Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
November 14, 2023 | 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Presidents Hall – Franklin Hall

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ahlbrand, Ashley; Anderson, Dana; Asher, Sofiya; Bridges, Chandler; Brinda, Chelsea; Buggenhagen, Beth; Butters, Rebecca; Cavar, Damir; Chen, Xin; Daleke, David; Dau-Schmidt, Kenneth; Dekydtspotter, Lori; DeMaine, Susan; 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; Loring, Annette; Mather, Tim; McCoy, Chase; Michaelson, Jonathan; Northcutt Bohmert, Miriam; Paschal, Joshua; Ramos, William; Reck, Cathrine; Sapp, Christopher; Sela, Ron; Shrivastav, Rahul; Silvester, Katie; Sinadinos, Alison; Tanford, Alex; Thomassen, Lisa; Torres, Vasti; Tracey, Dan; van der Elst, Louis; Walton, Christi; Wyrczynski, Stephen

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bala, Hillol; Cohen, Rachel; Cole, Shu; Dalkilic, Mehmet; Koda, Marsha; Lion, Margaret; Lochmiller, Chad; O'Brien, Travis; Perry, Brea; Raji, Aaliyah; Raymond, Angie; Rutkowski, Leslie; Siek, Jeremy; Terry, Herbert; White, Tameka; Whitworth, Cale

GUESTS: Chan, Thomas; Gayer, Jamie; Lee, Eunice; Paul, Logan; Ryan, Colleen; Waller, Matt

Agenda

1. **Approval of the minutes of October 3, 2023**
2. **Memorial Resolution for Rudolf Raff**
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. **Updates on Faculty-activity Reporting Tools** (15 minutes)
   Carrie Docherty, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs
   Logan Paul, Co-chair, Technology Policy Committee
7. **Questions/Comments on Faculty-activity Reporting Tools** (10 minutes)

8. **Proposed Changes to BL-ACA-D16: Creation, Reorganization, Elimination, and Merger of Academic Units and Programs** (15 minutes)
   Alex Tanford, Co-chair, CREM Committee
   Sena Durguner, Co-chair, CREM Committee
   [Discussion Item]

Transcript

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

Good afternoon. Good afternoon everyone. I'm advised we have quorum and it is 2:31, so let's get this meeting started as we always do. Let's begin by a approval of the minutes of the October 3rd meeting. Anybody willing to call for a motion? Yes, we have somebody seconding it. Hopefully we've got Elizabeth all in favor of accepting the minutes as written. Looks like we have a majority of the hands met when its are approved. We will begin today's meeting with a memorial resolution for our colleague Rudolph Raff, and it'll be Carrie Docherty who switched seats on me reading that out. Carrie.

Docherty ([00:01:02](#)):

Thank you Rudy Raff recognized internationally for his groundbreaking work on the evolution of orgasmal development and as one of the founders of evolutionary developmental biology retired from the Department of Biology on January 31st, 2018, the same department where he began his long and accomplished career as an assistant professor in 1971. Rudy was born in 1941 in Canada, in Quebec City to his mother, the daughter of a local physician, and his father a Palmer chemist with a PhD from the University of Vienna. In 1959, Rudy attended Penn State University enrolling in the Navy reserve officer training corpse. During this time, Rudy's fascination with all things biological blossomed, searching and collecting, rearing and observing everything that slithered jumped or swam. Dragonflies in particular became an object of affection. Upon graduating from college, Rudy started graduate school at Duke University, a move that was to bring about a foundational change in his life. Chief among these changes was meeting his wife, co adventurer and closest colleague Beth herself, a professor emeriti of biology at Indiana University Bloomington. He also completed his PhD in biochemistry on bacterial surface proteins In the process, finding himself drifting closer towards questions, focusing on evolutionary origins and transitions. Rudy transitioned to a second postdoctoral position in 1969 at Massachusetts Institute of Technology under Bill Gross beginning his deep journey into the nature of developmental.

([00:03:02](#)):

Rudy published three highly influential books in the process of his time and founded the flagship journal Evolution and Development of which he was a longtime editor in chief. Evo Divo is now thanks to Rudy's work among the most vibrant biological disciplines, complete with conferences, societies, and dedicated funding panels. Rudy received numerous awards and honors including the inaugural Pioneer Award of the Pan-American Society of Evolutionary Development Biology. Rudy's interest expanded yet again later in his career to include microbiological processes that underlie foscolization, but also the role that science plays in society and increasing threats science faces. His busy research slowed down, however, only when he was out in nature, whether it be far away as Australia or nearby in Griffith Lake Nature Preserve. Rudy was a wonderful colleague, a friend and a mentor to many of us at IU, and he was vital to the growth and success of the department over the last half century.

Shrivastav ([00:04:19](#)):

Thank you, Carrie. If you're able, please stand for a moment to silence. Thank you. I now invite executive committee business from Colin Johnson, president of BFC Faculty President.

Johnson ([00:04:49](#)):

Thank you. Good afternoon everyone. It's lovely to see you. So at this point it's been more than a month since we last convened, which makes it especially nice to be together again. Obviously a great deal has happened in the interim in the world and also at the university level on the campus. So I'd like to begin my report today by providing a brief updates on two specific matters. First, the business that was conducted at the first formal meeting of the university faculty council, which took place in Indianapolis on October 31st and also the executive committee's involvement and thinking about the recent controversy surrounding the Kinsey Institute, which I will also address. I'm sure provost, Shrivastav will also be talking about that where the UFC meeting is concerned. I'm pleased to report that the council was able to attend to a number of matters of university-wide importance, including officially approving a set of long overdue revised survey questions to be used in the review of core school deans an exercise that will be replicating this afternoon in this with respect to campus dean, the approval of an official charge for a probably equally overdue university level task force to consider the implications of generative AI's newly apparent arrival in our lives as both a powerful challenge and a powerful tool and a robust discussion of the penultimate draft of a newly revised and refined policy related to employee relationships involving students.

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

A slightly revised version of which this body will have the opportunity to learn more about and discuss this afternoon. I will say for those of you who haven't participated on the university faculty council before, have never had the pleasure of being involved in those meetings. It's always I think a lovely experience to have the opportunity to see our colleagues from other campuses and to convene with 'em and to be reminded of the fact that for all the specificities and differences of the different campuses that make up Indiana University, we share an enormous amount in common. And I will say that for my own purposes, I enjoy that experience and I'm always reminded at UFC meetings of just how many wonderful colleagues we have throughout the state and reminded of just how many opportunities we really have to expand our network of colleagues and collaborators and just friends throughout the state and I would really encourage us to think more about ways to do that because I know they're very eager to collaborate with us on a number of levels where the second matter is concerned. The Kinsey Institute, I want to provide a version of the set of comments that I provided that I made at the trustees meeting last Friday on our collective behalf and then I'll say just a few words about that. I think it's important for people to understand where that stands.

([00:07:48](#)):

As you know, news of the administration's plan to respond to legislation passed at the end of last year's session of the General Assembly by proposing a legal separation of part of the Kinsey Institute from the university became public or rather pseudo public at the end of October when Provost Shrivastav convened a meeting with the faculty and staff closely associated with the Kinsey Institute. It is important to note, I think that to our knowledge that meeting was not originally planned as part of the procedural lead up to the proposal being brought before the trustees. Rather it happened in direct response to the urging of members of the executive committee, the Bloomington Faculty Council who first learned the proposal just a few days earlier after a conversation with the Kinsey Institute's executive director Justin Garcia.

([00:08:35](#)):

Since that time or immediately after that, as soon as news of that became public or again pseudo public, the office of the Bloomington Faculty Council was flooded with communications from numerous individuals and groups expressing grave concerns about the proposal as they understood it based on the information that had been made available thus far, the trustees were CC'd on many of these communications as well. These communications included letters of various lengths from individual students, faculty, staff, alumni, longtime donors and other friends of the university, a collectively authored letter supported by the institute supporting the institute signed by several hundred faculty, another signed by several hundred students noting Kinsey's signal importance in drawing them to Indiana University. Letters from numerous professional organizations including the 100 plus member strong concern scientists at IU and the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality and a change.org position. I haven't looked at it recently, but that had garnered nearly 8,000 signatures from around the world as of the morning of the trustees meeting last Friday.

