

**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**April 2, 2024 | 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.**  
**Presidents Hall – Franklin Hall**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Anderson, Dana; Asher, Sofiya; Brinda, Chelsea; Buggenhagen, Beth; Butters, Rebecca; Cohen, Rachel; Cumberland, Claire; Daleke, David; Dekydtspotter, Lori; DeSawal, Danielle; Docherty, Carrie; Freedman, Seth; Gahl-Mills, Karen; Giordano, Anthony; Grogg, Jane Ann; Hamre, Kristin; Herrera, Israel; Hojas Carbonell, Virginia; Housworth, Elizabeth; Ivanovitch, Roman; Johnson, Colin; Kravitz, Ben; Kubow, Patricia; Lalwani, Ashok; Lammers, Sabine; Lanosga, Gerry; Lion, Margaret; Lochmiller, Chad; Loring, Annette; McCoy, Chase; Michaelsen, Jonathan; O'Brien, Travis; Paschal, Joshua; Perry, Brea; Ramos, William; Reck, Cathrine; Rutkowski, Leslie; Sapp, Christopher; Sela, Ron; Shrivastav, Rahul; Silvester, Katie; Sinadinos, Alison; Steenblik, R. Spencer; Torres, Vasti; van der Elst, Louis; Walton, Christi; White, Tameka; Wyrzynski, Stephen

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Ahlbrand, Ashley; Bala, Hillol; Bridges, Chandler; Cavar, Damir; Chen, Xin; Cole, Shu; Dalkilic, Mehmet; Dau-Schmidt, Kenneth; deMaine, Susan; Eaton, Kristine; Eskew, Kelly; Furey, Constance; Koda, Marsha; Need, Andrea, Northcutt Bohmert, Miriam; Raji, Aaliyah; Raymond, Angie; Siek, Jeremy; Tanford, Alex; Terry, Herbert; Thomassen, Lisa; Tracey, Dan; Whitworth, Cale

**GUESTS:** Gayer, Jamie; Miles, Emily; Ryan, Colleen

**Agenda**

1. **Approval of the minutes of March 19, 2024**
2. **Memorial Resolution for Terence Kelso Thayer**
3. **Executive Committee Business** (10 minutes)  
Colin Johnson, 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 Johnson by emailing [bfcoff@indiana.edu](mailto:bfcoff@indiana.edu). Questions should be submitted no less than two business days before the meeting.
6. **New Policy on Academic Standing for Undergraduate Students** (15 minutes)  
Andrea Need, Co-chair, Educational Policies Committee  
Vasti Torres, Interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education  
[Discussion Item]  
B33-2024: Academic Standing for Undergraduate Students
7. **Questions/Comments on New Policy on Academic Standing for Undergraduate Students** (10 minutes)
8. **Proposed Changes to the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, & Conduct** (15 minutes)  
Bill Ramos, Co-chair, Student Affairs Committee  
[Action Item]  
B34-2024: Changes to the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, & Conduct (Second reading)

9. **Questions/Comments on Changes to the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, & Conduct** (10 minutes)
10. **Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-A1, Academic Appointments, and BL-ACA-A5, Research Ranks at Indiana University** (15 minutes)  
Ben Kravitz, Co-chair, Research Affairs Committee  
[Action Item]  
B27-2024: Background and Overview to Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-A1 and BL-ACA-A5  
B35-2024: Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-A1, Academic Appointments (Second reading)  
B36-2024: Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-A5, Research Ranks at Indiana University (Second reading)
11. **Questions/Comments on Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-A1 and BL-ACA-A5** (10 minutes)

### Transcript

Shrivastav (00:03:12):

Good afternoon everyone. I am told we have quorum, so let's get our April 2nd meeting started. Welcome back to a rainy, cloudy beginning of April. We will start as we always do first with the approval for the minutes of the March 19th meeting. So I need somebody to raise their hands and support The motion. Motion is on the table from Bill. It is seconded. All in favor of moving the minutes. Recording the minutes as noted. Please raise your hands. Are we good? Okay, the motion passes. Thank you very much. I now invite as we always do, our leader for faculty affairs. Carrie Docherty to read out a memorial for Terence Kelso Thayer. Carrie,

Docherty (00:04:05):

Thank you. Terence Thayer lived in Bloomington for nearly 52 years, but his Indiana and Indiana University roots go even deeper than that. Born in Indianapolis in 1940. Terrance grew up in a small southeastern Indiana, town of North Vernon. After completing high school in 1958, he enrolled in Oberlin College where he received the AB in German in 1962. He spent the following year as a Fulbright scholar in Germany together with his new wife, the former Diane Wise, who he met at Oberlin. Although the two lived in a tiny village where the Swabian dialect was spoken, Terance managed to develop his command of the standard language and studied German literacy history at the university. While he and Diane began their long hiking and birdwatching career, as well as their lifelong travels together with trips to Germany, Denmark, France, and Greece. Upon his return to the United States, Terance entered the PhD program at Harvard with the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship.

(00:05:19):

He had been awarded as a senior at Oberlin. During the last two years, he taught sections in German language and comparative literature receiving a Harvard Graduate Society Prize for teaching in 1966. In an environment of plentiful academic jobs, Terance was contacted by Frank Ryder at Indiana and among other interested programs, the one at Indiana made the best overall impression. He came to Bloomington to stay in September, 1967 at the age of 26 as a new assistant professor in the department then called Germanic Languages. The time Terance, the time Terance cherished with his wife and family and the world and the wide world was well earned by doing good deeds. That is by teaching and service to the university community. In 1992, Terance received the graduate teaching award conferred annually by the Germanic studies graduate students. Throughout his years at Indiana, Terance remains steadily active in service roles.

