at how we move this particular small little policy past this, and we're talking about this today because we had some interest. Some people were quite interested in making the change this year. But we really felt after talking with academic advising, in particular the advising directors, that a change in the middle of the year was going to be disadvantageous for students and advisors was just going to be confusing, so to roll this into next academic year, and that would allow the registrar to make the necessary changes in time to support the processes on this. And with that, I just open it up if there's any questions about this It's really just redlining all the COVID things.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN:

SHRIVASTAV: It's open for your questions. It's a discussion Item. No vote required today, but if you have any questions about this. Yes. Go ahead.

JOHNSON: Dennis, on the red highlighted text at the top. I was just wondering if you could clarify the intent there because I actually found that a little confusing when I read it. Right now it says, "Extending the Auto W deadline during COVID withdrawal from all subjects during COVID. Sections of the policy were adopted by the Bloomington Faculty Council and will remain in effect when the provost determines that the COVID-19 pandemic has ended." Is that accurate, or is that a typo?

GROTH: Yeah, I didn't make that.

JOHNSON: Oh.

GROTH: That's the existing policy. That's the existing policy which includes the extension all the way to the end of the semester. That would go away. That statement would go away.

JOHNSON: The red stuff at the top.

GROTH: The red stuff at the top. That's not really part of the policy.

JOHNSON: I just wanted to be clear because when I read that. I was unclear about it seemed to be suggesting that the policy amendment that was made included a provision that basically gave the Provost the power to administratively say this is now done.

GROTH: I would probably say the, the pro, the way that was written.

JOHNSON: Yeah.

GROTH: The Provost does have that authority.

JOHNSON: Yeah.

GROTH: But we're bringing now ...

JOHNSON:... and that makes sense. I just wanted to make clear or receive confirmation that in supporting this, that provision that's been added at the top.

GROTH: Yeah

JOHNSON:... outside the four corners is basically ...

GROTH: I'm not in the role of declaring pandemics either on or over.

JOHNSON: No. That's why, that's why we have ... Thank you for that clarification. Thank you.

GROTH: Chase.

MCCOY: You said that you spoke with some advisors about their perception of this policy and how it's impacted that I guess 1% of students. What is their opinion of canceling this or essentially reverting back to the policy before, let's say, the EPC has a chance to look at it?

GROTH: It's a mixed, a mixed reaction. Some were, some were for it. Some didn't care that it didn't matter. Some realized if you if you go to too late with the W, then there's no opportunity to get the student into perhaps a second eight week class or anything like that. So there's a bunch of competing demands there. And what I and what I'm really saying here in my recommendation for EPC is, you know, take that on. Reverting back to where were is not going to have a huge effect analytically on what's going on with the students and if EPC wants to look at this, then by all means we welcome it.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT:

SHRIVASTAV: Other questions? Seeing none, thank you. If you have other thoughts, we will have this on our agenda again next meeting I think. Next item on the agenda is proposed changes to BL ACA D9, Bylaws of the Bloomington Faculty Council of IU. Rachel Cohen, chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee. Rachel's getting ready to present.

COHEN: All right, so just to give you some background on this, this was submitted to Exec and CRC as a proposed amendment from a faculty member. Exec [unclear] CRC looking at it, CRC gave it the thumbs up, and so we're bringing it to you. It is a very small change. We are simply proposing to add under 10J, after the sentence "And to speak on behalf of the faculty on matters of concern to the university community." Just to kind of clear this up, this is giving what the faculty president can do, basically. I heard a lot of people say they thought this was implied, and we're just now making sure it's specified. So that is all I have for this. Happy for questions or feedback.

AGENDA ITEM NINE:

TANFORD: I obviously support this and, with you, I share this sort of a little bit of surprise because I would have thought it was obvious that an elected president, but I think some of the uncertainty is that on some campuses they elect a president of the faculty council, and on this campus, we elect a president of the faculty, not limited to the faculty council, and I think that that may have caused some confusion in this summer when one of the things raised by Mike Jensen in his letter was he didn't believe that the faculty presidents had the authority to speak on behalf of their faculty. Which seemed a somewhat odd view, but I, in sort of digging into it, I understand why, and I thought it is important to clarify that the president, like any president, has the authority to speak on behalf of the people who elected them.

SHRIVASTAV: Yes, go ahead.

CAVAR: I think, from a linguistic perspective, to speak on behalf really is actually to represent, in point of fact, so it's redundant. I see one qualitative add-on here, which is basically to include matters that concern the university community, which is broader than just faculty, right? So that's the add-on. I understand it's a broadening of the representation from my perspective.

SHRIVASTAV: Alex.

TANFORD: Just one response to that. The phrase matters of public concern is a phrase used in Supreme Court and other cases about the scope of the First Amendment rights of an employee, and I think that that's why it's phrased, I agree, in a slightly awkward way to fit it into language that is familiar to the courts, should it ever come to that.

SHRIVASTAV: Other questions or comments? Elizabeth?

HOUSWORTH: So my question is, I believe that currently, the listserv for the faculty is under the control of the VPFAA and that Cate or any president of the Bloomington Faculty Council cannot use it without permission. Would this give them permission to use the Bloomington faculty listserv to speak to the faculty? Would adding this to the Constitution give them permission to use that listserv? That's not GR01. That's a policy about mass emails.