([00:09:39](#)):

In almost every case, the individuals and groups who reached out to the Bloomington Faculty Council questioned the necessity of the action being contemplated at that time. Its wisdom, its import as an indicator of the institution seemingly evolving values relative to what those values have been known to be for three quarters of a century and its general functionality given what struck many, whether fairly or unfairly as an uncharacteristically weak willingness or weak response in the part of leaders of the institution to accede quietly, or sorry, an uncharacteristic willingness in the part of leaders of the institution to accede quietly to a direct attack on one of the most widely recognized, highly respected scholarly entities in the world, not to mention the bedrock principle of academic freedom itself. I am pleased to report if you have not already learned of this, that the trustees in their wisdom decided to table the motion to authorize exploration of a possible partial separation of the institute until their next meeting in February in order to allow more time for exploration of the relevant issues and frankly more time for robust consultation with various stakeholders including crucially faculty and staff who are directly affiliated with it.

([00:10:51](#)):

I am also pleased to report that both President Whitten and chair of the board of trustees Quinn Buckner made statements reaffirming publicly their commitment to and support of the Kinsey Institute and signaling their eagerness to work with various stakeholder groups to develop a long-term solution for responding to the recently passed legislation that will ensure Kinsey's continued viability for decades to come.

([00:11:15](#)):

I just want to take an opportunity to say, and I would add Provost Shrivastav list of people who have made public statements. I think sincere statements supporting the Kinsey Institute and recognizing its signal importance not just to Indiana University but really to the world of scholarly thought and genuinely significant scholarly inquiry. I do think that this incident and Provost Shrivastav will have an opportunity to talk about it. As I said to the trustees, I think reasonable people can reasonably and constructively disagree about the best approach that needs to be taken in order to defend the Kinsey Institute. I think the episode itself points to a bigger problem or challenge we have, which is we obviously we live in very complicated times. The university is under considerable pressure from external forces. It is essential I think that we work together and that we actively and intentionally foster a culture of trust and collaboration amongst ourselves as faculty and also between the faculty and the administration. I work very closely with Provost Shrivastav. I think we have a very good working relationship. I think anyone who knows me also knows, and you can agree with this or disagree with this, I am not a shrinking violet and I'm not known for holding my tongue in terms of expressing concerns on your behalf as faculty to the provost. Yes, confirmation,

Shrivastav ([00:12:50](#)):

Holding the tongue part. Absolutely.

Johnson ([00:12:51](#)):

So there you go, and it's a trick question if he said yes, I just do it more, but anyway, or if he said that I did, I just do it more. But I genuinely believe that there is a commitment on the part of the institution to defending the institute. I also genuinely believe that this episode in our institutional history and kind of the unfolding of this makes more clear than ever the importance of consultation, collaboration, working together and doing so in a kind of explicit intentional way. I'm committed to doing that. I believe pro Provost Shrivastav is committed to doing that, but it can't be taken for granted. It's something we all have to kind of work towards. So I'm calling on us collectively to do that intentionally and with a sense of kind of generosity and I'm certainly calling on the administration to continue to engage with us in that spirit as well and the proof will be in the pudding in terms of how we proceed.

([00:13:45](#)):

I do believe that we come up with better solutions to problems when we work together and have trust and faith in one another's intentions and we really need where this matters is concerned, but I would say all matters to proceed in that spirit. So anyway, so we have some time to do that. There are two other issues that I wanted to address. Just updates from the executive committee that are actually findings that were returned to the executive committee on behalf of the Faculty Affairs committee who received a number of questions and proposals at the beginning of the year. They've been hard at work. One of them has to do with a proposal that was put to the Faculty Affairs Committee to investigate or a charge that was put to the Faculty Affairs Committee to investigate the program of professional leaves or what are referred to in university level policy as sabbatical like leaves, which I think is kind of the most awkward formulation I've ever heard in my life.

([00:14:48](#)):

But nonetheless, that's language that we use for NTT faculty. I know this was a matter that the Faculty Affairs Committee considered very carefully. Their finding was that first of all, it is in fact a crucially important issue and one that we have to sort of think closely about and think in a forward looking way, particularly because of the fact that this body and this institution has made new and I think long overdue investments in ensuring that our NTT colleagues are fully enfranchised like members of this community,

that their work is recognized and that their many contributions and their potential for contribution is fully supported by the institution. FACT did recommend however, that the move to try to expand the opportunities for NTT faculty to pursue sabbatical like leaves its assessment was that this would probably be done most effectively at the level of school policy committees and there's a reason for that.

([00:15:50](#)):

For those of you who are unaware, and particularly for deans and school policy committees who are unaware, there is existing language in university level policy, specifically it's university level policy ACA-47 section G4 that reads as follows. Although this is the policy on sabbaticals, although not part of the university's sabbatical leave program, units are encouraged to provide sabbatical like leaves for non-tenure track faculty for professional development. There is no campus level policy to our knowledge that actually elaborates on the provisions regarding leave eligibility and the specifics of leave policy at the campus level. That is done at the level of the schools. It is done at the level of the schools for tenure track faculty in every case tenure track faculty who are applying for sabbaticals have to put in a proposal to pursue sabbaticals. They're not just granted those things or guaranteed them.

([00:16:51](#)):

Different schools have different kind of constraints that limit their ability to grant sabbatical, leave applications precisely when people want them. There is a process. Some schools also have policies or practices in place that already facilitate sabbatical like leaves for NTT colleagues. Some do not. And so this is an area where I think the faculty affairs committee's finding was that while there may come a time where it makes sense to try to generate some campus level policy, the reality is access to all of these resources for professional development, for tenure track faculty and non-tenure track faculty are always circumstantially specific to the unit and that for a campus level policy to actually have a chance of passing and have a chance of transforming the culture at this institution to allow projects and the aspirations of our NTT colleagues to really garner that kind of support that we would really need to build a base of support, work out the details at the school level, and then we could kind of capture that spirit at the campus level and enshrine it.

([00:17:59](#)):

So that was their recommendation and I will be communicating to the deans of the schools and the chairs of the policy committees reminding them of the fact that there is actually an explicit request at the level of university policy for these sorts of leaves to be encouraged and to be facilitated, not just to be tolerated or to be categorically denied. Any move in this direction will require efforts on the part of those schools. It will require management of resources, it will require intentionality, but I think it's the logical next step in terms of creating opportunities for our NTT colleagues to really make the fullest range of contributions that they can make. So that was fact finding and it was the executive committee's belief that that was actually sort of the appropriate next step in terms of trying to push this initiative forward. The second issue that was brought to the executive committee was a request for the EC to consider the adoption of gender neutral language where the designation of where the emeritus designation is concerned.

([00:19:05](#)):

I'm not a classist, but I know enough about Latin to know that it is a deeply gendered language and that we live in an era where people are becoming rightfully sort of self-reflective about the importance of that fact considered this request and agreed that this was an important consideration and one that was worthy of further exploration. But because title designations are actually controlled in many cases by university level policy, not campus level policy, we decided that it was an issue that would need to be pushed up to the university faculty council for consideration and we fully intend to do that. I will say that

kind of on a provisional level, their finding was, and I think University of Wisconsin just went through this, that we ultimately believe ultimately that when people achieve emeritus status, Amerate status, that people should have the option to choose. Not necessarily that we should settle in one term, but that at a minimum people should have the option of selecting a gender neutral designation or a gendered one in line with the conventions of Latin, but fundamentally, as I said, it's a UFC level issue. It has to be codified there before it could be adopted here. So that is how we're going to proceed where that matter is concerned. Thus concludes my report for today.

Shrivastav ([00:20:22](#)):

Thank you, Colin. Let me start with my remarks. So welcome back. Good afternoon. It's been a little while since we last met as a group and we've seen a few changes over the world in the last month. First and foremost, our hearts go out to all members of our community that are impacted by the devastating events overseas right now, and particularly those with family and connections in the Middle East. Over the last several weeks, president Whitten, other IU leaders and I have had dozens of conversations with IU faculty, with our staff, with our students, alumni, donors, parents of all backgrounds, both Jewish and Israeli, Palestinian, Arab and Muslim. Our community members have shared with us directly their deep sense of loss, sometimes personal losses, their anger, their hurt, and the fear that this moment has brought to them in their day-to-day lives at this most challenging time.

([00:21:30](#)):

I call on each and every one of us to demonstrate humility and empathy and compassion for everybody who's impacted by this. These are historically trying times and circumstances and it is critical that we look out for each other and for our collective wellbeing as a community. Campus resources continue to be available for all students, faculty and staff who are impacted by this. We continue to monitor the situation locally and regionally as well as abroad. We spend hours every day discussing issues and addressing concerns when they're brought to us, and I want to personally thank all of those who continue to support our community members alongside the transformational work that they do in their classrooms, in their labs and in the community. I hope you all recognize that your students, your colleagues and your friends sometimes are dealing with an emotional and a personal crisis that sometimes goes unnoticed, and it is upon all of us to help us ourselves and as our community continue to remain resilient and helpful to each other on campus, we continue to make great progress on our 2030 strategic plan.