[\(00:06:26\)](#):

Most noteworthy. Among these were as Germanic studies director of undergraduate studies, a member of the college curriculum and tenure committees and chair of the Bloomington Campus Committee on retiring faculty. From 1988 to 2004, the last named committee coordinates and helps prepare the Bloomington's provost reception. In honor of the year's faculty retirees as committee chair Terance secured and edited by his own estimates some 500 biographical sketches such as the present one for distribution at this event and if there was a great deed to relate it, most surely was his tenure as department chair from 1992 to 2000. Terance's integrity, professional ethics and sound judgment and steady unassuming leadership led the department through crisis, through the crisis years of the 1990s and preserved its stature of one of the best Germanic studies departments in the country. Terance taught his last class, one of the two courses he had taught in his first semester here during the first eight week session of the fall 2004 semester and retired at the end of October. He brought to his teaching research and administrative duties, a subtle little noticed but sincere passion. Thank you.

Shrivastav [\(00:07:54\)](#):

Thank you, Carrie. If you're able, please stand for a moment of silence. Thank you. I now invite Colin Johnson, faculty president to deliver the executive committee business report.

Johnson [\(00:08:25\)](#):

Good afternoon and thank you Provost Shrivastav, so it's lovely to see you all. I'd like to begin today with some happy and exciting news, which is the results of the presidential election have been tabulated and it is my pleasure to report that our colleague, Bill Ramos has won the position of President-elect.

[\(00:08:49\)](#):

So I'd like to begin by congratulating Chase McCoy on having escaped the fate of serving as president. No, I'm just kidding. But really to congratulate both of them, Bill obviously for having prevailed in that contest and them both for thanking both of them for their willingness to stand for election and really all of us for, I think continually being able to find strong leaders for this position or at least accepting myself from that, but everybody else that we've been able to work with over the years, I look forward to working with really probably both of you in the year ahead during my term as past president. So that's excellent news. I will tell you where the election is concerned. The next step is for the nominations committee to populate the ballot for the officers, the other officers of the council, and also the ballot for members of elected committees.

[\(00:09:45\)](#):

And so we will be meeting in fairly short order to do that and then we will undertake that process and hopefully get the slate of officers for next year set up by the end of the year, which is good. I also want to note that the committee volunteer form is still open and that is actually a really important thing. I just want to underscore the importance to everyone of encouraging your colleagues to volunteer for those committees. As we've noted on numerous occasions, the bulk of the work of this council, the substantive work actually happens in the committees, and so it's really important that we have thoughtful, dedicated people involved in those committees so that the product that comes to this council for consideration is of the highest quality and that does require time and engagement, but it is ultimately essential to the operation of the council.

[\(00:10:33\)](#):

Yeah, okay. The second bit of executive committee news that I wanted to report is that last week on Tuesday evening, we actually received a proposed petition relating to the recent passage of Senate Bill

202 from a group of faculty, as is the case with anything the executive committee receives. Unfortunately we received that after the executive committee had convened to set the agenda for today's meeting. So as is the case with anything that we are in receipt of the executive committee discussed that we intend to refer to working committees for review to see what can be done with it. I did want to acknowledge receipt of it and I have communicated that to the people who submitted it. Now it is kind of in the pike and we'll see what we're able to do with it this year. We will have to see Third and perhaps most importantly, I did want to update people on another matter that kind of came to fruition, came to a head last week and that was the receipt of a petition, calling for a meeting, a special meeting of the faculty to consider a vote of no confidence in a number of our leaders.

[\(00:11:41\):](#)

I want to communicate to all of you the process that has unfolded since we received that petition and tell you a little bit about the executive committee, how the executive committee is prepared to respond to that petition. So on the evening of Wednesday, Wednesday, March 27th, I received a petition signed by 226 of our faculty colleagues, sorry, calling on me to exercise the authority granted to me as the president of the council under section 4.3 of the Constitution of the faculty to convene a special meeting of the faculty as a whole to consider a vote of no confidence and Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, Carrie Docherty, Provost Rahul Shrivastav and President Pamela Whitten. The petition justified this request in the following terms and I want to read it so that it is in the record and so that people are very clear about what we are responding to and what has been asked of us.

[\(00:12:37\):](#)

By way of this mechanism that petition read. The current IU administration is encroaching on both academic freedom and shared governance by among other things, sanctioning faculty and by canceling art exhibits at the Eskenazi Museum. These recent actions when taken together with the administration's failure to proactively and effectively stand against the Indiana legislature's violations of academic freedom and faculty protections is its fortunately unsuccessful attempt to separate Kinsey from IU. Its disregard towards the 2022 faculty vote in support of graduate student workers and its refusal to publicly support IU faculty member Dr. Caitlin Bernard motivate this position for an all faculty meeting to consider a vote of no confidence and then as I said, it's specifically named Vice Provost Docherty, Provost Shrivastav and President Whitten as the targets of that vote. After verifying the standing and eligibility of the petition's signatories, I convened an emergency meeting the council's executive committee to discuss how to proceed.

