

**Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
February 13, 2024 | 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Presidents Hall – Franklin Hall**

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ahlbrand, Ashley; Anderson, Dana; Asher, Sofiya; Bala, Hillol; Brinda, Chelsea; Buggenhagen, Beth; Chen, Xin; Daleke, David; Dalkilic, Mehmet; Dau-Schmidt, Kenneth; Dekydtspotter, Lori; DeSawal, Danielle; Docherty, Carrie; Eaton, Kristine; Eskew, Kelly; Freedman, Seth; Furey, Constance; 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; Michaelson, Jonathan; O'Brien, Travis; Reck, Cathrine; Rutkowski, Leslie; Sapp, Christopher; Sela, Ron; Shrivastav, Rahul; Siek, Jeremy; Silvester, Katie; Sinadinos, Alison; Steenblik, R. Spencer; Tanford, Alex; Thomassen, Lisa; Torres, Vasti; Tracey, Dan; van der Elst, Louis; Wyrzynski, Stephen

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bridges, Chandler; Butters, Rebecca; Cavar, Damir; Cohen, Rachel; Cole, Shu; Dalkilic, Mehmet; DeMaine, Susan; Eaton, Kristine; Eskew, Kelly; Koda, Marsha; Northcutt Bohmert, Miriam; Paschal, Joshua; Perry, Brea; Raji, Aaliyah; Ramos, William; Raymond, Angie; Terry, Herbert; Walton, Christi; White, Tameka; Whitworth, Cale

GUESTS: Carroll, Michael; Miles, Emily; Need, Andrea' Napoli, Lisa-Marie; Ryan, Colleen; Waller, Matt

Agenda

1. **Approval of the minutes of January 30, 2024**
2. **Memorial Resolution for Nina Perlina**
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. Questions should be submitted no less than two business days before the meeting.
6. **Proposed Change to BL-ACA-H21, IU Bloomington Academic Calendar Principles (10 minutes)**
Andrea Need, Co-chair, Educational Policies Committee
Brian Winterman, Co-chair, Educational Policies Committee
Michael Carroll, Registrar
[Action Item]
B17-2024: Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-H21, IU Bloomington Academic Calendar Principles
Passing Period Recommendation Timetable, from the Office of the Registrar
7. **Questions/Comments on Proposed Change to BL-ACA-H21 (10 minutes)**

8. **Results from Long Range Planning Survey on Mediation and Conflict Management and Updates from the Alternative Resolution Advisory Committee** (15 minutes)
Lisa-Marie Napoli, Director, Political & Civic Engagement Program; Co-chair, Alternative Resolution Advisory Committee
Colleen Ryan, Associate Vice Provost, Faculty & Academic Affairs; Co-chair, Alternative Resolution Advisory Committee
Cate Reck, Bloomington Faculty Past President; Chair, Long Range Planning Committee
9. **Questions/Comments on LRP Survey and ARAC Updates** (10 minutes)
10. **Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-D16: Creation, Reorganization, Elimination, and Merger of Academic Units and Programs** (15 minutes)
Alex Tanford, Co-chair, CREM Committee
[Discussion Item]
B21-2024: Revisions to November CREM policy draft based on feedback¹
11. **Questions/Comments on BL-ACA-D16: Creation, Reorganization, Elimination, and Merger of Academic Units and Programs** (10 minutes)

Transcript

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

Good afternoon everyone. I'm tol. We have quorum, although we are missing a parliamentarian, but let us get this meeting started. Welcome to the BFC meeting. Today is February 13th and we will begin as we always do with the approval of minutes from our last meeting on January 30th. So I need a motion and a second for that if anybody's willing to do that. Alex has a motion. Anybody to second that we have a second from Kate. All in favor of approving minutes as written and circulated. Looks like near unanimous. Okay, Lana, you're sort of sitting in for the parliamentarian so the minutes are approved. We will now call for a memorial resolution for our colleague Nina Perlina. And Carrie, if you are here, please go ahead.

Docherty ([00:00:57](#)):

Thank you. I want to start just by showing that we have a photograph of Professor Perlina. This came in with the memorial resolution. This is a practice that we hope that we'll be able to continue, so I'm happy to see this today. Nina Perlina was born May 16th, 1939 in Leningrad. She lived through the German siege of Leningrad during World War II as a small child, an early formative experience, which eventually resurfaced in her professional life as the 2005 volume of oral history, writing the siege of Leningrad Women's Diaries, memoirs and documentary prose with Cynthia Simmons. She graduated in 1961 and spent the first part of her career working at the Dostoevsky Literary Museum in Leningrad. She immigrated to the US in 1974. Nina obtained her PhD degree from Brown University in 1977 and taught at McAllister College and Rutgers University before settling in her ideal position in 1988.

([00:02:10](#)):

At as a literary scholar in the Department of Slavic languages and Literature at Indiana University. She has mentored numerous graduate students and enjoyed a highly productive research career well past her retirement in 2008 as a symptom of her remarkable scholarly intensity. When Nina passed away on

May 23rd, 2019, she had over 2000 IU library books in her home in Bloomington, a world-class specialist in Dostoevsky and the literary theorist Mikhail Bakhtin. She produced several noteworthy books in addition to a mountain of scholarly articles in both English and Russian former students praised her as a mentor. One wrote, I remember once attending a lecture. She gave a colloquium at our department using strictly scholarly analysis and without mentioning anything explicitly personal in her lecture, she managed to communicate something very personal, her love for the topic. I remember with deep inspiration, the deep inspiration I felt when I left the lecture and that's how I will always remember her.

[\(00:03:30\)](#):

Another rights Dostoevsky himself would have mentioned, would've commented that the grief and loss we're feeling are necessary if we're to develop a great intelligence and a deep heart. If so, perhaps these reflections are among the last of Nina's many gifts to us you never forget to mentor Nina was a person who deeply invested in her students, pushed them to grow and be better people. Her fellow graduate student at Brown and subsequent collaborator of her 2004 book, Cynthia Simmons also characterized her relationship as a kind of mentorship. Most significant in our shared lies as Slav was our work together with our colleagues on the gathering of the oral histories of women who suffered in the siege of Leningrad in World War ii. I had the opportunity to work in Russia with Nina on her native soil and in her native tongue. It was a gift to all around to share that time with her and to be part of that project.

[\(00:04:36\)](#):

Nina was original, a keen intelligence who at times found it difficult to fathom or master simple tasks. I was fortunate not to have taken part in the attempts, in her attempts to learn to drive a friend of hers in Petersburg. Described her to me as having either 'idée luxe' or 'idée fixe.' The former most definitely compensated for the latter. Within our department. We will remember her for both her unsurpassed intellect and deep knowledge of many diverse aspects of Russian culture as well as her great warmth and empathy towards her colleagues and friends. George Fowler, the department chair at the time of her passing, summarized these twin qualities. I knew her as a person with an outsized warm heart as it turns out eventually her heart with an unexpected weakness that betrayed her. She had a unique otherworldly way of asking a question in a lecture or dissertation defense, sometimes taking a winding path, but arriving at an incisive and unforeseen point that would turn out to be highly significant for her. Interlock her. Thank you.

Shrivastav [\(00:05:54\)](#):

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

Johnson [\(00:06:23\)](#):

Good afternoon and thank you Provost Shrivastav. So welcome to February. Things never boring around here. I have a few updates. Happy news I think to report share upfront the process of nominating candidates to stand for election for president of the faculty has now concluded and I'm happy to be in a position to publicly report who will be on the ballot for that contest. Our colleagues, Alex Tanford, Chase McCoy and Bill Ramos have all been nominated to stand for election to the presidency of the council. I will tell you that and Alex, because he cannot get enough, he's a glutton for punishment round two. Anyway, the bylaws of the council actually charged the nomination committee with ensuring that the presidential election ballot reflects some degree of diversity. And while there are some ways in which this ballot is actually not as diverse as some of us would like, we are very fortunate to have colleagues from multiple latter ranks and multiple different positions willing to stand for election.

[\(00:07:38\)](#):

We discussed this with the nominations committee. The constitution actually allows us to nominate or to put up to six people on the ballot. That's very rarely done. It's far more customary to have two, but precisely because of the fact that we have a colleague who represents emerita faculty and NTT candidate and also a TT candidate, we thought it was appropriate this year to put forward three candidates as opposed to the kind of more conventional two. So we took that charge very seriously and I think we've got a wonderful slate of potential future presidents to consider for election to the presidency of the faculty. I would like to take a moment to thank all three of them for their willingness to stand for election. I can tell you from my own experience, I think anybody else who has served in this position or will be shortly can tell you that it is not small.

[\(00:08:26\)](#):

It is not a small obligation in terms of workload, but also in terms of the kind of ethical burdens that people in this position bear. So I'm enormously grateful to our colleagues for being willing to contemplate taking that on. It's essential that people be willing to do that even under difficult circumstances, the general election in which the presidential election will take place will occur at the end of March and that will also be the same time when positions open positions on the council are filled. So I would just take this opportunity once again to encourage all of you to really reach out to your colleagues who you think would be good candidates to serve on the council, encourage them to take an active role in participating in the enterprise of shared governance. From my perspective, it has never been more important than it is currently for people to be directly involved in that and actively engaged with it.