([00:23:04](#)):

The faculty, staff, students and campus leaders charged with advancing key strategic plan initiatives are expanding work across all three pillars. Five working groups including a newly formed working group dedicated to undergraduate experiential learning are laser focused on student success initiatives. Groups working to advance research and creative activity have taken key steps in the area of faculty development and support for faculty in seeking external grants, as well as our recently announced faculty, 100 searches in areas of pre-priority, which include cutting edge technology and cybersecurity as well as life sciences including BioHealth. And just last week, IU Innovate celebrated a soft launch in the Von Lee building, a stone throw from here, ushering in a new phase of entrepreneurship and innovation support at IUB. It was exciting to be in that room filled with energetic student and faculty innovators and supporters inaugurating this new initiative and watching the conversations burst into life.

([00:24:10](#)):

It was the first of many networking events that the new IU Innovates hub in Bloomington will host to ensure that IU student and faculty entrepreneurs have access to resources, connections, and

mentorships that can help advance their ideas and innovation. In the coming months, students and faculty entrepreneurs will collaborate with IU Innovates to host or co-host coffee chats, founder, peer groups and other programs. I encourage all of you to learn and join in with these programs and I want to make say a special thank you to Carrie Docherty who led a lot of the early work in getting this from an idea on a piece of paper to its formal launch last week. So thank you, Carrie. As was shared previously with this group, this week, we are launching the process of updating the budget model for our Bloomington campus, which is scheduled to be implemented with the fiscal year 2026 Vice Provost, Amiee Heeter, and Kelly School of Business Interim Dean Ash Soni

([00:25:17](#)):

will co-lead a campus-wide steering committee to meet with stakeholders across campus and develop recommendations. As a reminder, our goals for this process include providing transparency, predictability, and accessible data and analytics to enable planning and accountability from a budget perspective, facilitating collaboration amongst deans, vice provost, faculty and staff fostering interdisciplinary activity luring the administrative burden that I've heard a hundred times about across the board opening opportunities to invest and innovate in big ideas and broadly to ensure that the campus is positioned to achieve the goals we've set for ourselves in IU 2030 and IUB 2030 strategic plans. I know you'll be hearing much more about this in the coming weeks and I hope you all participate in this effort. I know some of you seated around the table have been invited to participate in this and thank you in advance. I hope you say yes and we can get the committee charged and off the ground soon in the coming days.

([00:26:28](#)):

We will also have an exciting announcement on leadership for the Arts and Humanities at iu, but it's still something on the drawing board a little bit, so stay tuned for a couple more days for more details on that front. I would also like to provide a few search updates in the Optometry Dean search. We are in the very final stages of the process and hope to have an announcement in the coming days. The HLS Dean Search Committee continues to recruit and interview candidates. We are still expecting finalists to visit campus early in the spring semester, and finally this week we are inviting potential committee members to the School of Education Dean Search. We expect that group to be up and running and the position posted within the next few weeks here. If you have been active in the national media over the past week, you may have seen or heard the new ads for IU on NPR in the New York Times, Washington Post, or today in Inside Higher Ed.

([00:27:32](#)):

If anybody subscribed to that daily news bulletin, we have launched a new national brand campaign to raise awareness and engagement with IU that you'll be seeing much more of in the coming months. It's called Bring On Tomorrow, and already we are having fantastic results with engagement jumping across IU websites and platforms, interest from students, families, and our peers. And I don't know about you, but I've certainly received two or three phone calls from friends and colleagues who often while driving call and say, Hey, I just heard about IU on NPR, or something to that effect. But clearly it is starting to go national and be noticed as we head towards the Thanksgiving holiday. I hope we all take the time with family and friends to practice gratitude and find ways to celebrate the opportunities for learning, exploration and growth. We share here as a community at this challenging time in our world, we are deeply fortunate to have the gift of each other.

([00:28:38](#)):

I have received two questions this week, the first related to Kinsey Institute for an update and the proposal on how faculty have been involved. Let me respond to both of those as you have heard, and as

Colin just pointed out, last week, the board of trustees tabled a proposal to permit the university to set up a nonprofit entity to fund and operate a small portion of the Kinsey Institute functions that have historically been supported through IU General Fund. As you all know very well, this was in direct response to the state legislation that was passed earlier in the spring, and the board's decision provides us invaluable time to work together and with experts, faculty and staff, alumni and friends and other key stakeholders to consider how best to continue the legacy of the Kinsey Institute while still complying with the state law. I want to reiterate what Colin mentioned.

([00:29:38](#)):

It has always been and continues to remain our commitment to create a solution that ensures that Kinsey Institute and the collections will remain at iu. We have to find a way that allows us to do that while remaining compliant with state law. But the intent and the whole debate this week was almost entirely about the what and the how, not about the if every person I have talked to from our donors to our trustees to President Whitten, and I'll say that again, myself included, remained fully committed to academic freedom and for making sure that Kinsey continues to do the work it has been doing for many years. In my conversations with Justin Garcia, the director of Kinsey Institute, I mentioned to him that Kinsey has been attacked pretty much throughout its entirety of its existence, and it'll probably continue to be attacked for decades and decades.

([00:30:48](#)):

From here on we will continue to work to find ways in which Kinsey can operate, continue to do the work it does while remaining compliant with whatever laws are constrain, our ability to keep the structure exactly the way it is, the board, the precedent, and I look forward to our collaboration as we ensure that Kinsey continues as a beacon of academic freedom at IU. The second series of questions relate to the recent faculty, 100 announcements of new faculty hires in technology, particularly microelectronics ai, cybersecurity and quantum science and simulation. The questions specifically relate to faculty involvement and concerns about connections to the Department of Defense. As I shared in a recent engaged newsletter message, our upcoming faculty 100 searches have two broad goals. One is to expand our capacity to pursue research priorities defined through our 2030 planning process, including the use of AI to address complex problems and improve the human experience and harnessing quantum technology for discoveries and new materials, information science and cybersecurity.

([00:32:09](#)):

Second, it is to foster faculty development of new academic programs or growth in existing areas projected to see greater student interest and aligned with workforce demands. We are working closely with academic and research deans in the college in the Luddy School, SPEA in public health, optometry, optometry and others along with department chairs and individual faculty members, as well as key people in IU Research to identify most promising opportunities for innovation and create a infrastructure and bring the right hiring proposals to take advantage of those opportunities. I'm confident that the new searches we are launching will yield amazing new faculty to help expand IU leadership and impact in these vital areas. I also understand that some have questioned IU focus on research related to national security as a public state funded institution. IU has a long history of robust research collaborations with numerous state US government and other entities including those that are critical for the Department of Defense.

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

Our existing faculty already have a very rich portfolio of research being done either directly or indirectly in support of national security and Department of Defense priorities. These includes, for example, projects ranging from concussion research, cold water tolerance classification approaches using AI to

the dynamics of cyclone formation are probably the best in the country. Title IX, Title VI language and area study centers are very directly related to national security needs. In fact, I learned very recently that it was one of our own colleagues several decades ago who convinced the Department of Defense for the need to spend funding through Title VI to advance national security needs and wants, as we have always done before we continue to support the broader needs of our society while ensuring that our faculty remain full autonomy over all academic curricular and research and diverse. Nothing on those three fronts has changed, but certainly the investments in those areas are targeted to strategically aligned with some of the goals that emerged through IUB 2030 coupled with the strategic opportunities for service to the community and regional development that we find ourselves in the region through crane as well as through the life sciences industry.

(00:35:04):

With that, I'll end my report, but we have a few minutes for any questions from the floor if you have any. Elizabeth,

Housworth (00:35:13):

This is a question about budgets as some people might've known. I thought I had been invited to participate in the university level restructuring of the university budget, and I wrote to Dwayne Pinkney about this and he politely declined my involvement at that level, and that is not at all surprising to me. It was more surprising that I might be included. The surprising thing was that he told me that they were finishing up the 80 20 split of the budget so that the upper administration will control 20% of the budget. Since I wasn't involved, I couldn't ask what the denominator is or how it's calculated, but it appears that currently the university administration is about five to 10% of the budget, so that represents a doubling or quadrupling of the amount of resources that the upper administration will hold. I know that some regional campuses are concerned. I also am fully aware that this might be a good thing or might be a bad thing, but I was wondering if you could comment about whether you are worried about the Bloomington campus being able to cope under this plan and whether you're worried about, so I mean there's a hierarchy, so you're the campus you can take. Are you worried about the schools being able to cope under this plan

Shrivastav (00:36:54):

Broadly? No, so you're right. The current assessment part is about 10, 12, 15% depending on which unit you're talking about. What we also do in our current model is we pay for all services, so there is a base amount that goes to UA or central administration, and then throughout the year we pay more money for every picture you need to hang or every pretty much anything and everything that you need to do. The attempt being made through Dwayne is to combine those two into a single budget and get rid of the payment that is made over and over and over again. I think based on the way he's approaching it, when we are done, the total amount being spent will be about the same, plus or minus a few things because net costs are going to increase. They always do. So overall I'm not concerned.