[\(00:13:37\):](#)

At that meeting I noted my own sense of obligation under the terms of Section 4.3 of the Constitution to respond to the petition by calling a meeting a special meeting of the full faculty and sought the executive committee's approval to do so. The executive committee provided that approval by unanimous consent. Members of the executive committee also agreed that the state of controversy and proposed remedy included in the petition were sufficiently clearly laid out by the petitioners to proceed with developing an agenda of actionable items for that meeting. We are still in the process of doing that, but as I said from my perspective the fundamental controversy and the questions at issue are fairly clearly stated. We will continue to work on that, but I will tell you we are certainly leaning in the direction of treating the vote of no confidence is three separate motions for multiple reasons including the fact that well there are many reasons, but just procedurally it will be much easier to execute because after the vote is taken I will need to notify various parties of what the outcome of that vote is.

[\(00:14:38\):](#)

The committee then turns its attention to logistical and procedural questions related to the convening of a meeting of the full faculty, which I can assure you are considerable. I would note that discussion about all these matters is still ongoing and probably will be for at least the next week or so, so I would beg your patients with us in advance as we continue to work our way through them, but here is what I know so far. There is essentially one and only one physical space on campus that is large enough to accommodate an orderly assembly of 3000 plus members of the voting faculty and that is the IU auditorium. Our ability to schedule a meeting for the full faculty is therefore constrained by the availability of that facility, particularly at the end of the year. As it happens one of the few times when IU Auditorium is available is two weeks from today exactly during the same period when this council would otherwise have been convening for its final meeting of the 2023-2024 academic year.

[\(00:15:39\)](#):

As a matter of scheduling convenience and frankly also as a matter of simple necessity, I am therefore I have therefore called to cancel the last BFC meeting of scheduled BFC meeting of the year and in lieu of that meeting, convene a meeting of the full faculty two weeks from today on Tuesday April 16th between 2:30 PM and 5:30 PM at the IU auditorium. At that meeting, the faculty will have the opportunity to vote to debate and vote on three separate motions, a vote of no confidence in Vice Provost Docherty, a vote of no confidence in Provost Shrivastav and a vote of no confidence in President Whitten. Discussion and debate on each question will be limited to 45 minutes and reasonable limitations will be imposed on the amount of time anyone wishing to speak on any of those questions will be allowed to do so. The meeting will be open, well we'll see.

[\(00:16:32\)](#):

We're still debating that. We're still figuring that out. Eligible participants actually, let me hold off on that. We're still trying to figure out if it's open or closed. I will say this, given the seriousness of the proceedings, I strongly encourage everyone to consider attending that meeting and I will also say that given the seriousness of the proceedings, it's absolutely essential that decorum be maintained by those participating and ideally by those generally surrounding the facility at that time. The Constitution actually doesn't say a great deal about the actual conduct of meetings of the full faculty, but it is clear on several points and I want to stress those so that people have a sense of how this will proceed. First, as with any meeting conducted under the auspices of the council, even a special meeting of the faculty, the executive committee of the BFC sets the agenda.

[\(00:17:24\)](#):

At least it sets the agenda in so far as we are using our authority to convene that meeting. Second, the constitution clearly requires the presence of 200 voting members of the faculty to establish a quorum. Third, the constitution notes that unless 800 voting members are present at a meeting, any action taken at such a meeting must then be sent to the full faculty for subsequent ratification and that is the language that's actually used in the Constitution in order to be made official. What that means in practice is that if 800 or more members of the voting faculty attend the meeting two weeks from today, any questions raised in the context of the meeting will be decided by a vote definitively on the premises and by a simple majority vote of those in attendance and whatever decision is made under those circumstances will stand as the official policy or official position of the faculty on any of the motions.

[\(00:18:21\)](#):

If fewer than 800 members of the voting faculty choose to participate in that meeting, those in attendance will still be called upon to vote on the questions at hand, but the question of whether the outcome of any votes are officially adopted as being representative of the will of the faculty will then be determined by a majority of vote of those who choose to participate in a second round of voting that

will be conducted using an electronic ballot and subsequently sent to the entire faculty. The Constitution only requires a majority under those circumstances. The Constitution only requires a majority of those people who choose to participate in the ratification process to vote in favor of a measure for that to be adopted as the official position of the faculty. Under those circumstances, if a measure is formally ratified, I will send notice of it to the relevant university authority if the measure fails to be ratified.

[\(00:19:18\)](#):

The vote taken by the faculty who attended the actual meeting will like the ERA hang indefinitely in suspension as a significant but nonetheless unofficial expression to the faculties or at least some faculties current displeasure or pleasure depending on how it comes out. Finally, I would note that the constitution is quite clear about who qualifies as voting faculty for the purpose of such meetings. Voting faculty are those tenure track and non-tenure track faculty and librarians with an appointment of at least 0.75 FTE as well as emeriti. Part-time, acting, adjunct, visiting, or honorary faculty, Postdoctoral fellows, research associates, and academic specialists do not qualify as members of the faculty for the purposes of such meetings, voting faculty and they will therefore not be allowed to vote. Nor do student academic appointees. However much we may all appreciate the indispensable contributions students and our colleagues appointed in all of those other capacities make to the educational mission of this campus.

[\(00:20:17\)](#):

Bottom line, this is a faculty matter, an example of the faculty exercising both its prerogatives and responsibilities within the tradition of shared governance. Any reasonable person would therefore have to assume as I said, that any attempt to impair or disrupt these proceedings is in effect an effort to undermine that very tradition itself. One final note, given our proximity to the end of the academic year with everything that entails, there is no way that I can in good conscience try to schedule an additional previously unplanned meeting of the council, the meeting of the full council that will take place two weeks from today or the meeting of the full faculty that will therefore take place two weeks from today will be the final meeting convened by me as president of the council this year and the business we could collectively conduct there will be the last business we're able to conduct this year.