[\(00:09:25\)](#):

Alright, and I will say the nominations form will be going out fairly soon. At the same time, serving on the council is important. It's also crucially important that people be willing to volunteer to serve on the many standing and campus committees where most of the substantive work of the council has done. So please also encourage people to look closely at the volunteer forum as they're also considering whether or not to put their names forward to stand for election to the council. That will happen at the same time and is equally important. I wanted to report that at the last executive committee meeting there was additional discussion about the status of ACA-33 and BL-ACA-D27. You'll all remember that these are two policies that have been under discussion because of the complications that some changes to ACA-33 particularly seemed to have introduced in our ability to interpret, enforce and enact policies governing faculty misconduct review.

[\(00:10:25\)](#):

I was hopeful that we would have a formal proposed policy change to bring forward to you today. Unfortunately on closer examination, I think we all agreed that what's become more and more apparent is that in order for D-27 to be clarified, which is crucially important for us to do it, we probably are also going to have to make adjustments to ACA-33 that is a university faculty council level policy. It's a UA level policy, and the executive committee agreed that it's crucially important that we get all of those proposed revisions correct because we really do not want to find ourselves in a position where in trying to rectify or clarify language, we've introduced additional complications to that. So it's taking a little more time than I had hoped, but it is top of our list of priorities to try to address that this semester as expeditiously as we possibly can.

[\(00:11:17\)](#):

So I apologize for that but also appreciate your patience and as always, I'm enormously grateful to our colleagues working on the Faculty Affairs Committee for their close consideration of these matters

because they're crucially important. The third issue that I want to address is one that I know is of great concern to many people and that is Senate Bill 202, which is legislation currently pending for consideration before the Indiana General Assembly. Before I do anything else I want to point out, many of you may have seen that last week I believe President Whitten made a public statement expressing concerns about that legislation, particularly concerns about the unintended consequences, potential unintended consequences of that bill in terms of its potential to significantly impede our ability to recruit the most talented faculty to the state of Indiana and really our ability to focus our attention where it should be, which is serving our students and also conducting really transformative research.

[\(00:12:20\)](#):

I'm enormously grateful to President Whitten for having made that statement. I would note she's the only leader of a university in the state of Indiana to have done so, which I frankly find disappointing because it is a matter of such great concern. But I am pleased in this case that President Whitten was willing to do that and grateful to her for her willingness to do that. That having been said, and despite President Whitten's willingness to speak out of it, it remains very concerning legislation from I think many people's perspective, including mine. If you have not taken an opportunity or had the opportunity to look closely at the language of SB 202, I am not going to take too much time trying to characterize, trying to characterize in detail what some of its implications may be, but it does a number of things at fairly significant length including fundamentally changing the way trustees at all of the public universities in the state will be appointed.

[\(00:13:21\)](#):

It creates mandates with regard to the kind of teaching diversity, a diverse range of materials, which I think in disciplinary context, which is a general proposition, is not a horrible thing and I frankly think something that many of us try to do very actively already, but it also attaches a certain amount of jeopardy with regard to tenure, specifically to our ability to prove that we're doing that in the eyes of people who from my perspective are not necessarily, they do not have the expertise, will not have the expertise to make those judgments. It also creates reporting structures that are very concerning to me. Reporting structures that allow, for example, people to make potentially anonymous claims about faculty members' failure to do those things, which would then be adjudicated by a third party, in this case the Indiana Commission on Higher Education, which strikes me as being really problematic, particularly because of the fact that we have policies and procedures that allow us to speak to student concerns about those kinds of issues internally and in an orderly fashion and in a way that provides full context for the consideration of the expression of those concerns.

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

So it is a concerning piece of legislation.

[\(00:14:44\)](#):

We have been in conversation with a whole bunch of people, as you can probably imagine will say, and I'm sure Provost Shrivastav will be speaking more about this in his comments, but the process of considering this legislation is moving extremely quickly has to date it has already passed out of the Senate Committee and moved into consideration by the House. In fact, there will be a hearing tomorrow at 10:30 in the House Education Committee on that legislation. I intend to be present in Indianapolis for that hearing and to try to have the opportunity to testify about some of my own concerns and frankly, I think some of your concerns about that Bill, I believe the university also is making a kind of coordinated and concerted attempt to weigh in on that conversation as well. But in any event, I would encourage you all and I would encourage you all to encourage all of your colleagues to pay very close attention to what is going on in Indianapolis because it could have very, very serious implications in terms of our

ability to continue to operate and simply to bear the burden of the kind of reporting requirements that that Bill would introduce into our everyday lives.

[\(00:15:57\)](#):

I would like to remind all of you that as problematic as I find some parts of our government really GR-1 the bill, the policy governing our ability to interact with the state in any kind of official capacity and on behalf of the university, that policy is quite explicit about protecting our rights as citizens and as individuals to express concerns about matters of public policy. We are not allowed to represent our own positions as being the university's position and if you are interacting with anybody from the state, you should not do that. You should not say that you speak for the university, but you are thoroughly entitled to speak as a citizen, as a state of Indiana and as somebody with experience in higher education and I would strongly encourage people to do that.

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

We have talked to people who said that input from citizens as a state of Indiana and certainly from people who have experience with higher education in Indiana is really crucial. You can do that by contacting your representatives. You can also do that by contacting the chair or sending written comments to the chair of the education committee. So please keep your eyes on this very closely. We certainly are. On a related note, and this is a bit of an internal procedural matter, the last thing that I would like to report on the executive committee's behalf is we have received a statement that has been authored jointly by the IU chapter of the AAUP and also Purdue's chapter of the AAUP. It arrived very recently, they have been working very hard in order to put together a kind of position response to some of these issues as is appropriate because the a AAUP is particularly concerned with matters having to do with academic freedom and the rights of faculty members to pursue their research and teaching without interference.

[\(00:18:02\)](#):

So we received a statement that is sitting in front of you in the hard copy in this form and they have requested that this council consider that statement and consider the possibility of signaling formal endorsement for that statement. It is not in the agenda as I said. So in order for us to have a discussion about whether or not we would like to do so, we would have to suspend the rules in order to make space in order to do that and I'm happy to make that motion so that we can consider that now. So with that, I would like to make a formal motion to suspend the rules in order to consider the question of whether to endorse the statement of our colleagues affiliated with the IU AAUP chapter and the Purdue chapter of the AAUP

Reck [\(00:18:48\)](#):

Second that motion.

Johnson [\(00:18:49\)](#):

Alright, we do not have our parliamentarian here, but as a parliamentarian emerit I can tell you that requires a two thirds majority vote in order to suspend the rules to consider that issue. So I would like to, well, you're the presiding officer, you can call for the vote, but it's two thirds people.

Shrivastav [\(00:19:07\)](#):

We have a motion and a second to suspend the rules so we can discuss the joint statement from IU Bloomington and Purdue West Lafayette a AAUP chapters on SB 202. All in favor of suspending the

rules. Please raise your hands. We have the motion passes. It is now open for discussion. So Carolyn, you can take it away I guess.

Johnson ([00:19:33](#)):

All right, so the question on the table then would be whether or not this council would like to vote to endorse the statement in front of you

Shrivastav ([00:19:41](#)):

Elizabeth.

Housworth ([00:19:42](#)):

I'd like to know what the provost opinion about the matter is.

Shrivastav ([00:19:50](#)):

I think I agree with the intent of the statement. I share several of the concerns as President Whitten. I think to the extent their statement can be coordinated with our institutional strategy, the better it is. I understand the AAUP group is in touch with our university relations team. To what extent this reflects that discussion, that part, I don't know. So bottom line is I think you have to vote with your heart here. I don't think there is any opposition to the intent stated here and several of us share the same concern.
Alex,

Tanford ([00:20:42](#)):

Although this is a joint statement of Bloomington and Purdue, I understand that either a AAUP or the faculty at Ball State has also issued a similar statement on Senate bill 202

Shrivastav ([00:21:05](#)):

Other questions. Seeing none, the motion is to officially endorse it from the BFC, so if there are no other questions, we'll take a vote on it.

Johnson ([00:21:20](#)):

There is, if I may, there's one other in deference to the fine print of our government relations policy-1, I would just like to read into the record a short framing indemnification lest we be accused of speaking for on behalf of the university. I would append to that the qualification that the Bloomington Faculty Council provides communications that are in accordance with the authority of the faculty as outlined in the constitution of the Bloomington Faculty Council views and opinions that are expressed outside the authority of the faculty are being expressed solely by the membership of this council and do not necessarily represent those of Indiana University.

Shrivastav ([00:21:58](#)):

Nicely done. Colin. Well you're

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

Very welcome. You should be a lawyer. I know. No, I really shouldn't be a lawyer.

Shrivastav ([00:22:05](#)):

Alright, with that context, the motion hasn't changed. The motion that you all are voting for is whether or not to endorse the statement authored by AAUP as you have in front of you. Are we ready for a vote? Okay. All in favor of endorsing it. Please raise your hand. Motion passes. Thank you. Could you?

Johnson ([00:22:33](#)):

That's fine.

Shrivastav ([00:22:34](#)):

Back to you Colin.

Johnson ([00:22:35](#)):

Alright, thank you. I'm sure our colleagues associated with the AAUP will be very grateful for the support of this council and I would like to personally take this opportunity to thank our colleagues affiliated with the AAUP for the hard work that they've been doing on this. The AAUP is a very important organization and if I have one great regret, it's that I think interest and sort of the sense of the urgency of people's involvement with that organization has waned in recent years probably because people have sort of in some cases questioned whether the work that it does is absolutely necessary. I think we are entering a time in American history when the circumstances that gave rise to the AAUP and its commitments to tenure as an institution and to academic freedom aspects of the profession that this institution was very crucial in helping to bring into existence in the first place are becoming more and more apparent to all of us and I would strongly encourage people to revisit the AAUP as an organization and to consider involving themselves in it quite directly because I think it's time has for better or worse, for better and worse come again and I'm very grateful to our colleagues who have been doing a lot of work on the backside of things to ensure that its specific purview which is to concern itself with academic freedom and the ability of academic freedom to kind of prevail so that we can do the work that we're here to do on our students' behalf and on behalf of humanity can continue without interference.