(00:37:58):

I will also tell you this is a massive, massive exercise. We are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars in figuring out how the money moves, and so during this process, during the first year in particular, I think we have to anticipate some hurdles, some challenges, some things that'll fall through the cracks or some things that we should have paid attention to that nobody did. So I fully expect there will be some problems in the initial rollout, but I think when are all done, I'm not concerned that this would create a long-term problem. In fact, I feel it will give more predictability and will bring central administration in

alignment with the pressures we all face as academic units. In our current model, many central units do not face the same pressures you do if your enrollment drops, if your credit hour numbers drop, you are forced to adjust your budget, but central administration doesn't. They can shift the costs somewhere else in the new model because it'll be a percentage of the total revenue which is tied to enrollment or other resources. The same pressures will go across the board. So I think once we get past the initial hurdle, I think this will be a better model for how higher Ed operates in today's environment.

Housworth ([00:39:38](00:39:38)):

Thank you.

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

Other questions? Yes.

Gahl-Mills ([00:39:45](00:39:45)):

Forgive me if you covered this before I arrived in your remarks at our last meeting, I think you were talking about pedestrian safety on campus. So I'm going to ask a question in public that I have asked. In private, you may all know there were two incidents of a car versus pedestrian on campus on Halloween. One of those pedestrians who was struck is Frank Lewis. He is a senior lecturer at the O'Neill School. Frank's home and recovering very slowly, but his life has changed. So I guess the question that I have for you provost, is can you tell us a little bit about how this work is rolling out? What are the updates since we last heard from you about pedestrian safety and what can we as faculty do to help you? This is clearly a terrible problem.

Shrivastav ([00:40:27](00:40:27)):

Thank you for bringing that. Again, this is not the first incident. As you know, we've had multiple incidents on the 10th Street corridor. We actually did get a traffic study done. The traffic study was completed, it made some recommendations. There are three or four options to handle both traffic and primarily pedestrian. I'm more concerned about pedestrians as you are. As you all know, the streets are not owned by the university, they're owned by the city. It needs a partnership with the city. In this case, we have had some low level conversations. As you all know, we have a new mayor elect as of earlier this week, this week, last week. It's all blurring and we have already initiated some conversations with the city on that topic, if we controlled it, I know we would move much quicker on this, but this will require this partnership, close partnership with the city.

([00:41:35](00:41:35)):

I'm very optimistic with the new mayor as well as the new city Commission that we will have a productive, healthy, collaborative relationship, not just on this issue but on a variety of other issues because these are matters of concern to the city as much as they are to us. In the meantime, if you are walking or driving on the 10th Street corridor, especially Tuesdays or Thursdays, please, please be very careful. We've had more incidents and for every one where something is at the seriousness where somebody needs to be at the hospital, in the hospital, there are several others that are minor fender benders or small things. This is of critical importance to all of us. Thank you. Other questions? Yes,

Kubow ([00:42:39](00:42:39)):

Sorry, it's not working. Could you repeat the title of the ad campaign,

Shrivastav ([00:42:45](00:42:45)):

The branding campaign, Bring On Tomorrow.

Kubow ([00:42:48](00:42:48)):

Thank you.

Shrivastav ([00:42:49](00:42:49)):

You should see it on our website. You should see it in other ads, and I'm sure there will be a more aggressive rollout over campus.

Kubow ([00:42:58](00:42:58)):

Thank you.

Shrivastav ([00:43:00](00:43:00)):

Okay, seeing no other questions, let me move on to the next item on the agenda, and the first one is updates on faculty activity reporting tools to be led by Carrie Docherty, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, and Logan Paul co-chair of the Technology Policy Committee.

Docherty ([00:43:22](00:43:22)):

All right. Thank you all so much. So we are excited to report an update on all things related to faculty reporting systems. It's everyone's favorite topic, this brief history I think most folks are aware of. We adopted DMAI or under the brand watermark back in 2016, and if those of you that have been around here a little longer, you'll remember the far was its predecessor again, everyone was equally as excited about that one. So the usage of DMAI and historically, the use of these software has really been inconsistent. Some schools and departments use it quite a bit. Others really don't use it at all. So we had our contract with them that came to an end in October, 2023. And so it really prompted the necessity to begin reevaluating this. At the time, there was a few things going on, and so we extended the contract by one year and really started doing the work of identifying what would be best for the campus and the university last year.

([00:44:48](00:44:48)):

I also had the opportunity, and I think many of you have had the opportunity to hear the pros and the cons related to this reporting system, and here's just a few of the items of feedback that we heard. It's really clunky. It is very challenging to import all of your data. It is very challenging based on all of the fields that are included. I think generally folks find the usability quite low and then subsequently how we utilize the data that is in for other purposes really isn't occurring either. So both on the front end and on the back end, we definitely identified some barriers and I will not open this one up. I'm sure y'all could add to this list of feedback and concerns around this.

Paul ([00:45:50](00:45:50)):

So the university stood up or the academic leadership committee asked for a task force to be stood up in summer 2024, and there were two requests for that task force. One of them was to evaluate the usage of the current system and the configuration of the system to initially decide, Hey, DMAI is set up in this way. Could it be set up in a better way to better serve the faculty on the campus and make it more usable for them broadly? And number two was to concurrently also look at other vendors and other

software packages that we could use to do this task to help us do it better and do it more efficiently as we are kind of putting in all of our information for a lot of different purposes. And so the task force, we met with the vendor a couple of times in summer 2024.

([00:46:41](#)):

We also met with at least one or two, I can't remember, peer institutions that were using watermark, the same software as us, and we conducted demos. So I think they were about two hours a piece demos with four other software vendors throughout the summer. So they took us through their software, how it's used, how other institutions use it, and what it can do for us. So the final recommendation that the task force gave to the ALC was a little bit different than what we expected going into the summer task force. We were all very gungho on, we just need to reconfigure DMAI eliminate a bunch of check boxes, make it easier for people to use, figure out ways that we can better use the data so we don't have to adjust to a new system. After looking at the competitors that are out there, the task force made the determination that the recommendation would instead be the, that we should pursue a full request for proposal for new software to help us handle this very important task. Happy dance, commence happy dance. Commence.

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

Oh, sorry, one more slide for me. And then thinking about faculty governance. Faculty have been involved in the task force and in the RFP committee, which Carrie will talk about in a minute since the very beginning. So me along with a representative from IUPUI we're asked to be on the task force over the summer to sit through all of these demos and kind of bring feedback that we've received in part to the technology policy committee over the years on things like DMAI and FAR and Edossier and all of these other systems we use for these purposes to bring that perspective to that task force that we were looking at. The university faculty constitution clearly says that faculty of oversight over these processes and how we evaluate each other, these tools can help us support that process to make it effective and make it useful for all of us as we go about doing that.

([00:48:29](#)):

And then specifically on the Bloomington campus, we have another policy that talks about how we adopt actual systems and our oversight in that area. So we have a bit more of a stake, I think, than maybe the other campuses do, specifically via our policy for helping to or making this decision, not helping to make it, but making the decision about what we choose to adopt. And then finally, thinking about software. We've talked a lot in this task force and on the committee about the ways in which we can set up software. I think the selection is a really important thing that we're going to need to do as a faculty and looking at all of our options and giving feedback on all of those. But the far more important thing that's going to come later after the software is selected is thinking about how do we want to configure it?

([00:49:17](#)):

What questions do we want to ask? What information do we want people to put into that software? And for all of the products that we've looked at, including the current one that we use, which is DMAI, we can choose what we want to collect and we can choose what we want to ask for and we can choose how we ask for that. The issue I think, very broadly with DMAI one is its general usability, which is in part the software. The other part of it is that we chose, for example, in some of the checkbox boxes like we have for diversity, equity inclusion, that we wanted what feels like 99 things in that SCROLLY box that you can check in order to tag different things that you put into there. So we make those decisions. So I think it's important that we're actively involved in the configuration of that software, and I think that's a little bit more important than the actual selection of the software. So the TPC specifically, we'll be

looking at in the coming months the BL-ACAI 25 faculty Scholarly Activity systems, that's our campus level policy to see if we can more clearly indicate that we also want some oversight over the implementation of the actual software and how we configure it to collect all of that information.