SHRIVASTAV: Yeah, I think that's a different policy. But Eliza, do you have insight on that? I believe it's a different policy.

PAVALKO: Yep, there are there two policies that were faculty policies that list, that I mean, we in practice we give the list every year to the BFC and know that you all will use it appropriately, but yeah, so that's kind of extended. I certainly wouldn't get, I wouldn't want the VPFAA to get in the practice of reviewing every email that BFC sends out.

RECK: So Elizabeth, to answer your question, I think it kind of goes back to interpretation again. If the mass email policy talks about using the list appropriately and judiciously for BFC matters, and I think it comes down to someone's interpretation about what is BFC concerns and what is specific to BFC and then what is more globally of concern to the faculty. And so I think that's that fine line, that gray area. Which makes it somewhat problematic. And I do want to make it clear, I don't send my emails to Eliza and then she approves of them and then I get told my mom that I'm allowed to send them. I just want to make that very clear that. We can use the email list at our discretion.

HOUSWORTH: So this says on matters of concern to the university community and it does not limit it to just BFC matters. Are you saying the mass email policy limits it to just BFC matters?

RECK: That is accurate. That's exactly what that says.

AGENDA ITEM TEN:

SHRIVASTAV: Seems like there are no other questions on that. This will again come back for a vote later. For now, don't go away Rachel. We have another proposed change to BL ACA H30 grades and grading. Also a discussion item, and again I'll invite Rachael and Alex to present this change.

COHEN: Alright, again, some background. This is coming from the Task Force for Special Policy Review or whatever crazy name we have it as. Basically, the task force looks at policies, it sees what needs to be updated, what doesn't need to be updated, any conflicts with UFC, etc. So today we are bringing the grading, grades and grading policy to you. You can all thank Alex for this lovely template to walk through everything, and I apologize in advance that it's a little unwieldy. I am mostly just going to cover what we're proposing, if it's, you know going to the UFC policy, if it's staying from BFC's internal, or were you getting rid of it. I also only have a few minutes so I'm going to breeze through this so we have time for discussion. Umm. So. ACA 66 is the UFC grading policy there we start with. We basically want to take A, all of A, and just make it that. Other grades, the FN, etcetera, was actually never passed by BFC, or officially adopted, and so we are proposing what's on the side to allow for those actually to be legit, and then two FNN also has no BFC policy, and so we are going to do kind of verbatim UFC. We are not touching, which number am I under, three, ABCDE and F and G, and then for X – I have to say I've learned so much about grading from this policy – we are going to propose the following actions on that's listed and mostly link to things. So, the rest of this is proposed language that we have just updated, mostly to try to be in current practices. For all of this section, many of it is not changed really at all, just updates as needed. And then we are recommending to propose this next section into two parts to talk about R, which I didn't know was an option, and other grades. And then we removed all of, we would merge all of what we have into the IUB policy over. So H30D

from 1974, will have some updates to it. It's definitely older than I am, so. IUB has no P policy, which again I didn't realize, and so we were proposing to add that from UFC, and then we also had no NC policy, and so we are taking that also. I had no asterisk before, so you couldn't make a comment on a grade from my understanding. Oh, no, no, sorry. The asterisk is misconduct, so you could indicate the grade was given because of misconduct. No NR. That's because the instructor did not meet the deadline and. [unclear] And Y, used by the registrar to show for a special program which no grade has been received. We have a policy, H32, which covers withdrawals and so some of this will go to there and the withdrawal section. Alex, are we taking it or bringing it into this one? Just the withdrawals.

TANFORD: The withdrawal we're basically adopting the ACA.

COHEN: OK, that's what I thought. All of this is withdrawals and then, funny enough, we are waiting for the COVID extension stuff to be decided for this section, and we will find out what goes there. Uh. Page 34C, also from 1984, so we've gained 10 years, is basically we have very specific hour limitations and stuff like that for getting grades in. We have changed some of that and then want to just propose ACA 66 verbatim. Oh, we are rescinding preprinted grades, which I don't know what is. And then adopting verbatim A 66 for the changing grades section. All of these pretty much are no equivalent IUB policy, and so we will take ACA-66. And then H30A, which was the 1980s, that's 64, 84, is consistent, so we won't change that. And then, oh, changing to the extent. Sorry, I can say this. Recognition distinction. So, we are updating that slightly. Again, no BFC policy for this section, but it looks like we are taking the proposed policy from the trustees. And then we are kind of schooling this down to just saying every school should have a policy on grade appeals. Again, just going to ACA-66 for these, because there is no equivalent for BFC, and then we will propose to adopt the definitions from ACA-66. Which is all of this, and then the rest of it is background information, et cetera, so. That is a very, very, very fast version of this. I apologize. I also know it's very tricky to see on this, these screens, but I think it's more useful for us to bring up conversation than me read through every change. So, I will warn you, Alex will probably answer most of these. Go ahead, Alex and I will pass it to him.