([00:24:03](#)):

So I would like to publicly thank them for that work and with that I will close my executive committee's report.

Shrivastav ([00:24:16](#)):

Thank you Colin. I'll provide you my report and it'll echo some of the discussion points and sentiments we are sharing here. Anyway, first of all, welcome and thank you. It is mid-February, which means we are in the middle of our semester getting close to midterm exams and as you all know, it's downhill after that into the end of the semester. I know it continues to be a very busy time for everybody and I remain grateful and appreciative of the dedication you show to your research, to our students and to all the service activities despite all the many distractions and challenges that we face on a daily basis. Let me start off with updates on SB 202 because that is obviously the big topic of today to begin with, let me join and echo President Witten's comments from last week in standing again to affirm our deep commitment to academic freedom and to open inquiry as well as our shared responsibility to confront threats to these core values even in times of significant challenges.

([00:25:31](#)):

Much as we all feel here today, we have heard a strong and ongoing concern from faculty and community members about the proposed bill under consideration with the state legislature. There are

actually several bills out there that have an impact on IU. The one we often talk about is SB 202, which has now been approved by the Senate and is under consideration in the house potentially starting tomorrow morning amongst other provisions. This bill adds a new review for our faculty and while we continue to monitor the bill and any potential amendments as the president has shared, we are deeply concerned about the language regarding faculty tenure that would put academic freedom at risk, weaken the intellectual rigor essential to preparing students with critical thinking skills and damage, our ability to compete for world-class faculty. Really I'm referring to all of you here who are at the core of what makes IU an extraordinary research institution.

[\(00:26:40\)](#):

I share President Whitten's belief that as crafted senate bill 202 risks, unintended consequences that threaten not just the stature of IU but the economic and cultural vitality of the state of Indiana. I want everyone to know through our university and state relations team and in concert with fellow public institutions across the state, we are actively advocating with our legislators and our allies on the bill. You may have already seen media coverage about it, so the position that IU has taken on this is pretty clear and we will continue to promote that in the coming days and weeks. Please remember though, we are still in the middle of the process and there is still time for amendment and change. We clearly understand the importance of this to many faculty and to the university and we are continuing to work to promote the best possible outcome for IU more on this.

[\(00:27:44\)](#):

Hopefully by the time we regroup I'll have an update, but really if you follow the news channels in the media, you'll probably be fairly up to date on how this progresses in other update, I also want to share next steps related to the Kinsey Institute and I want to begin this by first offering a special thanks to members of the Kinsey Working Group that general counsel Tony Prather and I charged who have recently submitted their observations and recommendations following a series of listening sessions with the community. Please note that the community's feedback along with the working group's recommendations has been clearly heard and will be shared directly with the board of trustees, particularly related to key areas of concerns and opportunity. The key areas that have been identified in these listening sessions relate to the process and transparency concerns related to Kinsey collections that came up over and over again, potential impact on donors desired advocacy for the institute by senior leaders, faculty and student recruitment and the safety of faculty and staff who are directly or indirectly working with Kinsey.

[\(00:29:03\)](#):

To the last point, I want to add a personal note to our faculty, staff and students who are affiliated with Kinsey related to safety and wellbeing because this came up frequently in the listening sessions as well as through emails and other communication that I received directly to those colleagues. Please know we understand there continues to be unwarranted, unwanted attention and targeting by those who question the need for this vital work, including the spread of misinformation that impairs the integrity and character of our colleagues. While we may not always say so enough, we are proud of what you do and how you are strong members of our community. The hate and misinformation you face daily is undeserved and often mean spirited. Yet you persist in advancing, understanding and hope for those who follow in the spirit of human connection. Thank you for all that you do and for who you are.

[\(00:30:04\)](#):

Please remember IU values you, the President and I along with the Board of trustees, continue to be fully intent in our path forward to protect the Kinsey Institute and to ensure that its name research, scholarship, collections and education initiatives continue as a pillar of intellectual freedom and

academic inquiry at IU. From what I have heard and as I have shared with some of the groups I have talked to directly, I remain confident that any of the options under consideration for Kinsey can effectively address all the areas of concerns that have been raised in these listening sessions. As long as we work together towards shared understanding and the desire to protect Kinsey's primary mission, I am not very concerned about our inability to support Kinsey irrespective of the path the trustees take down the road. At this point, the board will now consider all feedback and options with legal guidance as well in determining our next steps to comply with the new state law.

[\(00:31:17\)](#):

But again, however we feel about these circumstances, I encourage us all to seek understanding and assume the best from all those who are involved in this important work. I now want to switch on other news from campus first across from campus. I continue to be excited this week to see the national rankings which confirm once again the true excellence and flourishing of our academic programs. I'm sure you have heard these by now, but the Kelley Direct online MBA program at the IU School of Business was named the best online MBA program in the United States for a third consecutive year with five specialty programs also ranked first or second nationally. By the way, this is seven times out of the last 10 that Kelley Schools program has been ranked number one in the country. The master's degree program at the IU School of Nursing is ranked at number two nationally.

[\(00:32:15\)](#):

Its online master's degree in nursing education, also ranked second nationally four specialty programs at the School of Education also made it to the top 10. My congratulations to Ash, Robin and Stacy and all the faculty and staff that make these programs so invaluable to our students. I mentioned at our last meeting the ongoing search for a reimagined position of executive director for arts and humanities. We have now charged the search committee and continue to seek out exceptional candidates for this promising new position and I hope you encourage your colleagues and other candidates who would be ideal for this position to put their name in the ring and Judah is sitting in the back as chair of the committee. Please reach out to him to help as you can. I'm excited today to introduce another newly reimagined position and again, I want to reinforce, reimagine not a new position, but a reconfiguration of an existing position from an existing role and existing source of funding.

[\(00:33:24\)](#):

And this one is to serve our campus and community. The title is the Executive Director for Community Engagement and the goal for this position is to lead efforts to develop an advance and innovative community engagement and outreach strategy for IU Bloomington that aligns with the IUB 2030 strategic plan and draws upon the unique excellence and expertise of IU faculty, staff, and students. This position will work closely with the city county regional leaders, businesses and organizations to co-create shared opportunities and collaborations in the region. We will be posting this position soon and again, I would appreciate your help in identifying great candidates for this unique role this week. In fact, it might be going on right now. We are hosting the first round interviews for the Dean of the School of Education. These are the so-called Airport Interviews done on Zoom these days. We are fortunate to have a pool of outstanding candidates in that search and I look forward to welcoming the finalists to campus in the coming weeks in terms of IUB 2030, our strategic plan.

[\(00:34:40\)](#):

We continue to make great progress on various initiatives. I hope you're joining and following these efforts closely. And as a reminder, current updates continue to be posted on the IUB 2030 website. These are posted there in near real time. As soon as we receive updates from committees, we try to post them up there later this week. The executive leadership team for the plan will convene again here

updates and give guidance on our entire plan This week. We also received an updated report from the Advising Working Group and are expecting an initial draft from the first year experience group in the next week or so along with numerous other efforts in research and student success initiatives. In closing, I ask that we please continue to look out for each other and our students and support those in need. Before I open for questions from the room, there were some additional questions this related to the Halaby exhibit.

[\(00:35:39\)](#):

My response will largely echo previous comments to the group, but let me give you some more specifics. As an update, our team at the museum is moving forward with programming plan alongside the exhibit including one program I believe on calligraphy with more information on other programs to come directly from the museum soon. They will also be announcing additional programs and other opportunities for learning and reflection at the museum this spring to provide critical space to confront the implication of this and other challenging issues of the day. In response to another question regarding the funding, the overall budget for an installation of this magnitude at the museum can often exceed \$250,000, not including support from grants and sponsorships. The actual expenses in this case include the cost of producing the exhibit catalog, creating and shipping works of art, as well as other costs of exhibition preparation, some of which were already completed when the decision to cancel the exhibition was made. We have returned funding for the exhibit from the National Endowment for the Arts and the Tara Foundation together totaling about \$93,000. The remaining fixed costs of about \$102,500 are being covered centrally. The museum continues to address finer details as needed with Ms. Halaby's team and other art lenders. And with that I'm open for questions as time allows, if there's any question from the floor, I'm happy to respond Israel.

Herrera [\(00:37:28\)](#):

Yeah, so I have two questions actually. One is regarding cultural centers and I just wonder if it's true that the university is planning or plans to merge or eliminate cultural centers. And my second question would be if there is any update about the contract with Zoom, is there any intention to continue with the contract for following years or is there any update about it?