Docherty ([00:50:27](#)):

So, we are excited to come to you all today to really launch this process. And we as previously discussed, this is a process that has to be driven and led by the faculty, both in the identifying which software that we use as well as how we implement it moving forward. So today is where we hope to launch this process. As a reminder, this is a system wide system that we use. So it isn't just used on the Bloomington campus, it's utilized across the university. So the RFP committee really includes representatives from all of those entities. So you can see in the makeup of the committee, every box reflects a human being. And you can see from the Bloomington campus in consultation with executive committee and Colin, we really wanted to make sure that we had the makeup of the RFB committee be consistent with our policy on the Bloomington campus.

([00:51:45](#)):

So after a little cajoling and working together, we have the following people from the Bloomington campus, again, representing those key committees that are needed for our policies purpose. You can see the other piece that's important is everyone who's in these red shades represent faculty members. So whether they're on the regional campuses, Indianapolis School of Medicine or Bloomington, those shades of red are all faculty. You can see there are some staff members involved in this, and they are all representing from each of our campuses, sort of the backend technology side of things. But again, we wanted to make sure it was really clear that this is predominantly driven by the faculty of the university.

Paul ([00:52:48](#)):

So as this process launches, we're kind of at the starting stage of it. So the RFP was issued in October for vendors to respond to with a set of requirements that was more than 80 individual items long, that we asked all of the vendors to let us know what they can do, what they can't do, what they have to use a third party system to do, and how they do all of those things. So across those 80 requirements, we intend to select the top two vendors to do demos, although with the submissions not just holding ourselves to that, we're only going to have two because that's what we decided. The list actually might end up being different vendors that we look at, which is more time for people to spend doing this. But it's important that we look at those vendors that we think are going to successfully kind of help us do this service that we really need.

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

So those will happen after Thanksgiving break across the university. Different campuses are handling those in different ways, and I believe how we're going to do it here on the Bloomington campus and the executive committee can correct me if this has changed, is we're going to do the live demos with the executive committee and the members from the RFP committee having 50 people or 500 people on a Zoom meeting to do a demo of software. It can be a little unwieldy. So we're going to record those and plan to send them out to the entire council and make them available to the entire faculty. And then we will collect and compile the feedback from those demos and those requirement lists from all of you. So the ask to the council and to your constituents and the faculty at large is we'd really appreciate if we can get some help looking at these things.

([00:54:24](#)):

Even if you can just take a couple of minutes to kind of watch these demos and look at these videos to look at the software that you might end up having to use. We think there are some really great options out there and we hope that people are going to be really pleased with them as we kind of spread those recordings of those demos out and the information from those vendors. So we'd really like to get, I would say, as much feedback as possible, even if it's just this is satisfactory to me so that we don't kind of end up on both ends of the spectrum. And then finally, selection is actually happening pretty quickly. So we'll do all this over kind of after at the end of the semester, a little bit at the beginning of the spring semester. And the goal is to make the selection in early 2024, although purchasing wanted to make it in the middle of January, we've been pushing back a little bit on that, and I think it'll be end of January, kind of mid-February to give this campus and all the other campuses enough time to gather that feedback and actually aggregate it so that we can use it when we deliberate what vendor we should offer a contract to, and then implementation.

([00:55:33](#)):

The more critical phase of this entire process will hopefully happen in fall 2024 or for a fall 2024 implementation. So it's all moving rather quickly. So we hope that everybody's feelings about DMAI can motivate them to look at these new options that we might have that can make all of our lives a little bit easier.

Docherty ([00:55:57](#)):

So as a quick follow up, that means we will continue to use DMAI one more time so that we should plan on, but I just want to echo, I think you're going to be really happy with some of the new options that have come out. And so even if you have five, 10 minutes to look at these recordings, I think that'll be very important. But again, then we need to figure out how we can thoughtfully utilize these in the future. Can we tie these to the faculty awards that we give out so you're not creating a separate dossier? How can we utilize this as part of the third year review as part of promotion and tenure? If we make a good thoughtful choice now, hopefully it will allow us to incorporate this into our systems for greater ease with all of these things moving forward and more updates will come as the process progresses.

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

Questions. Thank you, Carrie. Questions, Elizabeth,

Housworth ([00:57:06](#)):

I'm sorry if I missed this, but will the new system be able to import all the old information?

Paul ([00:57:14](#)):

That is a great question that has come up on every other campus that has kind of made this presentation to their faculty, including I think at the UFC, but I was not there. We don't exactly know the answer to that yet, and I don't want to say something wrong to you. That has been brought up many times as we've been going through this process that given the history of technology migrations on this campus, I'm still fuming over box because I miss it. We're hopeful that we will find a way in order to make that effective and efficient for people so that it is not recreating the wheel. So that is something that personally I will continue to push for over and over and over again. And I am certain that our technology folks on campus are aware of that need and that they're willing to work with us and figure

out how we can probably do something of that nature if the vendor doesn't explicitly allow it. Thank you. You're welcome.

Shrivastav ([00:58:11](#)):

Any other questions? Okay, thank you. Seeing none. Thanks both of you. Let's move on to the next topic, which is proposed changes to BL-ACAD 16 creation, reorganization, elimination, and merger of academic units and programs. I only see Alex here and as a reminder, this is a discussion item, does not need any vote. This is purely for your awareness and feedback. Alex,

Tanford ([00:58:38](#)):

Thank you and I continuing the acronym process today. After DMAI and RFPs, we bring you a proposed revision to the CREM policy if for no other, our first proposal, of course, is that we change the name of the committee from the CREM nobody remembers what those all four words are basically because I get tired of my wife continually asking me. Now, what does CREM stand for again? Again, emphasis that this is a discussion. We anticipate that there will then be a process in which we will expand in various ways of consulting more broadly among the units and the unit policy committees and things like that, and work towards a revision that works for everyone.

([00:59:41](#)):

So we welcome comments and suggestions not only today. At the very end of this, I'll put up the email addresses of myself and the co-chair and we recommend we welcome comments from anyone about the policy about things omitted, things you don't like. Whatever the need, the need for an amendment is obvious. This is a greatly reduced outline of the 40 different steps that are required under our current policy. It involves, you can see 'em in red. It involves five separate committees, has six different remonstrance periods. And if you think it sounds complicated for your amusement, here's a flow chart. This is real. I spent an hour on this actually tracking each step that was comprehensible. So the existing policy was created in 2015 and it was created intentionally to hamstring the administration and give small groups of faculty multiple opportunities to stop a reorganization. It appears to have been a very strong reaction to faculty dissatisfaction with the process by which the school of global and international studies and the media school were created and how decisions were made about which departments would move to the new schools.

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

Reading the several faculty council meetings at which the policy was discussed in 2015, it was uniformly opposed on all sorts of grounds by deans and administrators and even among the faculty. Many people who spoke at those meetings said that frankly they didn't understand it all, didn't understand all the steps, but would vote for it because they trusted their colleagues. It actually passed by 30 to 20, which those of you who've been around faculty, the governance for a while know that's extraordinary. To have such a closely divided vote, our committee think that it backfired that its definition of when applied was vague and it was so cumbersome. As you can see, it left the administration with no clear procedure for including affected faculty and academic unit reorganizations even if they wanted to.

([01:02:35](#)):

The policy as it had existed before this from 1982, 2014, was much simpler and basically a called on the administration to include affected faculty in the process and ask them to protect faculty appointments, the tenure process and student progress towards degree whenever this was going on, and to provide budgetary information. Our proposal goes somewhat back to that original model. It preserves the substantive requirements. If you look at it, that buried away in the existing CREM policy is like a list of

seven or eight things that a reorganization, we think a reorganization must do, protect tenure, have a plan for how students are going to be going to make progress towards degrees and things like that. It has preserved those substantive requirements, but reduces the number of procedural steps to nine. Here's the flow chart under the new policy, which as you can see is somewhat simpler than the old one.

(01:03:56):

And as you can also see, we are unable to give you a nice redlined version of the old policy and the new policy because the old policy was so unwieldy and so complicated and had so many different committees that just isn't possible. What we have given you, and we urge you to take a look at them and then send us comments in the background information. There's a section C that gives the current policy down the left hand side in one column and our succinct explanation of what we did with that policy down the right hand side.