TANFORD: If I can add a couple of things. I was on the University Policy Review Committee that thoroughly reviewed university-wide grading policies in consultation with the registrars particularly, and all of these grades that IUB never approved, the registrar was using them anyway. But there was pretty good coordination among the various campuses on the grades that went into the computer that the registrars is used in their grades, and some are notations that don't show up, those are all, it was a slog through minutia to get some of that down on policy, and it was done because, of course, the constitution gives grades and grading the legislative responsibility to the faculty and the faculty, as you say, we have grading policies in this campus going back to 1974, so the faculty had not been doing its job. And the registrar and the various Vice Provosts for student issues and grading and, you know, all that, people filled in, administration filled in the gaps. So this was a collaborative process at the university level of a long overdue conversation with administrators responsible for grading and students in various ways to get the grading standardized. This was driven primarily at the university level by the regional campus concerns, where students switch campuses fairly regularly. They take courses on multiple campuses, so the need for university-wide grading policies, grading practices and policies was thought to be an important university level. The university took away some

discretion from the campuses, which under the university constitution requires a two-thirds or three-quarter vote. At the UFC, the vote was unanimous, so passed that hurdle. Couple of important changes for this campus. One, which I assume everybody will celebrate, is that the grading, that the deadline for turning in your grades is now four days from the end of the grading period instead of two days after the end of year after you gave your exam. Nobody knows, even the registrars, didn't know where that two day thing came from. Four days was the best we could negotiate. Because of NCAA eligibility rules for winter sports where they have to be able to report that, you know, grades and grade point averages to retain eligibility between semesters, and some of them have their next athletic competition less than a week after the end of a of the winter semester. So that's where the four days negotiation came from. The second thing was the difference between graduating with distinction and with honors. Every school and unit is completely free to define, every campus unit, to define honors and award them, not award them, can you give them, anything they want. But distinction is a university-wide term and so the baseline, that distinction, is always the top 10%. It's something that was thought at the university level to be important to prevent student gamesmanship and/or unit gamesmanship in standing and gaining students and things by saying that our unit has a stricter or more lenient rule of graduating with distinction. So there were some units that had distinction based on something other than top 10% in grade point average or other things. That discretion has been taken away at the university level, and this policy now reflects it. Units are still free to set their own levels for high distinction. What are the other two? There are two levels above basic distinction, and units can set that but not the basic, so basic distinction, is now 10% for everyone. And I know that will be of concern to some units, but that, a lot of time was spent arguing about that at the university level. If there's a lot of concern about it, I can take it back to the university level and see if, and reopen that discussion at that level.

AGENDA ITEM ELEVEN:

SHRIVASTAV: This is open for discussion. Let's start with you.

JOHNSON: I do have on the distinction issue, when you say units have the discretion to determine kind of high distinction, highest distinction. We could also establish something at the level, a consistent description, of that at the level of the campus, right?

TANFORD: Yes....

JOHNSON: because we're responding ...

TANFORD: The UFC kicked that down to the campus level ...

JOHNSON: Right.

TANFORD:... or unit level at the discretion of the campus.

JOHNSON: At the discretion of the campus. So there might be space to actually have a discussion amongst this body about, okay, UFC has done it for the university, set a 10%

threshold, do we want to allow every school to have its own iteration of that or version of it, or do we want to establish a campus level set of thresholds?

TANFORD: Yes.

JOHNSON: Okay, just so that it remains open.

RECK: So, can someone enlighten me the differences, the difference between pass/fail and SF. So, when, well, I mean, just as an instructor who went through COVID, I found it frustrating to have to actually give the SF grade knowing that someone who got an S didn't necessarily actually meet my normal requirements for a course to do well in this in the subsequent course. So, can you enlighten us? What part, where does, what is the distinction between PF and SF? I'm looking at both of you.

TANFORD: What we all think of as a pass/fail course at this university is called an SF course. And the pass grade is one. In other words, it's a course where the entire course is offered to students on that basis. Putting COVID aside for the moment about exceptions on a regular basis, a pass is something that is given to an individual student. There are a variety of circumstances where it can be given, such as difficulty in completing work that's been done with an incomplete. And in some situations, students are allowed, for various reasons, to take a course pass/fail without the knowledge of the instructor. So the instructor submits a letter grade and that goes to the registrar, which reports it as a pass. So they're needed for various reasons to be a distinction between P and an S, and this was the one that is reflected in here, was the one that the registrar said they would like. They had been using and would like to continue.

SHRIVASTAV: Dennis.

GROTH: Yeah, just to follow up on that, I don't want to go use the Wayback Machine to go back to the spring of 2020, but I was involved along with our registrar at the time, Mark McConaughy, in putting the S grade as an option for faculty, and we saw that that provided the most flexibility for faculty to make, in their judgment, the determination whether they were satisfied with the student's accomplishment in their particular class. You have to remember, we weren't sure we were going to get to the end of this semester. We weren't sure that there would be a faculty member there at the end. {scoffing} No, honestly, we didn't, we were not. We were not sure. So we decided that rather than be prescriptive about that a P means this or an S means the equivalent of this particular grade. If we wanted to do that, we wouldn't have done it at all. We just said, just do your regular grading. But the feedback we got before putting it through was that students, faculty weren't sure that C meant the same that semester as I meant to the previous semester. So we decided just to be a little bit ambiguous about it. We weren't alone in the country in doing so. Sure, there was a little bit of confusion. My perspective was I wanted to trust our faculty members to make that determination. They were best positioned to make that judgment as opposed to, as an administrator, setting some bar. I would like if I could make a couple of comments about this particular policy, and forgive me if I go a little bit over on my comments. I actually, it troubles me when the university establishes a policy, it says, by the way, this is how you're going to do your academics on your on your campus. I would feel much more comfortable with the university-level policy on grading that says you have to have a policy on withdrawals,