[\(00:21:08\)](#):

I think it's important that we do that given the gravity of the issue, but it will interfere with some outstanding issues that we were hoping to address next week. I'm sure it goes without saying that this is not how I envisioned the end of my term as president to the faculty playing out when I officially assumed that position July 1st of last year. In a way, I suppose it's fitting, it's a fitting into the year since it provides clear evidence as if anyone needed it, of just how serious engrave the challenges I and my colleagues on the executive committee and indeed all of you and the university generally have had to navigate since we first convened back in August, but I will admit that this turn of events is not one that I particularly welcome. Whatever has led us to this point and whoever may be responsible for the significant chasm that seems to have developed between the faculty or at least some faculty, some of our faculty colleagues and university leaders, it is a sad state in which we collectively find ourselves at the moment of that.

[\(00:22:00\)](#):

I am quite certain on a slightly happier note however, and because it is clear to me that I will not enjoy the luxury of having the chance to do so at our final meeting of the year, as is our custom. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of you and especially my colleagues on the council's executive committee and in the council office, our staff for all of their hard work this year. I wish I could say that my experience serving my colleagues in this capacity has been a pleasure, but to be honest, this has

been a profoundly difficult and trying year for reasons that I'm sure are apparent to everyone sitting in this room. The thing that has made it tolerable however, has been the collegiality and support of my colleagues among whom I should note, I do count many members of the campus and university administration despite whatever our candid and sometimes quite pointed disagreements may have been over particular issues along the way.

[\(00:22:52\)](#):

I'm enormously grateful, as I said to all of you, and I certainly wish we were ending the year in a different way, but I think this is important and it is certainly within the kind of realm of responsibility in the prerogative of the faculty to express its concerns in this way. I really would encourage all of you, I will tell you I will be sending out additional information so that all of our colleagues have details about this meeting and can prepare themselves to participate in it. That should come in fairly short order. There are still a number of logistical matters that we're working out and it's important that when I circulate that information, that information be accurate so that people can plan accordingly. I will also say I encourage all this is a profoundly significant matter and I would encourage all of you over the course of the next two weeks to encourage all of your colleagues to talk seriously about where we are as an institution about what a vote of no confidence means and to think about how they want to proceed at that meeting. Like I said, this is within our realm of authority to do, but it's really important that people vote their conscience, they do it thoughtfully and that we make use of the kind of affordances that have been given to us thoughtfully. So with that, I will conclude my report. Again, thanking all of you for your work this year.

Shrivastav [\(00:24:21\)](#):

Thank you, Colin. Good afternoon everyone. It is now a turn for the presiding officer's report, so let me get right to it. First of all, I want to thank Colin for his update on the upcoming all faculty meeting and for his thoughtful and collaborative leadership of faculty in a challenging time in our world and a time of significant growth and evolution for IU. So Colin, really seriously thank you. You've been a wonderful partner and really appreciate having worked with you for most of the last year. I will echo what Colin said. I encourage you, all of you and your peers to share your perspectives as we move towards this next chapter together. As I said in my recent state of the campus remarks, we are actively working towards a bold vision for the future grounded in academic excellence, which will ensure that our university thrives not only today but in the decades to come.

[\(00:25:32\)](#):

That doesn't mean it'll be an easy path or that everyone will agree with or understand or like every decision or every new direction we take, but to get to the future we all aspire to. We must continue to be willing to listen and collaborate with each other and with colleagues across the university on finding solutions to our toughest challenges and realizing the amazing opportunities we have ahead of us, and that's where I intend to spend my time. And as always, it is my pleasure to join with you in creating a brighter future for Bloomington Campus and for all of IU. With that, let me address issues that we've all been working on. First, we continue to hear widespread questions and concerns from faculty about new state laws and in particular those resulting from Senate Bill 202. I fully appreciate that everyone potentially impacted would like to have a full explication of as soon as possible or what this may mean for your teaching and interactions with students and what steps, if any, you might or should proactively take to address the new law which goes into effect on July one later this year.

[\(00:26:52\)](#):

The reality is we don't have all those answers yet and we are opting to work deliberately and collaboratively through finding what the right path for us should be. At this stage, we are seeking the guidance of faculty leadership, general council, university relations colleagues, fellow state, higher education institutions and other partners, the president other IU chancellors, and I met recently with the university faculty council co-chairs to discuss our next step in the process and we will be meeting again in the coming weeks. Their recommendation, and I speak for Colin here as the law applies equally to all IU campuses, was to work through the UFC Executive Committee, the elected leaders for all IU faculty, and we intend to do so. What we shared with that group and I share with you now are our principles for this effort. As we determine a course of action that ensures compliance with state laws, we will work collaboratively to seek faculty input.

[\(00:28:05\):](#)

Any steps required for legal compliance will include and affirm our values of intellectual rigor and academic freedom and our existing academic processes of review for hiring, renewal, tenure, promotion and grievances will continue to be applied. We are exceedingly fortunate to have the world-class faculty and instructional leaders we have at IU and we want to ensure that your great work continues at IU well into the future Through the UFC, we will continue to engage faculty broadly and resolve as many of your questions as quickly as possible. We hear clearly your care and concern on this issue and we are working as diligently as possible.