(01:04:46):

So that just some examples, it'll tell you, we eliminated, we abbreviated it, we modified it, and it tells you where the intent or content of that paragraph is incorporated into our new policy. By giving you these paragraph numbers, and if you look at both the form it was brought to you, that is in motion and in the next document, section D in the background information, this has the text of the new policy down the left hand column and each paragraph has a separate paragraph number. It will not necessarily be kept that way. When it goes into a final version, there's a university policy template which divides into sections. It doesn't matter for discussion purposes and for ease of everyone saying, I don't like paragraph 31, it needs to say something. We've given them each a unique paragraph number and then what section D does, it gives you the text of the new policy down the left hand column and where it came from down the right hand column.

(01:06:11):

Now, some of them obviously came, you can see I just picked examples here. Some of them come directly from the current policy. If so, we say so and you can go back and look, compare those. Some of them come from a different model. We happen to use B12, the search and screen procedures for campus administrators. We thought the process by which we pick the dean of a unit ought to be about the same as the process by which we decide what the organization of that unit should be. They seem to us to be similar concepts, and so that'll tell you sometimes that we have borrowed a concept or some language from other policies, and then just sitting around and talking, we came up with some new stuff that'll tell you whether it's new the, oops, I go backwards.

(01:07:24):

Nevermind. I dunno why this is there again. The proposed process. Basically it adopts a shared governance model that is already in use in our other major policies on this campus that require faculty administrative, shared governance. That is policies on tenure, policies on the faculty board of review, policies on search and screen procedures for administrators, and the policy on the reviews, the periodic reviews of campus administrators. That is, it calls on the provost and the executive committee to convene a special review committee which gathers information liens heavily on input from the faculty from those affected units and drafts a recommendation report which goes to the provost for implementation. And with the expectation that the provost will go along with what we say, just like there is an expectation that the provost will agree, will accept the recommendation of a faculty board of review, or we'll accept the recommendation of the campus promotion and tenure committee.

(01:08:38):

As we all know, the provost who reports to the president, who reports to the trustees may in some situations not be able to accept our recommendation so that there was language in the existing policy that basically said the provost had to accept our recommendation. We thought as a committee that was exceeded our authority and also exceeded the principle of shared governance. That, and I know in some comments I've gotten before, eliminating a kind of a veto power on the part of the faculty and converting this to a recommendation, a report and recommendation and expectation that they will follow has generated some controversy. I assume we'll continue discussions on that, including discussions with the provost about how as it gets into that stage, how to, the best way to phrase this, to achieve sort of it's in the mutual best interest of the faculty and their provost to have the best system of academic units and programs that are possible on this campus. So we started from a proposition that we are not hostile to the administration and I know that not all faculty historically and have agreed with that, with all particular provost and president. So with that I yield back to Rahul to conduct any discussion. I would say to please leave the slides up because following this I have like 28 slides which include the entire text of the proposed policy so that if anyone says can we look at paragraph 16? I think I can find it and bring it up.

(01:10:37):

But again here our co-chairs, oh and I apologize. Sena had to teach this afternoon is why she's not here. But any comments and please. We were at the moment a three person committee. Now luckily we had Judah Cohen audit who's in the music school and the College of Arts and Sciences and in like three interdisciplinary programs and the Vice Provost for Faculty and Administrative and Academic Affairs office. So he's like seven people. But still we need more input, broader input. Don't be shy. I have a thick skin. And feel free to tell me that I have done something that you think is horribly wrong. Also, I can stay for a few minutes after the meeting in case anybody wants to berate me right now before you forget. And I'm taking notes. I'm taking notes.

Shrivastav (01:11:38):

Thank you Alex. It's open for discussion questions. Go right ahead Colin.

Johnson (01:11:48):

Alex, I have, I'm wondering if you could clarify for people, because I think one of the things that is confusing to people about the kind of potential import of changes to the BFC CREM policy is how it sits with respect to the kind of jurisdictions that flank what happens at the campus level. So there is, for example, UFC level CREM policy and many schools actually have CREM policies that are internal to them. And I think understanding the relationship between that and the instances where this policy as if you're proposing adjustment would apply, could be helpful to people in terms of thinking about how they're retaining or potentially seeding certain kinds of control and authority and voice where they want to have it.

Tanford (01:12:31):

Yeah, that is the most difficult question, which is how to define when it applies. And I'd say we have attempted to make it consistent with though it's more detailed than ACA-79, the university level policy that deals with restructuring of schools, what we call core schools and related, they're now more types of units that have activities on more than one campus. And that policy is kind of vague. It just says there should be a committee in the faculty should have input when it affects the Bloomington. So we're more detailed than that, but not inconsistent with it, I don't think. Then again, the types of, in the basic definition, the constitution also not well-defined is that it has to affect more than one program or unit.

Well, there's never been any definition of a program or a unit. And it's interesting because it came up going back through the history, the reason that CREM was started initially back in the 1980s had nothing to do with what we think about as reorganization of academic units today.

([01:13:47](#)):

It had to do with the creation of the Wells Scholars program where the administration at the time got the Wells Scholars got buy-in from individual schools on whether they would cooperate with the Wells Scholars program. And then some people on the BFC thought got irritated that maybe they should have gone to the BFC about the program and it involved scholarships for students. So that's a complicated question when we expect to work forward to our basic definition, working definition is that that we look at faculty at academic appointments and if it affects an academic appointment from more than one unit, then it falls under campus jurisdiction.

([01:14:43](#)):

And one of the areas that needs to be worked on, for example, was the creation of the existing policy got enacted because of irritation on the faculty with the creation of the School of Global International Affairs and Media School that were created in this bizarre notion of a school within the college. And it was thought that they did that deliberately to bypass the faculty governance process. So that history is taken into account basically. And then there's a provision that says in case of uncertainty, the provost and the executive committee arm wrestle just like other areas where there's a real question of how best to follow a policy, it's going to have gray areas.

Housworth ([01:15:32](#)):

Elizabeth, I had like to bring up one more piece of history and make a recommendation. The CREM policy got passed in this committee at a time when Lauren Robel was the provost and wanted desperately to be here to speak against the 2015 revision of the policy. She wasn't able to be here because her husband passed away and the committee did not accept her request to pause the agenda. And so that itself was upsetting to a number of faculty here. My recommendation is that clearly the faculty don't trust the administration and the administration does not necessarily trust the faculty. And if you go back to its being a recommendation, the provost essentially in the end gets to do what he wants, but if he overrules the recommendation, perhaps he should issue a report to the faculty explaining why

Tanford ([01:16:47](#)):

That's in there. It's actually buried away near the end of the paragraphs. There's one that says it's both. That must issue a report and must also then meet about that report with the executive committee to discuss whether for example, a modified proposal should go forward. So it is designed specifically to facilitate and encourage communication and shared governance. And the other thing that it does, you all remember from a high school, those the person who ran for student council on the pledge, they were going to eliminate student council? Well, I'm proud to say that as a member of the CREM committee, our first proposal is we eliminate the CREM committee and it's for exactly this reason. The current policy seems to make it sort of vest in a CREM committee, this communication with the provost and that's not the right place for it to happen. It struck us that the right place to happen was between the provost and the executive committee that at least as we currently structure faculty governance, they meet regularly, they talk regularly, they meet in confidential sessions where they can really hash things out and that's where it made sense to put these decisions.

Shrivastav ([01:18:06](01:18:06)):

Yes, go ahead and say the name.

Buggenhagen ([01:18:09](01:18:09)):

If I could just step back for a moment and ask what are the conditions or what would be the impetus under which this policy would come into effect? Would it affect units currently being reorganized or would the previous policy be the process through which conversations about that reorganization would occur?

Tanford ([01:18:32](01:18:32)):

Policy that hasn't been passed yet, but I think the policy would have to have an effective date for exactly that reason. It has become common in other things like at the university level when I was on their policy committee, we started putting in effective dates. There's an effective date for the new student conduct code, an effective date for the grading code for exactly the reasons that you say.

Buggenhagen ([01:19:02](01:19:02)):

And the first part of my question,

Tanford ([01:19:05](01:19:05)):

Sorry, I'm getting old. I've forgotten the part of your question. What triggers it

Buggenhagen ([01:19:10](01:19:10)):

Right

([01:19:13](01:19:13)):

Under the revision, it would be triggered by the provost. What would trigger the provost to trigger the policy

Shrivastav ([01:19:23](01:19:23)):

When there is a proposal, irrespective of where it comes from, if there's a proposal to reorganize. That's how I read it, right Alex?