you have to have a policy on this. Instead, what we have with these recommended changes, and I appreciate the work that went in to do this analysis. I don't agree that faculty didn't do their job. But I think what we lose is our authority as faculty on our campus to make those decisions. When you relegate it to a university-level policy, those changes can be made, sure, by a two-thirds majority, but that two-thirds majority only has one vote from Bloomington. And Bloomington represents, you know, way more than all other campuses in terms of students. So I actually, I disagree with the adoption of, and I recommend to all of my colleagues here, to not accept this. To instead push it to the Education Policy Committee for a more wholesome review of this and not accept the UFC version of the policy because if we are allowed to be different then it should be our decision whether we should do that But each of these parts has consequences, and the consequences for Bloomington are different than the consequences for the regional campuses. And although I appreciate their complexity of people moving around, we also have that same issue of people moving from those campuses here. With further, with regards to UFC policies, we have discussed this on a group called the University Articulation and Transfer Committee. It's a group of people who are responsible for, in some sense, making sense of all the policies associated with transfer and articulation, of course we're not only from other institutions to here, but also about the differences in courses using the same course number. And we get into deep discussions about, it's not the same course or is it the same course, and we try to work that all out. We noticed this year that policies at UFC had been both created without discussion or communication to any campus body, or modified in silent ways. Though, the first has been rescinded, the second the change has been rescinded. And I think this is something that all of us need to be watchful of is allowing the changes at another body to actually determine what is really the authority of the faculty here. In some cases, and I know Alex, you and I, we've traded some email on this, in some cases, our campus, because we are independently accredited from all other, from all the other campus, we're each independently accredited, we must have our own policy for many things. We must have our own policy that is voted on and determined by our faculty, and even if our policy has the same words as policies at every other campus, we still have to have our policy. And so this amalgamation of policies to try and make the world simpler actually is gonna bind Bloomington in ways that it will be very difficult to work its way out of in the future. And so I recommend this particular policy get shifted to the Education Policy Committee, who is responsible for this review, would be responsible for taking the information provided and making that consideration, and let the Education Policy Committee and the faculty of this campus make the recommendation on the changes to the policy. I'll get off my soapbox, thank you very much.

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you, Dennis. Other questions? Comments?

TANFORD: If I can just make one clarification, that the policies Dennis is referring to that were changed without anybody knowing it were changed administratively by the university transfer office, not by the University Faculty Council or our Policy Review Committee. The Policy Review Committee spends months on these policy. We consult widely with all administrative offices, campus faculty councils, campus educational policy committees. The vetting process that Dennis has talked about was gone through extensively. Now I understand the argument because it came up over and over again about whether campuses should have their own policies, and the answer is yes. What Dennis is seeing here is the discussion of that draft, not the final policy, which will be a policy discussed and enacted by this campus and, you know, I just, I understand

the argument about wanting to be independent, but if we start having grading policies inconsistent with grading policies from the university level that supposedly bind us, it creates all sorts of potential problems.

SHRIVASTAV: Colin?

[unclear]

SHRIVASTAV: Okay. Elizabeth?

HOUSWORTH: I have one comment and one question. Many years ago, I think I was responsible for rediscovering the F-star on this campus, and I am delighted to know that I could give a C-star instead. But my question I think is for Dennis. Are there specific things in here that concern you? So, one thing that could be concerning is letting all the faculty have until four days after the end of the term to submit grades, because that just, faculty procrastinate, but I was wondering if there were specific things in this proposal that actually concerned you.

GROTH: I'm sure there are. My concerns as I've voiced them are mostly process oriented. Concerns associated with ensuring that good faculty governance occurs as we look, as we look at these. That particular part of it was actually discussed here at BFC. I remember being here and discussing it, and we went back and forth over people's interest in having it extended, and then it was determined to not make the change. So there was no vote to approve what we already had because it was already approved. And then, now UFC has well, now, faculty you can do it four days after the end of the term. That's an issue for Bloomington because of the scale of the of the issue here. It may not be an issue for IU Kokomo. It may be. I don't know. I know that's an issue here. If all of our faculty said, oh, I'm just gonna wait till then. It's hugely problematic, and especially problematic in a way inconsiderate for our staff. They'll be here long hours trying to make up for that, for that work.

JOHNSON: Now I remembered what it was. Dennis, I take the procedural issues that you're raising very seriously, and I agree that we're always struggling to find this kind of proper balance between the sort of exercise of jurisdiction at the university level and the sort of preservation of the kind of prerogatives and sovereignty of individual campuses given the different, given their different natures. But I am wondering, Alex, because you're citing ACA-66 as an already extant UFC policy, right? So all of this is already on the books at the university level and presumably not newly, right? I mean, ACA-66 has been around for a long time, yes? Or this is entirely the UFC level policy ACA-66 is? Has it been substantially revised or is entirely new or what's the status of that?