[\(00:28:55\):](#)

This continues to be one of the busiest seasons of the academic year. As we host our final classes and wrap up projects, present awards and confer degrees, we learn all that we can and push ourselves to translate that knowledge into positive impact even in the absence of a major cosmic event, exceptionally salient geopolitical conflicts and related challenges on our campus. This would be a hectic season, one of confluence and saturation. I know that many of us are exhausted and that connecting in good faith with people of different perspectives can require a lot of energy and active participation, but I want to emphasize that our values as faculty and as an institution are as critical as ever, including honoring our diversity of community and ideas, respect for the dignity of others and academic freedom. As each of us contends with the events in Palestine and Israel in their many connections with and responses to in our lives here, it is vital that we use our freedom of speech to engage in meaningful and respectful dialogue. Through such dialogue, we have an opportunity to grow as individuals and strengthen the collective and collaborative building of community. Again, we will disagree, but we remain a community and greater togetherness even in the most challenging moments is worth prioritizing for all of us.

[\(00:30:35\):](#)

I was thrilled last week to attend the inaugural ceremony of remembering Hoosiers, the new event we've been developing to honor the members of our campus community who we've lost throughout the year. I would like to thank everyone who contributed to the program and those who were in attendance of this poignant ceremony. It was very special and an important moment and I'm pleased we will provide the space for friends and families to gather in remembrance of their loved ones for years to come. Speaking of cosmic events with April eight, now less than a week away, there is plenty of excitement generating for the upcoming eclipse. You may have seen the T-shirts already and to reiterate the message for faculty and students, there are no in-person classes that day. Students are reporting they're getting mixed signals, so please make sure you are communicating your expectations for what will or will not happen in your classes that day.

[\(00:31:38\):](#)



We are expecting as many as 300,000 visitors to Bloomington, many starting this weekend. This will be an incredible opportunity for us to connect and learn as eclipse programs have already begun across campus. It may also present some conditions which most of us have not experienced before, and as events unfold, we may need to remember to have some patients. Police and emergency personnel are expecting to receive a high volume of calls for service and will be prioritizing emergencies and issues that pose imminent or immediate danger. That said, IU has been preparing for the eclipse for three years and has been coordinating with numerous safety agencies outside of IU as well as many campus partners. We are prepared for a safe and fun eclipse weekend. The key safety notes for you to keep in mind are first stay in the know, make sure your IU notify contact information is accurate so that you can receive emergency alerts if the need arises.

[\(00:32:49\)](#):

Second, if you see something, say something, report suspicious or criminal activity to IU Police Department and finally, preparedness. Get your eclipse glasses if you haven't already, to protect your eyes and plan ahead for an exciting day of events shared with 300,000 people, friends and colleagues and students from all over. Briefly, I'm also pleased to announce that later this week in our Engage IUB newsletter column, we'll be sharing exciting details on research space improvements we initially announced in the fall. My special thanks to Brea Perry, Scott Michaels, our capital planning and facilities team and the space planning and implementation teams for their thorough work in planning this ambitious and much needed undertaking.

[\(00:33:44\)](#):

We did receive one question and I'll address that in a moment, but before I finish my prepared remarks, I want to in recognizing that this will be the last formal BFC meeting for this academic calendar, I want to say extend an extra special thank you to Cate. Cate has been a vocal leader really throughout my tenure here as Provost. Cate, you've been a wonderful, general, wonderful leader to work with, always had sage advice and good counsel and brought a wonderful sense of humor. I suspect you're relieved that you don't have to be in those many meetings going forward, but we really will miss you sincerely. I also was saving this for the last meeting, but I want to acknowledge before we end today the tremendous service our ROTC leader, Lieutenant Colonel Giordano has provided. Thank you for your service to the country and to IU. He will be retiring from his service at the end of summer this year and going into civilian life. We are fortunate to have you amongst us. Thank you for everything you have done. Let's give him a round of applause. We get one question every meeting about Samia Halaby's exhibit and I have one more. This time I can report all communications with the artists directly were handled through the museum as other details of the planning. There was no additional information or explanation that needed to be provided for Ms. Halaby other than what had been shared with that. I believe we have some time. I will open this up for questions from the floor if there is anybody with a question.

Michaelsen [\(00:35:53\)](#):

Do you have a sense of how 202 will affect teaching graduate students? Is there

Shrivastav [\(00:35:59\)](#):

That is one of many unknowns at this point. Part of this legislation really is that it's ambiguous in many ways and that ambiguity is what requires us to be very deliberate in determining how we go forward with its implementation. We want to be compliant with the law, but we do not want to overreact and do things that create other downstream problems. That is exactly why instead of having a solution, we have asked the general counsel and university relations to go through questions just like that to give us what

their legal opinion is before we decide how best to address that. So I think these are all questions we will address. I'm sure we will have more as time goes on, but I wish I had an answer for you today, but I do not, but thank you for bringing that up. Other questions, Israel

Herrera ([00:37:04](#)):

Mine is associated with the, I don't know if this is new, maybe I haven't seen this for the associated assistant vice provost for experiential learning and outreach for undergrad education and in the application it says that this person will be working with all the experiential learning units and I wonder on campus, which are those experiential learning units that we have in this moment.

Shrivastav ([00:37:41](#)):

I should

Torres ([00:37:53](#)):

Certainly, I'd be happy to. Almost every school and the majority of departments have some form of experiential learning rather than recreating the wheel. This position will actually just coordinate and help others bring it to light and create a designation so that we can sort of say this, many students are participating in experiential learning. So I would say every school, every college, some departments as well as some co-curricular departments.