Shrivastav [\(00:38:02\)](#):

So let me respond to the culture centers. There are no plans to cancel or close any culture centers. There is however, a review happening for all culture centers to see whether they are positioned the appropriate way they're serving our students, faculty and staff, whether there are any changes necessary in programming, kind of support, anything and everything. We have a very well-known expert from Vanderbilt I believe who has met with all our center directors, met with several other leaders. He's continuing to review, evaluate, and benchmark our culture centers. I do not, I think culture centers are a critical part of our university support system for students, for faculty. I do not see at this point any reason to close those, whether or not they are positioned to succeed in the decades to come that the review will tell us. The second question was on Zoom, I'm not aware of anything. I can ask our IT department to what the contract is, how long it is and whether or not there are immediate plans to renew or change it. I have not heard one way or another. I can find out and I can let you know over email separately. Other questions Elizabeth?

Housworth [\(00:39:36\)](#):

So SB 202 is problematic for a variety of reasons. One is this requirement that courses include diverse intellectual viewpoints and that is so vague that it's impossible to know whether that's a benign request

or something that requires us to include non-scientific things in science classes. I was wondering if the legislatures to your knowledge had made any comments about examples of what they believe is required under that clause of the bill?

Shrivastav ([00:40:20](#)):

To my knowledge, no. But again, remember this has been in the Senate and it has just moved over to the legislature, so anything of that nature will probably come out in the coming weeks, but at this point I have no knowledge of such things. Yes.

Michaelsen ([00:40:41](#)):

Thank you for the update on the art cancellation. Could you just for me review what's the museum doing that just sort of went by quickly or is there a place we can find that or

Shrivastav ([00:40:52](#)):

I don't know if they've posted it on their website or not, but I did talk to David Brenneman a couple of weeks ago to encourage them to explore ways to celebrate North Africa, middle East, Islamic art, see what's in our collection, see what other kinds of programs they can do around similar themes. So they have been identifying objects, artifacts, programs, spaces to see how they can better utilize what's available. So those are things that will be emerging in the coming days. I'm sure they will have it on their, but I don't know if they have it out yet. Yeah,

Michaelsen ([00:41:36](#)):

Great.

Shrivastav ([00:41:36](#)):

Thank you. Thank you Michael. Other questions? Yes,

Steenblich ([00:41:44](#)):

I know that there's been significant media attention about this issue. I'm just wondering what the university's trying to do besides returning the funds to try and mitigate those negative feedback from the media.

Shrivastav ([00:42:00](#)):

Well, I mean we have engaged with a number of people including several reporters about institutional policies, institutional framework, institutional compliance with laws. We remain content neutral and if you are walking around campus you will see activities and programs on both sides of the issue. Those are things we've talked, I've talked directly to some reporters about this as have other individuals including the museum people. What we do not control is what they publish and the reality is most media tries to publish things that draw the most attention and sometimes it is the extreme polarized things that draw the most attention. So we are engaging and we will continue to engage what does and does not come out in print. That's out of our control. Anything else? Alright, thank you. Let's move on to the next item on the agenda, which is proposed changes to BL-ACAH-21, which is IU Bloomington Academic calendar principles. We have Andrea Need and Michael Carroll. Brian Winterman is unable to join us here. So Andrea and Mike, you want to take this up?

Need ([00:43:26](#)):

Sure. Everyone can hear me. Okay, so there are no changes to the, I don't think I can hear you help. If I put my glasses on, I could see your answers to my question whether you can hear me, that's fine. So no changes to the proposed policy amendments from last time. We did talk to the EPC about the comments that were raised at our last meeting and we had no changes. So just as a refresher, the current policy says that there are 15 minutes passing time between classes, which we all know we're not doing right now. And so we would like to put to change the policy to reflect what we would like to put into practice starting spring 2025, which is 20 minutes and a minimum but not more than 25 minutes. And the 25 minutes allows the registrar a little bit of wiggle room to try to make the scheduling nest properly, but most classes will have 20 minutes passing time.

Shrivastav ([00:44:32](#)):

I just want to remind everybody, this is the second reading. Thank you for this one. So it is a item that is up for voting and I think Mike and Andrea did a great job explaining it last time, but it is open for discussion. Yes,

Cook ([00:44:57](#)):

I'm Connie Cook from the School of Music substitute for Steve Wyrzynski. So I realized there was discussion last week and I'm not sure exactly how much you got into the speed with which this change is coming up. It creates a massive problem for the school of music because we are also losing a building next year. So I don't know if Steve mentioned that last week or if anyone else did, but for our scheduling officer, this is a lot of stress. That's an understatement and I did see something in the minutes about, oh, there will be help. Well, it's a pretty specific job over there in the music school and without one of our buildings. I mean is this calendar deadline exact? Is there any chance of moving it to the following fall? I know it's already been discussed.

Shrivastav ([00:45:57](#)):

Do either of you want to respond to that?

Carroll ([00:46:00](#)):

Well, it is certainly possible that we could move it to fall if needed. We are working on ways to help the School of Music. We've actually worked to find them some additional space to help relieve some of the issues and what we're planning on doing, assuming this changes, is translating all of the times as they exist today. When we create a semester, we create a copy of the prior term and we will move all of those times to the new times to save some of that work. I realize music still has other concerns and issues that they need to work out, but we're hoping to get it to a point where this change itself doesn't exacerbate those issues.

Shrivastav ([00:46:47](#)):

For context for everybody else, the problem school of music is facing is because their big building is going to be out of use while it is being renovated. That was, as you may recall, approved in the last biennial budget by the state. And I also want to remind everybody, the data that was shared last time shows that during peak periods we have almost zero classroom availability throughout campus and part of this change is to add a class period that would expand the classroom availability across the board. So just wanted to remind everybody where this conversation started. Elizabeth, did you have a question?

Housworth (00:47:32):

Oh no, I was just going to basically echo what you said. That the change ought to help the School of Music by adding that extra period.

Shrivastav (00:47:47):

I would assume so, but I'll let Mike respond because he knows that data like the back of his hand.

Carroll (00:47:53):

I would agree. I think it should we get with more class period finishing up by, well 5:10 in this case as opposed to pushing into the evening and that freezes of course the evening up a little bit more. It should help with not only the many activities that occur on campus that need spaces, but also conflicts that are created when classes are going much later with those activities, be they student events outside of class exams, all of those kinds of things we've seen increasing conflicts with in the evening.

Need (00:48:34):

I'd add just one other thing, which is reminding us that we used to have 15 minutes prior to covid, so this is five minutes longer than what we had prior to having to extend everything for passing times.

Shrivastav (00:48:49):

Yes.

O'Brien (00:48:51):

So I just want to make a follow up. In the last meeting I had passed on a comment from one of my colleagues expressing concern about the potential impact it has on students and recognizing also right now that this is, I hear that this change will make it easier from the registrar's point of view for scheduling. That's great, but the concern with students is in the number that have back to back classes. So thank you Michael for getting back to me and confirming that it's 47% of students last semester who had back to back class transitions. I just want to keep that in mind as we vote on this that there's also a student impact to keep in mind. I hear what you're saying, Andrea, that it was shorter before.

(00:49:32):

I think student opportunity and just the matter of convenience that I mentioned the last time biological needs in between classes and stuff is something to also consider. I guess the one other comment I want to make in addition to this, or I guess this is a question, did the topic come up in this scheduling change of the idea that we might be at peak enrollment right now? Are we possibly making a scheduling change that in a few years may not be as impactful if we don't have the student body loading the classrooms quite as much as they're right now? If that's actually true. I mean, I haven't actually seen the data, but I've heard that that may be the case that this might be the largest deal we expect over the next decade or so.

Need (00:50:18):

We didn't discuss that issue with the EPC. I can report that.

Carroll (00:50:23):

What I can say is that in the 18 years I've been on campus in various roles related to scheduling. Every single semester we send as many as 200 classes back to the units to say we don't have a place to put you at the date, time, size you've requested. And so yes, maybe we are at peak. I don't think that precludes a change down the road if it's warranted, if we have a smaller population. I mean this policy has been changed before.

Shrivastav (00:51:02):

Yes, go ahead.

Grogg (00:51:03):

Hi, I am clinical faculty at the school of optometry, so I just am not sure that this is the correct place to ask this question, but I'm going to ask it anyway. Do the individual schools have the ability to tweak the schedule so we're all housed in one building. We have clinical faculty that see patients either before or after classes and interns that have to get to the clinic to see patients. And so I'm curious if individual schools are able to tweak these passing periods when you're considering clinical care and patient care

Carroll (00:51:43):

For situations like yours where you have a unique cohort of students. Yes, that is typically what happens and I don't think that would change.

Shrivastav (00:51:57):

Go ahead.

Cook (00:51:58):

I just have one follow up. I totally appreciate the need for a longer passing period and that you're working with the School of Music. I do want to point out that it isn't just music majors that are in those buildings. So I'm the director of music and general studies this semester. We have 2200 students that are in our buildings, so it's students from all over campus. That's why I asked if there was a chance of having it delayed one semester on behalf of the scheduling issues. If you're helping them out and can deal with that, that's great, but it is a massive number of students.

Shrivastav (00:52:44):

I think I won't speak for you, Mike or Andrea. I think technically it's feasible. Everything has a cost and I think it's the will of this group to decide when it is you want to do it. So I think procedurally, again, we need Rachel back. I think you would have to propose an amendment to modify the start date of this particular schedule. I guess it's not policy, so you don't really need an amendment per se, but we would probably need to do a vote on it. Do you see, other than classroom availability, is there another domino problem that you anticipate, Mike? Will it create problem potentially? I'm just putting it out there. It could impact first year seminars, it could impact the first year experience efforts, it could impact advising. I don't know. All of these things have domino effects that somebody will have to evaluate.