TANFORD: Yes, all three of those.

JOHNSON: Oh, great.

TANFORD: Okay, there are of elements and I didn't break it down that way. The substantial body of ACA-66 has been around for a long time. There was a revision to it, but the revision to it was driven by the registrars who said this is, it was, there was an update of the policy to reflect

what the registrars were already doing in terms of the transcripts and things like that. And then there were a couple of, moving ahead, you know, of rethinking things. For example, Dennis's concern about the grading period. Well, we enacted the two-day grading period when you turned in your grades on pieces of paper. Now it's done on a computer and the registrars assured us, including Mark McConaughy, that this did not present a problem because it was all electronic. Now, there may be at other levels, there might be people like me, old members of the faculty, who still sort of have to go to our administrative assistance to help us do anything electronic. So, there are some staff issues that got raised.

SHRIVASTAV: I would say grades are the first step for a lot of other things to happen and submission of grades is not the problem, it's what happens after that. You have to process financial aid, you have to do admissions, you have to do all kinds of authorizations, students in the ROTC have to report it to get their military service, NCAA has a regulation, Pell Grants are an issue, so there's a lot more processing that happens after the grade is turned in, and I will need our registrar to speak to whether that timeline is adequate or not. And the other thing that sort of backs into this is our calendar start date. If you have a holiday period and people are willing to work during the holiday period, then yes it can be done. But if you finish the semester, four days later, you go into Christmas break, come right back into the classes, there's no not enough time to do all the other work.

TANFORD: All I can say is this was fought out in the trenches, line by line, word by word, with every single office of any interest at all the campuses, and four days was the compromise point between what is driven by academic concerns. That is, the faculty was, a lot of the faculty was very adamant that the two-day deadline prevented them in some, in some situations from giving appropriate in-depth academic exams that tested. They were forced to use Scantrons, for those of us old enough to remember those, forced to use multiple-choice questions, because they would not have time to read even short essay exams. So the, I understand all the administrative concerns. Grades is an academic policy, not an administrative policy, under the constitution of the faculty and this, and while we initially wanted even longer than four days, the faculty in the group, we were beaten back by the administrators for all the reasons that you say. But the agreement, 90% agreement, there was never agreement about anything, was that four days was adequate, not ideal, but adequate to serve those all those various administrative concerns about post, about immediate post-grading period.

SHRIVASTAV: That may be the so. I'm just telling you the process, whether it's right or wrong, we'll have to discuss with the right people.

JOHNSON: But in effect, the reason I this is because, in effect, regardless of whether we, for the purpose of providing clarity at the level of the campus, chose to adopt, for example, like, you know essentially emulate the language that now exists at the university level in lieu of any countervailing language at the, articulated at, the level of the campus, we are bound by university policy as it currently exists under the terms of ACA 66, right? It's not like ACA 66 exists at the university level, we have nothing, that means the university policy doesn't apply to us. And so the reason I'm asking this is because Dennis, if I take your expression of concern seriously, which of course I do, the follow up procedural question I would have is, is that a formal motion to refer this to the EPC, which I understand you're saying it's already been discussed and you've

consulted with EPC, but are you offering that as a formal motion to refer to EPC to sort of go through this again and potentially come back to this body with ...

[unclear]

JOHNSON: Okay. So, anyway. But would you make that then a formal motion?

[unclear]

JOHNSON: Okay. Well then, Okay.

SHRIVASTAV: So just to summarize, there's been a lot of discussion. One recommendation is to refer it to EPC. The other is to continue with the process and bring it up to vote, which will be at the next meeting. It won't be at this meeting. Anyway, so I do not think any action is necessary today, unless you want to make a formal motion to recommend it to be referred to the second.

GROTH: I'd be happy to make a formal motion to refer it to EPC.

SHRIVASTAV: Anybody seconding the motion? Elizabeth. Elizabeth, are you seconding the motion? Elizabeth seconds. So now this goes for a vote. No, I guess it's open for discussion, right, for the motion? The motion is.

TANFORD: Just a question, which is if we refer it, what grading policy does the campus operate under? Do we end up with essentially. We either have to operate under this as an interim policy or we have no grading policy.

JOHNSON: Well, you have the university-level policy.

TANFORD: Yeah, and we just adopt [unclear]. And the university policy specifically delegates some decisions on the extent of drop/add period and things like that, and departmental honors. It delegates some things to the campus. Can I propose an amendment to the [unclear]? My amendment would be to adopt, to add to Dennis's motion that, pending the results, pending the review by the Educational Policy Committee, that we adopt this as an interim policy so that we at least go, coming into this grading period coming up, the campus is in compliance with the university.

SHRIVASTAV: Why wouldn't we continue with what we have?

TANFORD: Because the ACA 66 has nullified it.

GROTH: That's my point on the process that university level policy has nullified a campus level policy without any discussion at the campus level about whether they would nullify it.

SHRIVASTAV: We are six weeks from all of you needing to submit grades. I don't even see how we'll propagate whatever changes are happening, people will adapt. You've issued your syllabi

seven, eight weeks ago, with presumably some grading policy in there, I don't see logistically how we could adopt a new grading policy midway through a semester.