Shrivastav ([00:38:30](#)):

Thank you. Go ahead.

Herrera ([00:38:31](#)):

So in other words, the key person in each department, in school or program related to experiential learning will be working with this person?

Torres ([00:38:47](#)):

What I'm struggling with is the working part. That can mean a lot of things. Coordinating is probably a word I would use more openly, so I'm not sure what you mean by working with,

Shrivastav ([00:39:05](#)):

If you are asking whether people currently supporting experiential learning will need to report to this person, that is not how it is envisioned, but it is certainly something that needs to be coordinated. It is also an area of emphasis in our IUB 2030 plans. There is a faculty committee leading that effort, so I know Vasti is trying to lay the infrastructure to support what should become a fairly big undertaking on campus over the next several months. Any other questions? Yes,

Sapp ([00:39:45](#)):

Yes. In the case of Abdulkader Sinno, the faculty Board of Review has reached a decision ruling that the VPFAA should have applied Bloomington policy, a CAD-27 as you know, and that the case should have been sent to the Faculty Misconduct review committee. Rahul, in your statement in January you said that you would abide by the decision of the Faculty Board of review. So my question is do you intend to refer this sanction to the Faculty Misconduct Review Committee?

Shrivastav (00:40:17):

So I have received the report. You're right, it is a personnel matter and I'm afraid I'm not legally allowed or it would be appropriate for me to comment on personnel matters. I will review the FBR recommendation along with all the details with the case, consult with all relevant parties and render my decision as appropriate.

Sinno (00:40:46):

Go ahead.

Shrivastav (00:40:49):

Again, I cannot comment on personnel matters in public.

Sapp (00:40:58):

Can I just ask in general, do you intend to follow the report without giving details

Shrivastav (00:41:04):

About what that would be? I have just received it. I have not even reviewed the file. I am unable to comment on anything related to this at this time. Other questions? Okay, seeing none, I will move on to seeing none. I will move on to the next item on the agenda, which is the new policy on academic standing for undergraduate students. This is a discussion item, does not need a vote today. The discussion will be led by Andrea Need co-chair of the Educational Policy Committee and Vasti Torres VP for undergraduate education.

Need (00:41:49):

Okay. Hi everybody. This is a introduction to the process. First I'll go through the process we went through to get to this point to get to the draft policy you see or the policy. So first I want to let you know that this policy was brought to the EPC by the undergraduate academic council and you can probably not read because it's so small, but the names of the people who are on that council are at the bottom of the screen and I wanted to show you just that they're representative of the different units on campus. So this group, which is led by Vasti Torres, we met on several occasions to work on the language. We worked on it remotely. We encouraged the members of the committee or council work, encouraged to share it with people in their units like advisors. And then it went to the EPC for a first take a look. And then after that worked on it some more. We gave the EPC members plenty of time to come up with any questions or concerns or suggestions they had before we brought it to the EPC for a vote and we made changes based on those comments. And then the EPC unanimously adopted the policy.

(00:43:15):

So I'm not going to go through all parts of the policy, but just to give you the highlights at first, talking about the purposes, we are trying to have some kind of consistency about academic standing terminology and process across the campus and we're hoping to help students by having this consistency. We're not having the units have uniform standards, but we are going to have the uniform use of terms. So for example, different units might be using different words to describe is a student in good academic standing or what kind of bad academic standing they're in. And also they might have different stages. And so we're trying to unify those two things. So the first part of the policy number one is defining what is good academic standing. And so we have a minimum standard based on the IU 2.0 requirement, and this is a cumulative GPA and a semester GPA requirement.

[\(00:44:24\)](#):

And then units can have their own requirements. You might notice how there's a little more student forward or student focused type language in this policy than others. For example, telling students where information about their units requirements can be found. Then we move on to, well, if I'm not in good academic standing, the group decided to and the EPC decided to move away from language about probation with its connotation of the criminal justice system. So that's why you don't see probation in here anymore. And you see academic watch as the first level of not good standing and this is based on your semester GPA. Again, we have the IU 2.0 minimum and then we refer to whether your unit has other requirements. We also added in here what the goals are. We want to make sure students know that they are need to either address their academics or other issues that they're facing and we note in each one of these steps that this designation will not go on their transcript. It's part of the advising record. The next is academic alert. This is a higher level problem. Problem, hence the name alert because this means that you have dropped below. What is the graduation requirement for IU as the base or perhaps seeing your unit if your unit has other standards. So we're notifying the students of major that this is a major concern with their academic performance because they are at risk of dismissal.

[\(00:46:11\)](#):

The next step is explaining academic unit dismissal. So we specifically say that a student that's on alert can be academically dismissed, they don't have to be by their unit. And it's established based on criteria that the unit has established. At this point, the academic unit, of course, not only notifying the student of each of these steps, but at this point the unit is now also notifying OVPUE of the student's dismissal. Next we have dismissal by IUB. This is a new provision. As part of working on this policy, we realized in fact that students were not formally ever dismissed from IU. So the purpose of this step is that if there is not a path forward for a student, that that student will be dismissed and OVPUE will be helping figure out with the student whether there is that path forward. Lastly, we have reinstatement. It's up to each unit to determine the criteria if they want to have a reinstatement process and if they've been dismissed from the unit and if they've been dismissed from IU, they will work with OVPUE who will coordinate with the students' unit they want to get back into to see whether they qualify under the unit's criteria.