Carroll (00:53:49):

Yes, I think the primary impact is the closure of the buildings. We are working on assigning space for the fall of 24 right now, and it is one of the tightest semesters we've had in a long time. So it would have an impact there. Having this in there may loosen things up a bit, but it certainly is something we could put

off till fall of 24 when we were talking to EPC about this fall, spring of 25 was the earliest we thought we would be able to implement given the timing of passing this policy. So yes, we could do fall of 25 or fall of 25,

Shrivastav ([00:54:33](#)):

But remember it will come with the 200 plus faculty who don't have rooms. That issue will not go away. Elizabeth,

Housworth ([00:54:43](#)):

I'm sorry. I think that's just my point again that I'm not, so I understand that scheduling for everyone will be different, but I can't imagine how anybody's going to be helped when they've found a whole nother period for classes. That's got to allow more flexibility and more freedom and more ability to hold classes. So I understand that it's going to be very hard on all the scheduling officers, but they're going to give them a schedule based on their past spring, for the new spring. So there's the usual basis for a starting point and you've got more classroom space because they've shortened the passing period. So I am having a hard time understanding except for staff or faculty having a hard time adjusting to a new schedule, which they would have at any time. I don't see how the loss of rooms is helpful for anyone.

Shrivastav ([00:56:02](#)):

How are we doing on time?

Cook ([00:56:05](#)):

Is that better? Okay. Certainly lots of rooms is very difficult. I'm really speaking about the staff because we have limited staff. They already have. A really tough problem is if you get all of our music majors, plus the 2,200 I already mentioned is 3,800. It's huge. It's a staff issue. I'm speaking on behalf of the staff without asking them if they want me to, but I work with them quite often. Judah Cohen, maybe you have another idea about it or am I stating it the way you've heard it? Oh, okay. Okay. Alright. The answer is no, sorry, Judah, nothing personal. Okay. I'm sorry. I think that I have some support from over here that this is really a problem for our staff. So that's really where I'm coming from. I appreciate how it will loosen up the schedule for the students. I think that's great for faculty, but gosh, our staff are going to go crazy.

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

I mean, if I could just say so I actually think the concerns that I'm hearing are very real. I take them very seriously. I do think we have to make a decision because I think the reality is that, and you're very much doing your job right now by representing and giving voice to the concerns of the School of Music this year. It will be the school of Music. The next year it will be somebody else, which is somebody else's building will be taken offline and it will present a similar problem, not necessarily in the way it impacts music because of the very specific nature of music instruction. I understand that. I guess I would phrase the more general question for consideration in this way, which is how much lead time do we think it is reasonable to provide people to sort of implement a change of this sort?

([00:57:58](#)):

I could imagine, for example, an argument that just by virtue the way the academic year works generally it makes sense to provide an entire academic year's lead time rather than switching the calendar in the middle of the academic year. That to me would be, not that I think the concerns of the school of music

aren't relevant, but that to me would be an even stronger argument for delaying until the fall of 25 than citing the specific needs of a particular school with respect to a particular building. It's true, there are 3,800 students. There are also 40,000 students on campus who not just have bodily needs but literally can't take classes because we allow our scheduling to be determined in part by the preferences and needs of faculty. I mean, we have space. We don't have space at nine o'clock in the morning on Friday because nobody will teach then or actually a lot of people teach then a lot of people.

[\(00:58:53\)](#):

I take that back. I retract my insensitive mischaracterization of the commitment, but let me put it this way, fewer people are willing to teach at 9:00 AM on Friday than are eager to teach between one and two 15 on Tuesdays and Thursdays. And that's kind of our problem in some regard and it's a problem for us, but it's also a problem for our students who not just can't make it to the bathroom. They literally can't take classes because scheduled at the same time and that falls on us to fix. So whether we deal with it now or not, I would just say I wouldn't even, as much as I respect that, I wouldn't even necessarily think the strongest argument for delaying is articulating those concerns. It would be how much time do we need to give people effective lead time to adjust to this and to plan not just in our interest but our students' interests primarily.

Shrivastav [\(00:59:40\)](#):

Okay. Go ahead.

Thomassen [\(00:59:42\)](#):

Hi, thank you. Two things. First of all, I'm inclined to want to call the question because we do have an agenda, but I do want people to be able to discuss it, but I want to clarify something. My understanding was, and maybe I'm misinformed about this, I was here for the last reading of this. The first reading of it is we're already operating under a 20 minute passing period and the implementation of this, if I wasn't mistaken, and maybe I am, is that it's really a reconciling policy with what we're doing since campus is so big and students have to go very far and are scheduled back to back and some have need accommodation and so forth that it's not as dramatic a change compared to what we're doing now. Although we all are experiencing pressures for finding classrooms and so forth. I thought the point was very good about if not, it's your building now, it'll be your building next. We're all scheduled across campus everywhere for teaching, but is this not already what we're doing 20 minute passing period and there's one 25 minutes, sort of like a leap year passing period that can move between one.

Need [\(01:00:42\)](#):

There's a 20 minute passing periods for three day a week classes right now and half an hour for two day a week classes. So yes, part of campus is already operating under what we're talking about now, and the rest of campus would go from 30 to 20 with a couple 25's like we mentioned sprinkled in there. I just want to chime in with anecdotal. I mean, I think for every student who feels hurried, I've also heard from a couple students that just sit around in a building waiting for their next class and they would like to go to work sooner or do something else. So I think that there's always going to be that balance of what students want.

Shrivastav [\(01:01:28\)](#):

Okay. I think we've exhausted most questions. The perspectives have been heard, so let me call upon a vote. This comes from a committee, so I don't think it needs a second. Right. Again, we are missing a

parliamentarian, but I'm pretty sure that's the procedure. Alex is nodding, so I feel confident. So let me call on a vote to pass the motion as is. So this will reduce the passing period to 20 minutes, add a extra class hour, and this will go in effect spring of 2025. Correct. Okay. All in favor of that proposal, please raise your hands. We good? Okay. Motion passes. Thank you Mike and Andrea. Okay, next item is results from the long range planning survey on mediation and conflict management and updates from the Alternate resolution advisory committee, Lisa-Marie Napoli, Colleen Ryan, and Cate Reck.

Ryan ([01:02:40](#)):

Good afternoon everyone. I'm Colleen Ryan and I just want to give a little bit of background before we get to the results. This project, this charge was given to us in September by Vice Provost Carrie Docherty based on a need, and this has been ongoing over the course of several years, and information that we had from previous coach data, et cetera, the need to be more proactive and preemptive in our approach to being aware and effectively attending to issues and concerns of faculty where interpersonal and other forms of conflict are concerned. So our committee was charged with identifying strengths, opportunities, and challenges to better navigate conflict and recommend a structure for providing resources and support to faculty. Our goal is to have this happen in dialogue and collaboration to the extent possible with those resources and units that already exist.

([01:03:43](#)):

Next slide.

([01:03:45](#)):

So here on the next slide, you will see the members of the committee. We have been working twice a month since October, late September, early October, and we are in the process of concluding our work now. At the end of February, we will be handing a proposal to Vice Provost Dockerty and the committee members, as you can see, come from already entities on campus that are working in the support of faculty, faculty and students. Because some of times the conflicts cross borders with staff, faculty and students. So we have student affairs, for example, OIE represented Dean Henne-Ochoa, who represents diversity, equity, inclusion in the college, et cetera.

Napoli ([01:04:37](#)):

Great. So I'm Lisa-Marie, nice to be here and very grateful to be here, especially as we're wrapping this up. This is a great last chance to get more feedback, questions, clarity as we move forward with making recommendations. So one thing we learned early on to do this right and well, we needed to be sure we heard from the voices of faculty to figure out the needs that were happening, what conflicts are out there, what have they tried, what works, what doesn't work, all that good stuff. So we did that in a variety of ways. First, thanks to Cate's assistance especially, we did some research on Big 10 schools, looked at that, looked at what's working for them, some best practices, some examples, and that sort of thing. Then we've had a couple opportunities for faculty to chime in. First, when the announcement went out in October, there was a link for anonymous feedback.

([01:05:27](#)):

Then there was a specific survey that we co-created as a team, as a committee, and we sent that faculty wide across campus and that included SAA's and that was not super extensive, but it covered the bases. We needed to figure out what the information we were seeking. We've also had a series of focus groups. We've done that with the college's diversity chairs, thanks to Carmen, who's here with us who helped lead that conversation. Associate deans, graduate school representatives, and this Friday we're going to be meeting with the college's chairs and directors. So again, focus group time to get feedback

about listening to people, what's going on for you? What do you think we should be thinking about in this work? So the faculty survey that went out, I will turn to Cate to say more and a special thanks to Wen Qi, who's the director of faculty analytics. She was really instrumental in making and sending the survey and helping us get the data themes and understanding the data. So I'll pass it on to Cate. Thanks.

Reck (01:06:31):

Fantastic. So I'm going to go over the faculty survey results. There's a lot of results on the slides. I'm not expecting you to see and be able to read all of them, but I'd rather give you the data than tweak it too much so that you can't find what you're looking for. The survey was open for three weeks. It was sent to all IUB faculty, including SAA's, part-time adjuncts, postdocs and visiting faculty. So we tried to have a wide net. The response rate was about 13% and if you know anything about surveys, that's actually a pretty good result. We were happy with it, we were pleased. So here's the respondent demographics. We had a nice feedback from adjuncts, both tenure track and tenure track and about equal amounts and I was very pleased actually that 165 SAA's responded to the survey. So thank you.