TANFORD: All right.

SHRIVASTAV: Could you?

TANFORD: What is a student, how are we going to handle a student complaint about a grade ...

SHRIVASTAV: We have some students here.

TANFORD: ... that didn't follow the university policy? [unclear]

HOUSWORTH: How far out of compliance is what we've been currently operating under with university policy? So there were some sections where we didn't have anything and the university has something. There's a section where we have to get in our grades a little bit quicker than the university is requiring us to. But we've been doing grades on this campus for years, and it seems like we could do them this semester the way we've been doing them forever. I mean, honestly, I would be happy for a little bit more time to get grades in when I've got my small classes when they have essays to grade, and I do for applied statistics. It would be nice to have a little bit more time to grade them. But you know, for this semester, I don't see why we couldn't do things like we've always done.

SIMPSON: Right. I don't know. I agree with Elizabeth this ACA 66 was adopted, right, in 2021. Why would we all of a sudden have to do it with this kind of immediacy and not be able to send this to EPC, and just have the time to look at it and be where, and use the same rules that we've been using up to this point?

SHRIVASTAV: I think that is the motion.

SIMPSON: Yeah.

SHRIVASTAV: Israel?

HERRERA: If this goes to EPC, like this, [unclear] or comments would come from the EPC for a vote or would come from the committee review policy task force?

GROTH: I'm not the chair of the EPC, Kelly is, but I would recommend they take the recommendations that have been provided by the policy review as what they should be looking at and discussing. I'm not saying that everything here is bad. To me, it's how this process has unfolded.

ESKEW: Dennis is on EPC, so.

JOHNSON: I would just say procedurally, I think even if they exercise, and I do understand the concern of railroading like sort of a very complicated policy proposal, but I think procedurally, in

deference to Dennis's concerns if we're gonna adopt a whole bunch of provisions and enshrine them in campus-based language, I mean call it laundering, legitimate for legitimation purposes, even if it's running through EPC and EPC comes back and says, you know we've looked at this and we're actually fine signing on with these things, then I think that would then you know, Dennis, I'm sure you would be prepared to defer to that, you know, a decision coming from EPC. But I think, I think the issue is that it's important, what I hear you expressing, it's important for this body to to be presenting, to be preserving its sovereignty to some extent and for those proposals to be run through EPC as the sort of sponsoring organization. But I would say if concerns arise in EPC's assessment of this, they don't get to, I mean this is one of the complicated things, they don't get to just like disagree with the university-level policy. That will then require them issuing concerns to UFC to basically strike out overly. Right? We can't just go, well, we're not gonna do that, do something different. That's the reality of how this works. So, so that's something to bear in mind, and it's one of the reasons why I do think on some level the, this can't, you know, like we have to be conscious of that because it's a much more complicated process and probably more, you know, mindful and attentive to what's going on at the university level in that regard if we want to express concerns about those things.

SHRIVASTAV: The clocks ringing 4:00 o'clock, We do need to move, move on here. So since there is a motion on the floor, it has been seconded. We have to take a vote on this one. The motion is whether to send this to EPC or not. If it is, then that's the next step. If the motion fails, it will come back for a formal vote at the next meeting. So that's what we are voting for today. All in favor of moving this to the EPC, please raise your hands. I think the motion passes. This policy will now move to the EPC. Kelly, good luck and we look forward to ...

{laughter}

SHRIVASTAV: Thank you again we are ...

[unclear]

{laughter}

AGENDA ITEM TWELVE:

SHRIVASTAV: Chat GPT. Let's move on to the next item on the agenda. This is proposed changes to BL ACA D23, SAA Mediation Committee and BL ACA D28, Recommendations to departments on SAA grievances. Danielle DeSawal to present. Take it away, Danielle.

DESAWAL: All right. So we have three policies that we're going to look at and then Catherine is going to take us through our fourth one. So just a little bit of background, so overview. So the recommended changes come to the BFC with the support of the BFC Task Force on Mediation, which has been working since October, and for the three that I'm going to talk about, I'm going to specifically talk about the relationship with the newly formed Student Academic Appointee Affairs Committee which worked on these pieces, and then the Board of Review worked obviously with Catherine and the task force to do the last piece. So changes were considered as part of an overall look at SAA grievance policies to align language and process, which is why