[\(00:47:37\)](#):

Vasti, do you have anything to add?

Torres [\(00:47:41\)](#):

I'll just add that it's important to understand that you can be dismissed from a unit because of accreditation differences. Different units have different GPA requirements, but it doesn't mean that you are dismissed from the university or the campus. So that's why we have this two-tiered process that you would notify VPUE and then we would have the advisors work with the students to look at their options.

Shrivastav [\(00:48:13\)](#):

Thank you. This is open for discussion. If you have any questions,

[\(00:48:22\)](#):

Chip,

McCoy [\(00:48:26\)](#):

I was reading through the policy and I was curious if there's any appeal process for the student if there was some extenuating circumstances that might have led them to be either on watch or alert. And it

does mention extenuating circumstances and 4-A, but I was also a little confused by that sentence whether it was extenuating circumstances that could lead to a dismissal if they did not meet the different academic criteria or was it that the dismissal can be considered not to happen due to extenuating circumstances? So just a little, yeah, like some clarity on that.

Need ([00:49:03](#)):

I'm not sure I understand your last point, but as far as intent, the process that we are imagining, that's up to the unit to develop its processes. I know in O'Neill we do have an appeal process attached to unit dismissal and so that would continue to be allowed to happen and the student, they actually, that's where they make their case about the extenuating circumstances. So the idea was to leave it up to the unit to develop their practices. Which reminds me, actually there's one more thing I forgot to mention, which is that we all agreed that there are a lot of details that aren't appropriate for a policy that could go along that would be helpful. For example, what kind of information should we all be sending to students when they're on academic alert? Maybe to discuss how many times should you be meeting with an advisor or required to meet with an advisor? And so we talked about we're going to have a separate guiding principles document that we are going to work on to kind of flesh out some of these things but they don't make sense for policy. But Chase, did you want to follow up with it?

McCoy ([00:50:14](#)):

Yeah, I was just wondering if it would be useful to have something in the policy that says that appeal process can should be determined by the unit. Just some sort of statement

Torres ([00:50:26](#)):

In the discussion with the undergraduate deans, we chose not to have an appeal process but to allow the schools to have the leeway if there were extenuating circumstances. Examples of family emergencies or something like that. Appeal processes, when you're talking about academic standing is very difficult because in essence would have to change a grade for an appeal. So the extenuating circumstances allows the schools to take into consideration truly extenuating circumstances but not necessarily an appeals process. Does that make sense?

Johnson ([00:51:13](#)):

I do have one question with the introduction of, we kind of have in some cases a two-tiered admissions process or sort of movement into particular schools, right? They start currently in university division or in AIMS or whatever we're calling it now. Where do they end up once they're dismissed from the unit purgatory or is there some other address?

Torres ([00:51:38](#)):

It's funny you should use the word purgatory because that's exactly what we're trying to avoid.

Johnson ([00:51:42](#)):

Oh good. Okay, good. Yay. The system

Torres ([00:51:44](#)):

Purgatory students who are in essence floating around. That's exactly what we're trying to avoid. So if a student is dismissed from the unit because of the unit criteria but still qualifies for other opportunities

on the campus, that's why the unit would notify VPUE and the aims advisors would reach out to that student to figure out what are your options. So there's both the communication loop and there's a process that would not let the student fall through the cracks.

Shrivastav ([00:52:24](#)):

Other questions? Well, thank you very much. Seeing, oh, there is one more. Danielle,

DeSawal ([00:52:32](#)):

I don't actually have a question. I would like to make a motion that we move to vote on this given that this is our last official BFC meeting. In order to get this approved, while our bylaws state that ordinarily major policy proposals should have a first and second reading, given the vetting that it's already had as well as the limited number of questions of concern related to this item, I would like to make a motion that we vote this on the floor today.

Torres ([00:53:02](#)):

I would like to second.

Shrivastav ([00:53:04](#)):

Okay. We have a motion to basically drop standard procedures and call on a vote on otherwise a discussion item. Would you bless this parliamentarian?

([00:53:16](#)):

Cohen: Yes.

([00:53:16](#)):

Shrivastav: Okay. Alright. So we have a motion to approve the new policy on academic standing for undergraduate students, the details of which are on your screens. We have a motion,

Johnson ([00:53:31](#)):

I think we need, it's a two stage process. First we have to approve the motion to make it an motion to vote

Shrivastav ([00:53:35](#)):

That's right. That's correct. Thank you. Right. So first we have to vote on the motion to bring this motion to vote. Does that make sense?

([00:53:45](#)):

Johnson: It does. And nicely put.

([00:53:45](#)):

Shrivastav: So we have a motion and a second. So all in favor of moving this from a discussion item to an action item, please raise your hands. That is near unanimous. Alright, sounds great. Thank you. So the motion passes. This is now an action item and we can per protocol, open it up for discussion one more time if there are any other questions before we bring this to a formal vote. Any questions? Seeing none. I will call for a vote on adopting the new policy on academic standing for undergraduate students with the major provisions on the screen in front of you. All in favor? Please raise your hands. Once again, I would say near unanimous. Thank you very much. The motion passes. Thank you Vasti and Andrea.

Thank you Danielle. Okay, the next item on the agenda is proposed changes to code of student rights, responsibilities and conduct. This is brought to us by Bill Ramos, the recently elected president-elect and this actually is an action item, so we do have to take a vote on this after discussion.