(01:07:25):

Gender demographics, respondents with administrative responsibilities, years of service at IU, years of service at previous institutions, years of service at IU, the mean was 11, 12 years. So I think it was a nice representation of people who had been at IU for a bit. They knew how IU ran and actually could provide an opinion based on being here with some length of time. So like I said, I give you too much data and I know that already, but the reason I did this is when I'm showing you the questions, when did a very nice job of ranking the top five responses, but as you'll see the top five responses for each question, the next set of responses actually weren't that different in percentages. So sometimes it was just off by a few percentages. What types of conflicts or adversarial situations do you face or observe? Most frequently? We had 567 responses. You can look at them there. Interpersonal disputes and different kinds of flavors.

(01:08:31):

Let me see next slide. Promotion and tenure issues. Working as a committee, we were actually surprised, at least I'll speak for myself, we were kind of expecting more promotion and tenure disputes and there was actually more interpersonal disputes, so that will help us actually focus about how we address those types of issues. So I think this data is going to be very helpful. Have you personally used conflict management or mediation services on campus? 10% said yes. Where did you find or where did you use the conflict management? You can see 50% of the people have gone to OVPFAA or your department administration and then different kinds of levels for those who have not used conflict management or mediation support services, why not? And so it's nice to see that 30% of the people managed to resolve the conflict for themselves. What that might say to an individual is maybe we need to actually help more people learn how to resolve conflicts and maybe that could be something that goes to training in the future.

(01:09:41):

Good, great. Looking forward, what types of issues should i's new mediation and conflict management and support services address? So I think these answers harmonize with the first question. What problems did you have and yes, would you like us to help you address them? You can see, and again, I was frankly surprised, I hear more promotion and tenure issues than I hear interpersonal disputes, but to me the data clearly points to there's interpersonal disputes and we can actually work to help address that with the right support systems. Another thing I just want to point out is 50%, so again the top five, right? But workload issues were 50% of the respondents. So obviously there's work to do in that type of

situation and by the way, we can make all of these data available. It's just that I wanted to make sure that if something caught your eye, you'd be able to see it on the slide.

[\(01:10:41\)](#):

New resources might be housed in another of different institutional settings across the campus. Where would you like to go? Where do you feel comfortable going? So we asked this question and you can see the types of responses. What we took away from this was that the majority of people, respondents said that they wanted an independent unit that was not actually under the umbrella of another unit. We'll see what that looks like. We'll, part of the proposal, we don't know what that looks like yet. In an ideal world, what can best lead to healthy work relationships About five themes came out. I'm certainly not reading these to you, but I'll read you the themes. One theme was potentially create new procedures and processes for conflict management. And so I think we're actually doing that within respect of the BFC and actually tweaking some of the policies that we have and hopefully making progress there.

[\(01:11:34\)](#):

Theme two, establish a culture of communication and I think that the administration and I think a lot of us want to actually change culture on campus to have better communication. Theme three, improve administration and administrators. I think that I don't think any of these results are incredibly surprising. We did hear a lack of trust and confidence in the current administration. I'm not convinced that if we had given the survey five years ago, you would probably see very similar results. I don't think it has in my part I'm saying personally I think that this has nothing to do with current administration versus previous administrations. I think there's a natural divide between faculty and administrators and once you get to a position of being an administrator, which many of us have you felt that that divide yourself at some point in time. Theme four, face, structural, not personal challenges. So hopefully we can actually provide a structure that actually helps faculty come get help resolve conflicts and part of that will be recognizing and valuing the contributions for all individuals. Finally, theme five, improve overall campus climate sounds kind of redundant with one of the other themes through better policies and self-improvement. So that might be workshops that might be training that might be coming to your faculty meetings, etcetera. We definitely have a lot of work to do.

Napoli [\(01:13:04\)](#):

Okay, great. So in terms of just a big picture here to wrap up. Thank you so much Cate. That was such a great way to make succinct all the data that we were looking through. So the goal of this project obviously is to integrate all faculty perspectives and voices campuswide, which is a part of the reason why we're here to make sure perhaps it's on everybody's radars. If you have feedback questions, help us think this through. That's more than welcome and invited. Our next step will be of course I mentioned to meet with the chairs and directors of the college on Friday and then after that our team is meeting for one last power round, if you can put it that way. To wrap up what we've already started to write in terms of the recommendation report and making sure that we're integrating this last round of feedback that we hear. We hope to submit that to Vice Provost Docherty by the end of February and again, if you have any questions or we'd like to email us, please reach out and let us know. So I think for the moment that's all we have to present and we have some time I think maybe 15 minutes, 10, 15 minutes for comments, questions, thoughts from you all so we can pause and give you a moment to jump in if you'd like.

[\(01:14:20\)](#):

Shrivastav: Go ahead Alex.

Tanford ([01:14:23](#)):

I just want to respond a little bit to Cate's comment that suggested that had we done the survey five years ago, there might have been similar dissatisfaction with the administration because I've been here for 44 years and there's constantly been, nevertheless, we don't have that data and I think we should be cautious about underplaying. The possibility that this is identifying a current strain on the part of members of the university community, that is a little different and does reflect a bit of a distrust of the current administration in part because there's been such a complete turnover of people I think may be contributing to it and without suggesting that it is disproportionate or that it cannot be fixed. I do think that that coincides with what I have heard from people in my general role as campus ombuds, that there does seem to be a distrust of the current administration that exceeds anecdotally what I've seen in the past.

Reck ([01:15:46](#)):

If I may respond, I don't think there's any quantitative data when you're creating themes using keyword searches. So I don't know how to actually measure that. I was just stating my own personal opinion

Tanford ([01:15:58](#)):

And I don't disagree. Thank

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

You. Okay, others? Is this making sense to you all what we're doing and the direction we're moving in and okay, just checking in with that. You never know what silence means, so just checking in.

([01:16:18](#)):

Shrivastav: There's one more question from Colin.

Johnson ([01:16:21](#)):

It's just an observation and I just want to thank all

([01:16:26](#)):

Just a word of thanks for the work that you're doing on this and I will say Lisa-Marie and I had had conversations earlier. I think this is speaking to a particular need to address kind of conflict and strain and challenges that people face. I think the other side of this, and it's something that we're going to have to think about collectively, is there is the need to actively and intentionally go out of our way to create a positively inflected culture of knowing one another even more than we do. Putting stock in one another, not just as sort of experts in disciplines, but as colleagues across disciplinary divides. It's about creating a part of what we need to do is create a really vibrant civic culture that is kind of unique to our institution. I think that's a challenge that civil society faces generally. Now. I mean you deal with this all the time. You think about this all the time, but I don't think any conflict resolution mechanism is necessarily going to give us everything that we hope that it will if we can't simultaneously be proactively creating an environment, a work environment, an intellectual environment

([01:17:40](#)):

That is even more nourishing than the one that we have is. So I would just really encourage us as we're thinking about dealing with dispute, dealing with concerns, addressing those kinds of concerns to really focus on the other side of the equation because I think that that's ultimately part of also how you mitigate some of these kind of negative dimensions of people's experience of conflict. I don't know what

that looks like. We had talked about creating a kind of faculty forum, a practice. We may still do that, but I just want to thank you and say that I think that that's also a really important thing that has to be done intentionally.

Napoli ([01:18:20](#)):

Right. Thank you. Okay.

Reck ([01:18:23](#)):

I guess I'm sitting here digesting Alex's comment and maybe I just want to rephrase how my perspective is Cummings, an NTT faculty member. I've seen the same issues for 20 years that have been unresolved. So maybe I'm coming from maybe a different lens that everybody else is. The issues that I showed up to IU with are the same issues that many of my colleagues have today,

Shrivastav ([01:18:50](#)):

Elizabeth.

Housworth ([01:18:53](#)):

So I don't remember all the slides, but I think there was one that suggested a role for the chair and I think I would not recommend putting more on the chair at this moment because all the chairs feel greatly overwhelmed by needing to meet with every faculty member in their department and every staff member in their department and things like that. I also think that it makes clear the percentages here that a fair amount of this is actually conflict with the chair so that an external person who is trained rather than trying to change all the train, all the chairs to deal with conflict, an external person in an independent office who is trained to deal with conflict might be the best solution and would also lift the burden from the chair.

Napoli ([01:19:56](#)):

Go ahead Lisa. So just to clarify, so the piece about the chairs and directors was that we're going to be attending the meeting anyway so it's not extra for sure, not an added burden. Yes, and I think for the chairs it would be an opportunity that I know a lot of them would welcome. In terms of professional development, there's a craving and a seeking from what I hear from a lot of the chairs. I've been attending chairs and directors meetings for five years now and that's certainly prominent I think by and large, but yes, not to overburden is well taken.

Shrivastav ([01:20:30](#)):

Any other questions? Seeing none. Let's move on to the next item. Thank you again, Lisa and Colleen, please if you have other thoughts or suggestions, please send it to them over email. The next item is proposed changes to BL-ACA-16, that's creation, reorganization, elimination and merger of academic units and programs. Alex Tanford, co-chair of CREM committee will present. By the way, this is the second reading also. It's still a discussion

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

Item. No. Yeah, well no, this is at the discussion of the executive committee. This is now a revised first reading. It's not an action item

Shrivastav (01:21:12):

Revised first reading, so it's not an action item yet.