they're coming to you today kind of as a cluster. So the first thing that I wanted to talk about is that in October when we were charged, what we did was we did an initial review, the task force did, to look at the policies themselves, take a look and figure out, how does this actually work? How do these policies work together? What is the flow? What is the timeline? So what we did was then establish and design materials that are now housed under the BFC site under Policies and Documents. So I just did a little screenshot so that you can go there if you want and you can see all of the student academic appointee mediation and grievance connection points for what a student would need to know if they were going to file a grievance. These are based on current policies. Now, this was important because what it did was it gave the task force the opportunity to identify where the gaps were and where the holes were and where the misalignments were. Which was really, really helpful. So what we initially did was establish a flow chart to outline the grievance policy, the processes at the BFC level, created guides and standards to establish transparency and consistency about the process for the faculty and SAAs. So two specific things that you'll see on that website are a mediation guide, and then you'll also see an SAA Board of Review uniform standards. Both are established in order to help be transparent for both the folks who are serving on those committees, as well as for the SAAs to understand what happens in those processes. All right, so here we go. ACA D28 recommendations to departments units on student academic appointee grievances. So the focus of recommendations for these challenges are these policies are to look at specifically just recommendations. Obviously we do not control the policies at the unit department level, but what this does is provide some uniform guidance for those departments and units to look at the creation of those policies, as well as do any updates of those policies. What's important to note about this is that currently the SAAAC is working with the Graduate School to collect information on which departments and units have existing policy surrounding SAA grievance procedures and where some might be missing. ACA-D23, which is the Student Academic Appointee Mediation Committee Policy. What we did in here was changes to the procedures. So what you'll see is primary changes. We're focused on the removal of repetitive language within the policy as well as clarification of the procedures themselves. The first big thing that was very important to everyone who was part of this process was that an SAA can request mediation without attempting resolution at the department or unit level, meaning they can go right to the Mediation Committee, indicate that they want to file agreement or grievance, and go through mediation, and start that process. Providing context for mediation and what it means to engage in that process was included, also clarifying that establishing an outcome to mediation which would result in a mutually agreeable resolution, or an MOU, and then also the integration and clarification of content from BL-ACA-D29 to outline the procedures that are in there. The procedures were then reworked to be presented in a sequence, so you'll see that they are numbered so that we kind of have a clear and concise look at what those pieces entail, and then clarify that mediation is voluntary and both parties need to agree to participate in a mediation process. Clarification of timeline is overall timeline for the grievance process was considered by the task force for mediation, so we looked at that as in its entirety. Policy change focuses on a timeline for setting up the mediation and establishing flexibility and allowing the dialogue to continue as needed for the process. So what you will see is on the mediation side of the policies. We don't put a timeline into the process post setting up the actual mediation because those are dialogue based, so the whole concept of mediation is that we're going to engage in and continue to engage in dialogue in order for us to figure out a mutually agreeable resolution to the process, so it doesn't have a fixed time limit to it. But we wanted to make sure that that the clarification would be that a mediation would be scheduled for a

minimum of three hours, that then aligns with what you'll see in the Board of Review. Business days were added to a line with Student Code changes from Spring 2023, if you remember that from last year, and that should say Spring 2022 because we're in Spring 2023, and the BFC approved the definition of business days as days when the institution is open when we can expect people are working to conduct business. Alright, the last policy, which is ACA-D29, student academic appointee mediation procedures, what we are asking to do with this one is just to rescind it. So really it had repetitive duplicative language and so we integrated that content into D23 and into 28. And so the task force did not see a need to keep this policy. So we have two sets of changes, one that's gonna then be rescinded, and then next steps following our discussion today, I'll take other requests back to the task force as well as share those with the S Triple AC. In addition, then, if the vote is affirmative after the second reading, what we'll do is go through, update the BFC website for SAA grievances as well as the new flow chart and the content to reflect changes, and then we'll also work with the VPFAA to update the SAA Guide for Fall 2023 appointments.

AGENDA ITEM THIRTEEN:

SHRIVASTAV: Very good. Thank you. This is open for discussion. This is a discussion item. No vote necessary, but it is open for your questions and comments. Yes, Elizabeth.

HOUSWORTH: Sorry, the thing said something about mediation being voluntary. So, is it voluntary for the department?

DESAWAL: Yes, both parties have to agree to engage in mediation. When you'll see when Catherine gets to her piece, the other piece that we were very conscious of was making sure that then they could skip this part, and so if both parties don't agree for mediation, then it is built into the overall process, they can skip that piece and go right to the board of review. Oh, I can't. When we get there. Just a second. Oh yes, I can click for you.

AGENDA ITEM FOURTEEN:

SHRIVASTAV: Other questions, comments, around the table. Seeing none. Thank you, Danielle. Let us move on to the next item, also on Mediation Committee and BL-ACA-D28, recommendations to departments on SAA grievance. No, wait a minute, that was. I'm reading the wrong number, I'll take it back. The next item is proposed changes to BL-ACA-D24 SAA Board of Review and this will be presented by chair of the SAA Board of Review, and this will be presented by Catherine Sherwood Laughlin.

SHERWOOD-LAUGHLIN: Thank you. You click for me, right? I appreciate that. Thank you for the opportunity to talk about BL-ACA-D24 and I wanna just acknowledge my committee that consists of Maria Bucur-Deckard from history, Jessica Lester from education and we also have three graduate students, Louis van der Elst, Joshua Paschal, and Andrew Guenther. So we worked really hard in coordination with Danielle and her group to make sure we're in alignment with all of the changes to the policy which all of you have received. So this is really the changes are to clarify the final step in the grievance process for the SAAs on our campus, and as Danielle said, they could choose, the department and the student, could choose to skip the mediation

process and come right to the SAA Board of Review. So we basically clarify timelines. Just one slide looks like. So we basically clarify timelines to be in alignment with student code of conduct and also the policies that Danielle presented. There was repetitive couple of paragraphs in the policy statement that we removed. Yeah, I think you've got that. And then we added, the procedures were clarified to include the link directly to the provost after our recommendations were made. We also indicated in the policy that we could recommend that the student go back to mediation if necessary. The length of the hearing was also specified to three hours. Is there a slide after this one, Danielle? I just have different slides from prior to spring break. Maybe this was all just put on one slide. Is that what it seems like?