Tanford ([01:19:31](01:19:31)):

Yeah, it recognizes that we don't know where a proposal is going to come from. It can come from President Whitten about the Kinsey Institute. It can come to digress a little bit. My father was at Duke and did basic genetic research in the biochemistry department and the members who did genetic research about far of them went to the provost there and said, we think we'd be better off in the medical school where there's more resources and funding. And he said, oh, okay. So that was a reorganization proposal that broke up. A department moved into the school that was initiated by four faculty members. So it doesn't try to answer where a proposal can come from. It just drops it on the provost desk. And obviously, I mean the provost of the chief executive officer of the campus who has to make the initial decision, not the end result, but whether or not to even begin the discussion of the process.

Sela ([01:20:45](01:20:45)):

So what's the major difference between the current proposal that you're proposing and the proposal that preceded the current policy? It's clear that the current policy is extremely complicated and perhaps redundant, but the previous policy was pretty terrible. And I'm speaking from the point of view of the school of global intergalactic, whatever it is that we are because the people in that school never voted on anything, were never consulted about anything. It just came from the top down and that was the end of it. So what's the major difference between what you're proposing and what was there before

Tanford ([01:21:32](#)):

All the safeguards you just talked about that were missing from the earlier proposal? That is, it used to be we put in all these different committees and they had to go to the units and get the votes. And that's been simplified but not eliminated. So it is still the case that it requires that there be faculty on a review committee to think of this, that a majority of those faculty should come from the affected units and have a voice that needs to go to the policy committees and the full faculty of those units for discussion and a vote. So that process is in there, which wasn't in the old policy, the original policy and was repeated four or five times in a row in separate procedures in the current policy. I did not actually, this is actually interesting. I think your questions are interesting and I think I will actually go back and look and maybe do like I did for these two, do a kind of a comparison between the original policy and where we are now.

Shrivastav ([01:22:46](#)):

Go ahead Freedman.

Freedman ([01:22:48](#)):

This might sort of follow up on that. Maybe I misread the proposal, but I was going to ask about the role of faculty and administrators from the infected units being in the review committee. It looked like it said the deans would be consulted by the provost in appointing members of the review committee and the BFC executive committee will recommend faculty members, some of whom would be from the affected units. But I think you just said that the majority of the review committee would be from the affected units. So can you just clarify that kind of breakdown?

Tanford ([01:23:27](#)):

Sorry, I may have merged. First of all, we as the faculty do not have the authority to tell the provost which deans and which people the provost should put on this committee. So that's why it doesn't specify that the administrators have to be from the affected units. You've got a second problem, which is if you're creating a new school, there is no affected unit. It's a new unit. So that's why the language was vague about exactly where the faculty were going to come from and how many and what percentage. And I misspoke when I said the policy said a majority.

([01:24:07](#)):

It is the decision of the executive committee and they may delegate it to mcom, they may delegate it if they want to look at the proposal and decide how best to bring in people from the affected units. And I can say that because our vision all the time is suppose there finally is the long needed decision to break the College of Arts and Sciences into two units, humanities and social science and whatever those hard scientists do that would affect what 40 different departments. You couldn't staff a committee with everyone from every affected unit. So it was deliberately vague and left it to the executive committee to decide how to populate the committee given the circumstances of the particular proposal. And that's

simply a continuation of the at least unspoken policy currently, which is the beginning of the year. Two people are appointed to the creme committee and they hide under their desks and hope nothing happens all year.

([01:25:27](#)):

And in fact, I'd served on, I'd forgotten even that I previously served on the creme committee for two years and we never did anything and never had any reason to. But then if something arose, then the Nom Com or the executive committee would then populate creme committee with an undefined group of relevant people. We continued the open-endedness of that process. Again, if people think there should be, this is the kind of thing people think, there should be more specific language on the faculty side about faculty from the affected units. Email me and let me know everything is open for discussion.

Shrivastav ([01:26:10](#)):

Okay, considering it is almost four o'clock, last question. We have two more items on the agenda.

Sapp ([01:26:17](#)):

So what's the advantage in eliminating the two members of the creme committee as opposed to having them there to monitor situations that may emerge

Tanford ([01:26:31](#)):

Competence? The answer is competence. That is if you appoint two members of the current committee in advance before you even know what the issue is. Like right now, the committee is one person from the law school and one person from the Kelley School. If there's a reorganization that involves like Kinsey involves the college and the library and the school of public health, we don't have any competence. We don't to know anything about that or to supervise it. It creates a different, it means you create, from our view, create an appropriate standing committee, an appropriate special committee where you can put people on it with more competence to review the process

Shrivastav ([01:27:29](#)):

Go ahead. Colin,

Johnson ([01:27:30](#)):

I could just add one thing to this too. I would note my biggest concern, and again, I think there's an honest discussion to be had about the balance and I know that one of the biggest concerns that a number of people have had about the current structure and the CREM policy and the CREM committee is it's not just that the CREM committee hasn't done anything for two years. I believe the CREM committee hasn't had any kind of actionable item brought before it for almost for maybe six years. I think

Tanford ([01:27:58](#)):

It's six

Johnson ([01:27:59](#)):

Years, nor has it actively involved itself in anything. And we're not just talking about big spectacular reorganizations, but it's important to remember the current policy covers creation of anything, right,

which doesn't tend to sort of elicit a lot of commentary from people they see that as added on top of and not threatening anything. Reorganization is more controversial. Elimination is very controversial when and if it happens, mergers are a little more manageable and tend to be worked out. But I do think we need to think about, and again, I think there are many discussions that can be had about the details of this and making sure that everything, but if we have a policy that essentially is so disincentivizing for actual engagement that nothing ever comes before it because everybody tries to avoid it because it's so procedurally complicated, I actually think we're kind of shortchanging ourselves even as interested faculty who want to maintain kind of a strong position in the context of the shared governance enterprise because stuff happens all the time and people say nothing about it, it just happens.

([01:29:02](#)):

And I think that's the culture precisely the culture. We don't want a culture where people are actually consultative, where people are in the position to create things, do think it's important to come in and say, this is what we're thinking about, what do you think? And some part of the BFC on the campus's behalf can say, you need to sit down, we need to have a conversation about that. And you need to talk to these people in order to make sure that they know what's going on and you're hearing from them before you act. And my sense is that doesn't happen right now in ways that are actually limiting for us. But again, I think the detail, it's really important to get this right.

Tanford ([01:29:35](#)):

And just a reminder, I will hang around after those of you who'd had comments or questions and didn't get them answered. I will hang around after the meeting and you can talk to me and I'll take more notes.

Shrivastav ([01:29:46](#)):

Okay, thank you Alex. And thank you everybody for a robust discussion. We have two more items. The next one is a proposed university level policy on employee relationships involving students. Also a discussion item. Take it away Colin.

Johnson ([01:30:03](#)):

So I think I'm, oh yeah, I have to get the thing from Alex. Alright, so now I have the thing. So a little bit of background on this before we get started. I'll actually walk you through the timeline. This is actually a policy is a university faculty council level policy. It's a policy that is currently being considered, I'll talk for adoption by the UFC, but for that very reason, it has implications for all of the campuses in the university. It's a policy that, as you'll see, we spent a lot of time working on multiple university faculty councils have worked on it and Bloomington faculty have been very involved in that process. It was the feeling, it was my feeling and the feeling of Carolyn Schult and Phil Goff, the other co-chairs of the university faculty council. However, that it was a policy worth sharing with this body and in fact with all of the campus governance bodies because of the fact that it's an important policy.

([01:31:08](#)):

So, and when it is formally adopted by the university faculty council, it's really important that it have life and that it kind of inform everyday practice on all throughout the university. But it's also a policy that's very complicated in lots of ways because it deals with very, very sensitive issues and calls on us to have a very explicit and thoughtful relation to our own ethical and professional commitments. So it's extremely important that before it becomes the law at the university level, that people be aware of it and they have an opportunity to provide feedback on it. Because as I'm walking through this, it's the kind of policy that has the potential to create a lot of unintended consequences and it's better to try to acknowledge

what those might be and work them out before it becomes kind of policy. So, alright, so just to give you a little runup on the history.

([01:32:02](#)):

In 2019, the university faculty council convened a task force to investigate to look into what policies existed in order to regulate a, at that point what was referred to as consensual relationships between students and faculty, but actually between a lot of differently positioned people within the university in 2019, they did that in 2021. That working group, after having worked for three years, finally completed a report on the revision to the policy on consensual relationships. That report, which we received last year, last spring, if I'm not mistaken, recommended specific changes to a ACA-33, which is the university faculty council level policy, as well as additional work on related policies, partly because of many of these issues have been addressed in different contexts in the nepotism policy and in other areas, policies on sexual harassment.