Tanford (01:21:15):

Okay. Here's what in back in November, which seems stages ago, the committee brought a proposal to substantially revise our campus policy on faculty involvement in the reorganization of academic units and programs for discussion. Quick refresher. The basic proposal that we brought was to simplify and streamline our current process so that it consists of proposals running through the provost office where they arise anyway. Then a collaborative effort between the provost and the executive committee that forms a review committee to look at the proposal which has the right people on it and the right expertise to do so. That review committee coordinates discussions with and feedback from the affected units and then proposes a, it comes up with a final recommendation proposal, which goes to the provost for implementation with a bunch of escape hatches along the way for what happens if things start going wrong, which could happen since November.

(01:22:37):

This is what we have done. It was obviously the program was discussed at the November meeting. A draft from November was circulated to the faculty, the elected policy committees at all academic units asked to risk. Some academic units still appear not to have an official faculty policy committee, so it was the one that everyone that we could identify. I thank David Taylor in the faculty council office for doing that work. That legwork and a number of them actually sent me feedback. A number of them also ignored me. Then we with the nominations committee, the executive committee added new members to the CREM committee to give it more campus-wide diversity and there's the list. They were from the English public health, optometry, anthropology, physics, education, and of course Judah Cohen who is in music and the college and our liaison to the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs. This committee met several times and came up with proposed revisions to the revised policy, which we presented in November.

(01:24:05):

What I'm going to do is go through the changes that we have come up with over the last couple of months based on the feedback we have received, and I'm going to first blow fairly quickly through just to mention those that I think are innocuous and then I will back up to those that I think are more substantive and might warrant discussion. This is an attempt to sort of streamline this process. I do not mean by that to cut off any discussion that anybody wants to do over any of the red proposed changes or any of the text that we didn't change. Alright. It is our anticipation based on what discussion today is that we will bring this back for hopefully the next meeting as an official motion to amend the policy and then we will discuss with the parliamentarian whether that should be presented as one thing or over two anyway innocuous the different academic units of the university rather than on the campus thinking of Kinsey for example, if it moves off the campus.

(01:25:31):

Somebody pointed out, we forgot to mention merger, so we added that in. What it doesn't apply to. Again, we realized there's both a university and a campus policy on restructuring that is required because of financial crisis. This doesn't apply to that. It just adds that language, which then we may want to come back to this if anybody wants to. There was a question about how to define when a reorganization proposal affects schools within the college and whether those when that is a campus concern and when it's just a college concern, and we did this with an attempt to add even if it seems to be just within the college, if the reorganization will affect departments, programs or academic

appointments from units outside the college, then it is covered. We're not entirely happy with that language, but it was sort of the best we could come up with then no changes. Then the proposal was to add to make clear that the guiding, the main guiding principle behind this is collaboration between faculty and administration.

[\(01:27:04\)](#):

Then no changes to a lot of the stuff which was basically just copied over from the existing program. Then there wasn't a clear definition. This is what I'm going to come back to, what is an affected unit? Because the policy is triggered when and the roles, the people who have to be involved, the faculty have to be involved, are affected units, and I want to come back to that definition. We added that then at the suggestion of the Luddy school, which of course concerns with data, they thought this should be a written proposal, which is included somewhere in the permanent records of the BFC, so we added that. Now this one again is a fairly, is a more complicated, it's how we comprise the review committee. I want to come back to that, and this was just provost selects the chair that's agreed on by the provost and the executive committee.

[\(01:28:17\)](#):

It made clear somewhere else in there there shouldn't be any member of the committee that is opposed by either the administration or the faculty. It just clarified that and then we added a definition to eligible faculty. I think this is not controversial, it wasn't in the original policy and it simply says that eligible faculty means academic appointees eligible to vote on unit policies as defined by the unit. We didn't want to get into. It wasn't up to us. We thought as a committee or as the BFC to dictate who gets to vote on a unit policy. When it comes back to the definition of units, there at least in the past have been faculty members who have a true joint appointments. They're halftime in one unit and halftime in another. There at least historically have been some that are halftime on the Bloomington campus and halftime on the IUPUI campus. Anyway, we just kicked that down to the unit to make that decision.

[\(01:29:29\)](#):

31-B I want to come back to that's basically thinking about whether there are circumstances under which a proposal should be killed, and if so, it combines to the next provision. If there is who and wonder what circumstances, where does the authority lie to say this proposal just has so little faculty support that it should not proceed and how that gets phrased. Then we get just into the definitions. Okay. Then to go back to, I will slow down. The first one was the affected unit. You don't have to read that. You can read that for yourselves.

[\(01:30:25\)](#):

The eliminated reorganization merged the unit itself or which, and again, this language in which you take programs resource and stuff out of one unit and put it into another, but then the question came up, who's an affected unit? If the proposal is to create an entirely new campus unit from scratch and there is no existing campus academic program or unit that'll be affected by it, but it will involve new things. In which case the affected unit for discussion voting purposes is the Bloomington Faculty Council, which is the broadly representative body of all the units on campus. So that is one that people may want to discuss. That's sort of a new idea.

[\(01:31:19\)](#):

Then what the committee, the makeup of the committee, we thought there was no particular controversy over including both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty. On the faculty part, there was some question about how to phrase that the faculty should have equal membership to the administration on this committee. We settled on the language after some discussion about

approximately half, and the reason for that goes down to number four. We could imagine with small units, a committee of 10 people made up essentially of four under our policy, four administrators, four faculty members, one student representative, and one staff representative. That's a 10 person committee. Even the faculty is only four people, but that seemed approximately half under those circumstances. So we left it a bit vague since we thought that each committee, one of the advantages of eliminating the standing CREM committee, which we do is to allow is that every one of these situations is going to be unique and how you construct an appropriate committee, who's on it, how many people is going to differ for each review committee. So we left it as approximately half and then the one quirk down in three, we changed at least one representative of the undergraduate graduate students and staff to one or more to avoid the reading that you had to have three, you had to have one undergraduate, one graduate, and one staff member in part because there are units on campus that don't have any undergraduates, including some of the professional schools like the law school doesn't.

[\(01:33:45\):](#)

So again, and then we had a long discussion on whether what the minimum numbers should be on the committee and we ended up believing that it should be 10 that gives enough representation to everyone and allows it to be diverse and means that in sort of small reorganizations, that committee can be kept small and nimble. But we kept to the existing maximum of 25, which is in the current policy really, which would be for large reorganizations that affect multiple units. Then eligible faculty, we talked about that. Okay. Then 31 and 32, this is what we came up with. The what happens if the proposal runs into resistance, lack of support from the very faculty, were going to have to operate under it. And one of the reasons we revise this policy is the current policy then provides for an endless loop, an endless loop of revise and resubmit.

[\(01:35:04\):](#)

For those of us who've gone through that with journals, that's no fun and it kind of didn't have a way out. And so this says, this then says you can either revise and resubmit it. You sit down and talk about it whether you think there's any reason to do so, and if the nature of the opposition is sufficiently strong, then the committee can say it's not worth the revise and resubmit. We recommend that the proposal not proceed and it changes made a shall to force the committee to do one thing or another, make a decision.

[\(01:35:38\):](#)

And then the question is, suppose the committee recommends that it not proceed, and there was a lot of discussion on whether the policy should mandate to the extent that we are able to do so that the provost not proceed with a reorganization proposal if it is failed to receive support either from the units or from the review committee. I mean a review committee could say, we propose that this should go forward even though there's opposition from the units because the opposition from the units are a handful of old curmudgeon professors who just don't want to change and lots of other constituencies think this is a good way to go forward. But if no one wants to do it, then the question is whether it should require the provost recognizing that we can be out voted by the trustees to not implement it unless we are in one of these university or campus financial crises that requires the provost and a financial crisis committee to make hard decisions. So those are the changes open. I yield back to the

Shrivastav [\(01:37:02\):](#)

Thank you, Alex. It's open for discussion and Danielle can't wait to speak up.

DeSawal [\(01:37:09\):](#)

Thank you, provost. One of the things I want to remind the council of is that this is a completely new policy, so this is a little bit more complicated than just us reviewing this at the moment and the edits that came in. So currently CREM is a committee that is within the bylaws of the council, which means that there's a request for thinking about removing that and doing it more of kind of as needed. So there are multiple parts to this that need to be considered, but I would encourage everyone to remember that what we're looking at today is actually an entire discussion of the entire document and not just the redlined components and that there are implications for the structure of this in regards to how the council is currently structured, which also will then result in depending on what we choose to do, a potential change to our bylaws. So I just wanted to clarify that just so folks knew where we were. Thank you.

Tanford ([01:38:17](#)):

Yeah, I want to reiterate strongly what Danielle said. What we did last time was not only did you have our proposal, but you had 30 pages of background documents and memos that's missing this time. We just want to refine our proposal. Then it will come to you as a proposal with that full background document that includes several charts about what the current policy is, why we think it needs to be changed, and how the various provisions are going to go. So yeah, this is just want to reiterate what Danielle said, and this is a fluid process that will come as a proposal when the committee and the executive committee thinks that it is ready to do so.

([01:39:07](#)):

Shrivastav: Elizabeth,

Housworth ([01:39:10](#)):

So currently the college is the only school with schools within the school, but that may not always be the case, and you might think about trying to make this proposal universal. So if the business school decides to have schools within the school or Luddy decides to have schools within the school or music has schools within the school that it would equally apply to them and the use of the word college in 3B, it means that the proposal would have to be modified if any school decided to go to a model with schools within schools, and I assume that business could have schools within schools without invoking this policy because that would be a reorganization within business.