RECK: So we're just waiting for some electronic information being transferred from this side of the table to that side of the table to the back of the room. So give us a second. So it's been sent from here, Lana. Okay. I can play music.

HOUSWORTH: Can I ask a question about days?

RECK: Yes.

HOUSWORTH: I have been on one of these committees and days can be a real issue. So business days would be weekdays that we're open for business. My committee was instructional days and that could include Saturdays, so it was extremely weird But actually Saturday is an instructional day on this campus, or it used to be more so, but it still is, and so I had to include Saturdays when I counted days and my policy.

RECK: Okay. We're just waiting one more minute. It's gotten from the side of the table to that side of the table. Now we're just waiting for it to get to the back of the room. So thanks for your patience.

SHRIVASTAV: As a reminder, this is a discussion item and while we are waiting, if there are questions or comments, please raise your hands and we can call upon you for discussion. Nothing yet. Should be pretty easy, Catherine.

SHERWOOD-LAUGHLIN: Do you want to address the question? [unclear] Oh look, that looks like what I have on my computer. Can we come back to your comment in just a moment when we come back to timeline, because also Danielle might have something to add. Okay, let's rewind and start over again, I apologize for that. So the overview for this particular policy change was recommended as we worked with the BFC Task Force on Mediation, and actually this is the final step in that grievance process for the SAAs. And I also I didn't mention earlier but want to thank Danielle and her team for also putting together the website and I took a look at that and it's, and shared it with our committee, and the graduate students were really impressed. So thank you for clarifying. That makes the process so much easier to go through. So this again was all part of the grievance process. Click to the next one. So this allows the SAAs to go directly to the Board of Review with the grievance. Again, they can bypass the mediation as discussed earlier if an agreement between the department and also with the students. So it's important to have that opportunity rather than the students and the departments having to go through a kind of a direct path to a resolution and this, we did this, because we wanted to make

sure that this recommendation goes right to the provost with the option for the Board of Review to recommend, again as I mentioned earlier, that it could go to mediation before a formal hearing is conducted, again, within keeping in mind the best course of action for the students. So clarification of the timeline, which we can talk about this in in just a moment. The flexibility of the timeline and requesting from the hearing from the Board of Review that we are going again in alignment with the Student Code of Conduct. Changes related to when we are conducting business and when the institution is open. So we'll come back to that in just a moment about instructional days and whether or not a Saturday is consistent with that. And I'll consult with you, Danielle, and we'll talk about that as we continue through this. And that we need to schedule a minimum of three hours to align with the individual elements regarding with hearing in the procedures, as I also said on Hearing Commission for Student Code of Conduct, it gets in alignment with those procedures as well. So overall changes to the procedures again I mentioned remove some repetitive language. We also indicate a preponderance of the evidence presented, how the board shall reach its recommendation to again align with student hearings and conduct on campus. Again the timeline clarification was submitted for the Board of Review agreements, and respondents and the provost were outlined. An option of a statement of dissent to be included in the recommendation to the provost was added to provide a holistic view of the hearing. So questions, and let's go back to your comment about should we include Saturdays, instructional days versus business days? Do you have thoughts about that, Danielle, because this is all a domino effect on how we respond to that.

DESAWAL: Yeah, so my understanding from our discussions about business days and if we all remember that, that was fun from last year about this time, was that Saturdays would not be included because the university as an entity is not technically open for business. So while we would conduct class, our offices would not be open for business. It would not be considered to be a business day. Everybody seems to be nodding, so that's good. I remembered that correctly.

SHRIVASTAV: Other questions, comments? Yes.

CAVAR: I just don't understand the minimum of three hours. Can you say something about that?

DESAWAL: Do you want to do it?

SHERWOOD-LAUGHLIN: No, go ahead.

DESAWAL: I was going to say it's really just about trying to, so minimum was to ensure that folks understand that these can take a long time, and as Catherine and I both know from doing these, they can last almost all day. So the minimum is there to ensure that you wouldn't cut off the process if something went wrong or discussion went wrong, right, because we're engaging in the dialogue with the students, so the minimum piece is there so that folks understand that this is three-plus hours potentially and so scheduling it for three hours means you should have a little plus added to the side for some cushion just in case it becomes something that requires a little bit more discussion in that process.

COHEN: Is there the possibility of scheduling a second-half on another day, I know that several of the, like, other student conduct does that at times when there's it's getting long so.

DESAWAL: So I think that that's a procedural piece if we get into a pickle that I wouldn't necessarily want to put into a policy for folks to think that that's how we might adopt all of those processes. That would just be my feedback.

SHERWOOD-LAUGHLIN: We've done that for the hearing commissions. The committee, we're all out of brainpower. We need some time to hear more witnesses or more testimony. We can schedule another meeting.

SHRIVASTAV: Any other questions? Seeing none, I think that that is the end of this discussion. This again will come back for a vote later, but thank you very much. I think that was the last item on the agenda. Thank you everyone for being here, meeting stands adjourned.