Ramos ([00:55:01](#)):

Honored and humbled. Thank you. This is coming as a second reading. We took feedback and heard opinions so we're coming to you today. This was a charge that had several items and through this round we'll really be addressing the first two. There'll be one major change you'll see and then one minor. If you remember last time the topic around changing the percentage or the number of faculty to student people on a hearing committee will stay the same. I will say student affairs will be coming in the fall with a 2.0 version that might have a little more breadth and depth that we'll also consider to cover. The other items for today, there's really two things to consider and I'll go through the slides, but you'll see the changes are pretty much the same. So the first one is moving graduate cases from VPFAA to the graduate school and we also had a comment last time about changing terminology. So it's now posted as Vice Provost for graduate education throughout. The minor change was we kept the concept of taking serious out. Again, just a semantic change. We didn't feel serious. We have no way to gauge grad in there, so we just took it out. So it's procedural error, which is allowed during an appeal and the remainder of what you'll see are the places where we will just change it to vice provost for graduate education.

([00:56:39](#)):

And that's it.

Shrivastav ([00:56:41](#)):

Thank you Bill. This is the second reading. This is now open for discussion. Before we call for a formal vote, any questions? Seeing none, I would, oh, there is one. David,

Daleke ([00:56:58](#)):

Can I just ask about the timeline for implementation? If this passes,

Johnson ([00:57:05](#)):

We could probably give you a while. Why?

Daleke ([00:57:11](#)):

So would that be for example, fall? Would it be summer? What would be the appropriate time? I ask because we would need to put into place a mechanism within the office to be able to hear cases

Ramos ([00:57:27](#)):

Fall. I'm hearing fall I say fall.

Shrivastav ([00:57:30](#)):

The way I see this is the faculty will give you the charge to implement it and then you will have to do it as soon as possible. Okay. Seeing no other questions, I don't think this needs a second. I think this is comes from committee. It comes from committee. So all in favor of the changes as proposed by bill to the code of student rights, responsibilities and conduct. Please raise your hands.

Cohen ([00:58:04](#)):

We are good.

Shrivastav ([00:58:05](#)):

And this motion passes. Thank you very much. The next item is proposed changes to BL-ACA-A1 academic appointments and BL-ACA-A5 research ranks at IU. This is also a second reading and therefore an action item led by Ben Kravitz, co-chair of research affairs committee. Ben, take it away.

Kravitz ([00:58:29](#)):

Alright, thank you. So a lot of these will look familiar, but it's good to be thorough. So we propose to add assistant research professor, associate research professor and research professor as available titles for research faculty and to differentiate the tracks because research is diverse on this campus and this is important to do. We also added descriptions of postdocs and research associates. Not everyone should be judged based on an independent self-funded research program. Granting agencies don't always know what a research scientist is and many of our peer institutions already do this. We are allowed to do this. This is what Indianapolis did. So there will actually be two items that will be voting on. Number one is a modification of BL-ACA-A1 just to add in the new titles and remove duplicate descriptions. The second one is a lot of the larger items is BL-ACA-A5. So updating the qualifications you've seen the redlined version. There are a lot of red lines and then a lot of the work will then be left up to the schools and the units as to who gets to use which title. The different criteria can research faculty move between the research scientists and research professor ranks. This should be a discussion and ultimately all of the decisions as always end up with OVPFAA. So there will be some consistency applied across units.

([01:00:14](#)):

That's it.

Shrivastav ([01:00:16](#)):

Thank you. This is now open for discussion. Wow, not a very, okay, there you go. Colin

Johnson ([01:00:26](#)):

I do have just a, this policy is adjusting a policy that used to ineffective describe ranks that were referred to as research scientists if I'm not mistaken. Correct. Those are, and I just want to be clear because in the documents that you pointed to, you used the language of TMP. Are these These are NTT ranks if I'm not mistaken.

Kravitz ([01:00:50](#)):

Yes, that was an abbreviation. It's promotion.

Johnson ([01:00:53](#)):

Okay. So tenure issue is just because that introduces an entirely different set of considerations. If we're, for example, allowing tenure track faculty to be classified as research professors exempting them from the other kind of dimensions of TT appointments. I just wanted to be clear.

Kravitz ([01:01:08](#)):

Yes, that was my mistake.



Johnson ([01:01:09](#)):

Okay. Lest there be any confusion for the record?

Shrivastav ([01:01:14](#)):

Any other questions? Great.

Cohen ([01:01:19](#)):

Ben, can you go to the first slide for me a second? Okay. You're adding descriptions for research associates. I just wanted to make sure we weren't adding those in because those are non-voting faculty versus the rest are voting faculty and I wanted to make sure we weren't confusing them in the constitution then.

Kravitz ([01:01:42](#)):

No, no. I put that on there because there just wasn't a lot of mention of postdocs and research associates in policy anywhere and I figured there should be.

Cohen ([01:01:51](#)):

Perfect.

Shrivastav ([01:01:54](#)):

Thank you. Any other questions? Seeing none, I will call upon a vote. We don't need a motion or a second comes from the committee. So all in favor of changes as proposed to BL-ACA-A1 for academic appointments and BL-ACA-A5 research ranks. Please raise your hands.

([01:02:17](#)):

Do

([01:02:18](#)):

We have a count? Yep. Do we need an all opposed?

([01:02:21](#)):

Cohen: No.

([01:02:22](#)):

Shrivastav: Okay. Alright, the motion passes. Thank you very much. That actually brings this meeting to a close. Well thank you very much. Thank you for a successful semester and good luck as we close the year out. The meeting stands adjourned.