([01:40:11](#)):

I'm also a bit troubled with the language about approximately half being faculty. So I understand that you want flexibility and I do not have a concrete recommendation at this second, but that sounds really a little bit too vague. It's true that the BFC executive committee and the provost has to agree, so it retains all that flexibility, but I think I would might say at least half so that it could be a lot more than half or at least 40% if that's what you're imagining. But that worries me. I also am, so somebody who is more proficient at English grammar than I am can look at three and when it says one, so if we scratch the or more, it says one representative of the undergraduate students, the graduate students and the staff, and I'm not sure whether that's an implied one each or whether it's one from the collective and what you meant was one from the collective. So I would think about that just a little

Tanford ([01:41:50](#)):

As a person who's also not necessarily provisionally. The idea was again, flexibility in some units there in a big unit, there may be lots of undergraduates, lots of graduates, lots of staff in some, there may be no

Housworth (01:42:10):

Undergraduate staff. I completely understand the intent. My question is whether does the English there reflect the intent or does the English need to be modified so that the intent is clear?

Tanford (01:42:23):

We did have one member of the English department on our committee, but anyone who thinks

Anderson (01:42:26):

I'll out myself right here speaking for somebody who was supposed to understand grammar just a little bit, it's kind of bad. We can fix that.

Tanford (01:42:34):

Send me, we will flag this. We will flag this for our next committee discussion and I'll point Dana as a committee of one to try and come up with a better language.

(01:42:46):

Shrivastav: Yes Kate.

Reck (01:42:49):

So during your discussions, was there any conversation about affected family, affected faculty being outside of the department? So I teach in a department where we have a lot of service for other departments. So God forbid something happened to chemistry, but we would actually be affecting a lot of other departments. And so was there any discussion in that kind of way about what it means to be an affected department or affected faculty to that department?

Tanford (01:43:24):

We addressed, only affected faculty, not we felt whether affected department from an administrator standpoint was kind of not our jurisdiction and so I don't know, maybe we should rethink that, but that was the idea was to define affected unit, which has to do with faculty who, and again, there are courtesy appointments all over the campus of people who are listed on the department's website who aren't even aware that they're listed. And then there are faculty who really, that it really is through research and teaching and cross-listed courses and things have where a course, a program in one unit really does affect faculty in more than one unit. And the best we could do with that basically was to say there has to be an initial discussion between the provost and the executive committee on whether this proposal and Kinsey is a perfect example of that, whether this except it hadn't been taken out of our hands by the trustees, but it's a perfect example of whether it involves faculty from more than one unit.

Johnson (01:45:00):

I'm wondering, Alex, if you could talk a little bit about the role of deans in this process as it's been reconceived. I am generally not particularly sympathetic to the whining of deans about their lack of power given their own belief about the amount of power that they have in other circumstances. But I have in fact heard concerns expressed by some people in those positions about the fact that this essentially becomes a conversation between the provost and the faculty council and that the deans themselves are not specifically implicated in any procedural way in discussions about this and on some level, but I do think I do hear their concerns and I can imagine a circumstance where, for example, a

dean of a school would be very concerned about these things happening and them not necessarily needing to be involved in any procedurally irregular way. In that discussion,

Tanford ([01:45:56](#)):

Easy, we gave that decision to the provost. If you look at two there, additional members selected the roles in consultation with the deans, but this proposal assumes throughout it a good provost basically, and the previous one was written at a time when I think a substantial number, the faculty distrusted the provost in some ways and wanted to diminish the provost power. I assume when we assume in this that the provost is the one who's in regular discussion with the deans, and if the deans are upset, that's the provost problem, not ours. A more interesting question, which you raised that we didn't is what about department chairs? We didn't include a particular role for a department chair on the grounds that chairs don't chair a unit or a program programs chair had led by directors. Units are led by deans. So if anybody has thoughts about whether there should be a role for the chairs, we have a chair here. In fact, most people in this room have been a chair at some point or other, so we didn't do that.

([01:47:26](#)):

Shrivastav: Elizabeth,

Housworth ([01:47:29](#)):

That brings up a couple more interesting points. The way this is structured, the committee has a maximum of 25 members so that the BFC could potentially hamstring the provost from appointing additional members by packing the committee with 25. Another point somewhat is what if faculty were the initiators of one of these propose proposed mergers or separations like say the Department of Statistics wanted to run over to another school or something. You might think through that scenario and the business about whether half the committee, only half the committee should include faculty or more if a proposal came from the faculty. And finally, if this is all reliant on having a good provost, we have a ton of policies where the result is advisory to the provost. For instance, the Faculty Misconduct Review Committee is simply advisory to the provost. Why is this one dictating what the provost can do besides the fact that many years ago people were very upset with a former provost because of a bunch of reorganizations and mergers.

Tanford ([01:49:13](#)):

The single biggest piece of feedback that we got from the policy units, from people who just emailed me randomly from our discussions was the reason for adding 34. The committee did not add it themselves the first time through for the very reasons that you suggested. We use the model. We use what I call the been here too long realist model, which is we can make things mandatory to a blue in the face. And then fact, what we do is advisory. And what we hope for is that we have a good relationship with the provost and the president and the trustees, so they listen to us and that therefore making things mandatory on the provost host, I'm skeptical of, but it was strongly supported by the people who commented and asked for revision and ask that it be strengthened.

([01:50:16](#)):

Shrivastav: Israel

Herrera ([01:50:19](#)):

Yeah. Thank you Alex for bringing this and working on this. I have some questions regarding a number 23 and 25, and the first one would be the 23-C1 with the replacement of or inclusion of the word

appropriate, appropriate faculty. What do we mean with appropriate faculty? That's one. And number two, I see maybe on the document that you sent that I saw two and there is a symbol, I don't know if it's just a typo or in the document that we receive, but I can see there that there is not that symbol like a plus or a cross. I don't know if that means something. And also number 25-E, what it says the committee chair shall be agree on by the provost and the executive committee. I don't know. In other words, who's going to propose the chair and then who's going to agree, who's going to initiate this name and then who's going to second?

[\(01:51:37\)](#):

And also, I don't know if there could be or if this is the time for maybe a friendly amendment because we are including non-tenure track faculty in the process. And as you said, some units might have less entities and other units. Some units might have 15 or 20 lectures or clinical professors. And I wonder if there is room for having the company share or co-chairs slash co-chairs in the case that the situation for the unit is made of too many lectures who they have or to know about the roles they are going to perform after the elimination of the merger.

Tanford [\(01:52:29\)](#):

A couple of things. One, if you look at procedure, a paragraph 21, it says whoever initiates the proposal, it lands initially on the provost's desk and the provost talks to the president and the trustees and whatever it does to decide. I mean the faculty come forward and say, if we can do this higher proposal, let's break up the college into smaller units. I think it has become too big. Let's do signs. Let's do STEM in one side. Let's do arts and humanities in one side. Let's make Luger and the media school separate units. That's a perfectly sensible, I mean, you could imagine a group of faculty coming up with that policy, but it is going to go on their provost desk and it's not going to go anywhere if there's not some administrative support for the idea. So that's why in answer to your question about who comes forward, who drafts the proposal is the provost is responsible for sort of creating the proposal, bringing it to the executive committee with a proposal, with a proposal for how the committee should be comprised and who should be its chair. That's what the administration is good at, is that kind of organization. And then it's, as you put it, the executive committee that would discuss and agree. The second question about the tenure and non-tenure track faculty, it works both ways. For example, there is no tenure track faculty member at the Kinsey Institute. They're all ntt's.

[\(01:54:17\)](#):

So I would want to give the provost and the executive committee the authority, the discretion to decide given that how many ntt's, whether they're also tenure track faculty from other units whose research interests, teaching interests in gender studies, for example, whose research interests overlap with the Kinsey Institute. So that's why we didn't think we were scared to death about trying to micromanage the makeup of individual committees. And so that's why it is vague as to tenure and non-tenure track.

Shrivastav [\(01:55:04\)](#):

Thank you, Alex. We are running out of time, so I will close the discussion here. This is the first reading, so there's plenty of time for feedback. But in the 90 seconds or so, I do want to sort of frame this discussion. This is really critical and I think shared governance is really important, but there are two ways to approach the challenges around any reorganization at any level. One is to say, we will do our best to maintain status quo until we hit financial exigency. The other is to say we will do our best to change in a productive way so no individual is harmed. So we never reach financial exigency, and those are philosophical ways to approach this policy and discussions around it. This is a time of great change in

higher education. We are not immune to those same challenges every week. Arizona, if you've followed the news Penn State, over a hundred million dollars.

[\(01:56:04\)](#):

Chicago came out just last week. Rutgers, New Hampshire, Nebraska, dozens of schools are having between 50, 100, 150 million in cuts over the next few years. If we are too rigid in our approach, we will be in a position where our backs are against the wall and we have no choice but to make the hard decisions because the financial exigencies already there. If we have a framework and leadership like you all that tries to stay ahead of the curve and not be afraid to make changes that prevent a financial exigency, then we will come out as winners. So as you think about this and other policies, I hope you keep that in mind. Don't be afraid to make a change, but be very cognizant of making sure individuals and the work remains protected. Thank you again, Alex.

Tanford [\(01:57:09\)](#):

Yeah, just want to say, feel free to send additional comments to me or any other member of the committee. We're all listed on the BFC website.

Shrivastav [\(01:57:17\)](#):

Thank you with that, right at four 30, I call the meeting adjourned. Thank you.