([01:33:04](#)):

Last year in 2022 and 2023, UFC Co-chairs with the support of university leadership requested the drafting of a distinct policy dealing with relationships between faculty, staff and students. So that was under Kate's watch and she I'm sure can answer questions about that process if people have any questions about the history. In April of 2023. So last spring at the last university faculty council meeting, there was an extensive discussion of the draft policy that had been developed. And at that time a number of concerns were expressed, not about the spirit of the policy or the goals of the policy, but from the perspective of a number of people. And certainly for me, there was some concerns expressed about some of, as I said, the potential unintended consequences of some of the language in that policy. And the UFC made request at that point that additional revisions be made, additional revisions to the existing policy were also suggested by the Office of Institutional Equity and also the University Faculty Faculty Affairs Committee.

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

And a new draft was then subsequently discussed very recently at our October 31st UFC meeting. So this policy has been around for a long time. It's had lots of iterations, it's had lots of rounds of feedback, lots of questions had been asked. And the document that was circulated to you is the most recent revision and frankly, the revision, the version of the policy that the University faculty council has committed to voting on once and for all at our December meeting, which will take place on December 5th because at a certain point it just needs to be adopted. This is our opportunity, however, for people on this campus to provide input less for the purpose. I think at this stage of revising the substance of the policy being considered then to inform the perspective of people who serve on this body, who will also be voting, who are also members of the voting members of the university faculty council.

([01:35:06](#)):

But as I said, more importantly, it's an opportunity for you all to ask questions for the purpose of starting to get kind of knowledge and information about the likely adoption. We'll see how it goes, but sort of the existence of this policy and its implications for us kind of across this campus and to your constituents. This is a list of the USC policy Drafting committee. As you'll see there are many of our colleagues, many colleagues from Bloomington were involved in this including Alex Tanford, Colleen Ryan from the VPVAA's office, Jenny Kincaid from Institutional Equity. These are all names that we kind of recognize, people who have been very genuinely and capably involved in the shared governance enterprise for quite a while. And so let's take a look at the language that's actually been proposed. So the scope and purpose of UA-22, which is the working number if I'm not mistaken, of the university level policy that will be voted on in December, intends to address any potential conflict of interest to protect

students, promote fairness, and to uphold the integrity of the academic environment broadly, it applies to all academic appointees, and this is actually a matter that was discussed at the university faculty council meeting.

([01:36:20](https://)):

This includes faculty, also student academic appointees. It's a very important thing to keep in mind and also staff who have responsibility for administering any aspect of a student's educational progress or experience. The UFC asked questions actually about the jurisdiction, kind of appropriate jurisdiction of the UFC to make policy related to staff because traditionally that's been handled by HR and there are kind of different bodies of policy, but they're also examples of policies that implicate all of us as employees and the UFC and just like the BFC has played a role in that. But it's a really important issue I think to think about one that needed to be asked about because as you'll see in some instances it's staff who are more likely to find themselves awkwardly positioned with respect to this policy simply by virtue of the fact that many of our staff colleagues are involved in relationships with people who use, make ample use of the tuition benefit that has afforded them, which means they're kind of already in relationships with people who are technically students like their spouses for example, and other people.

([01:37:25](https://)):

And that's one of the kind of complicating factors in terms of thinking about the implementation of this. But it is one that I think has been addressed unlike our previously existing policies, which we had. This policy also incorporates language that addresses kind of, for lack of a better term, the phenomenon of grooming. And that's a really important issue that had been kind of brought up by people specifically this policy incorporates language that says, and I quote, any inappropriate intimate behaviors or any actions by a university employee that attempt to initiate an amorous or sexual relationship with a student over whom the university employee currently has or foreseeably could have a professional responsibility or responsibility for administering any aspect of the student's educational progress or experience are prohibited it.

([01:38:14](https://)):

So this is actually a much stronger statement than the existing policy existing policies that proceeded this had a lot of mandates to manage these kinds of relationships. And in fact, I think as Jenny Kincaid and other people who worked on this would say when they were drafting this policy, they surveyed a lot of faculty and students and actually a lot of people were sort of lukewarm about the ideas about policies that explicitly prohibit relationships. Nevertheless, this version of the policy moves in that direction and I think that's something worth talking about and thinking about. Although I do think it's important to note that unlike other versions of these policies that just categorically exclude or prohibit relationships, which maybe is a lovely kind of idea to have but is very difficult to sort of in practice actually completely. This does focus specifically on relationships, supervisor relationships, and that's a really important thing or relationships that put people in direct kind of relations of accountability and responsibility to one another.

([01:39:20](https://)):

The revised policy includes an exception process and this was added actually in response to concerns that were raised again about the kind of unacknowledged degree to which there are plenty of people on this campus who are involved in Amherst or sexual or longstanding relationships with people who technically have student status. So this was added a requirement or an affordance that basically requires prompt disclosure at the start of any relationship so that responsibilities can be reviewed and if possible restructured to address the conflict of interest. And secondly, I think language that suggests that the university holds the individual who holds the professional authority in one of those relationships

responsible for reporting the relationship to the relevant principal administrator at the beginning of the relationship. So this is an attempt essentially to ensure that if one could foreseeably find oneself in a position of running afoul of this or this policy, it tries to encourage pursuit of a formal exception so that a management plan can be put in place in advance. The policy requires self-disclosure and management plans as I mentioned. So relationships have to be disclosed in writing to principal administrators and in a timely manner. Principal administrators have to evaluate the situation and determine if relationships fall within the scope of the policy or whether a management plan is needed and the management plans have to strive to remove the employee from all current or future professional responsibilities towards the student.

(01:40:58):

It's important to note too that this policy is kind of imagined to be in compliance or aims to be in compliance or coordination with other existing policies, including the existing policy dealing with sexual misconduct, discrimination and harassment that I think is no surprise and entirely appropriate. And then there are provisions in the policy that authorize the office of institutional Equity to undertake assessments and investigations in cases where a existing relationships are seen as being potentially in violation of the policy or where appropriate steps haven't been taken to report and to seek exceptions from the existing policy or to seek explicitly articulated management plans.

(01:41:46):

I can go through these, but the bottom line is there is a kind of formal process for doing that and there is also a mechanism in place to ensure to certainly incentivize compliance and to ensuring cases of pretty explicit violation of the spirit and letter of that policy that the institution is actually investigating proactively in taking steps to try to address situations that are potentially problematic. And so that is the nature of, you have the sort of full language of the policy that is proposed. As I said, our goal was really to present this to you so that questions could be asked and really so that voting members of the uscs disposition toward this can be informed by your thoughts.

Shrivastav (01:42:31):

I'll open it up for one question. We have one more item, but this is a discussion item. You can or please encourage you to send your comments and feedback to Lana perhaps so she can share with Colin and others. Yes,

Paschal (01:42:49):

As an SAAI kind of look at this from both perspectives. I know of people who are uncomfortable to me or idea of a faculty student relationship. I also know of one case of what I would consider an inappropriate relationship. My main thought slash comment is that it's pretty hard. So the point about violations and sanction is actually buried in the investigations header. And so you have to open the other policy and then it's not clear how the possible sanctions for harassment and misconduct relate to the policy proposal here. And as an SAA, I'm concerned about this because it seems like the implication might just be to pass a buck along or that there's no clear recommendation on what a sanction should be in the case of some inappropriate relationships. So yeah, that's my only thought. That's more of a comment than the question than anything.

Johnson (01:43:44):

Okay,

Shrivastav ([01:43:46](#)):

Thank you. It is four 15 and we have one more item, which is actually a item we need vote on. So I will move on to the last item on the agenda. Once again, let me reiterate if you have questions, suggestions, comments about the previous, the item we just finished discussing, please send it to Lana and she will forward it to Colin and others for discussion at the UFC. The last item is an update on questions for Dean reviews. Once again, Colin, your microphone.

Johnson ([01:44:19](#)):

Yes. So the policies that there are different policies that govern the review of deans and vice provost at different levels. Core school deans are because of the fact that their core schools are actively governed by UA level policies. Recently at the UFC meeting on October 31st, the policies for review actually include provisions that require different sets of questions to be developed to be administered to faculty in units under review at the UFC. And the way that works basically is most of the policies call on the relevant faculty governance body to generate a list of 10 questions that will be administered to faculty and units under whose deans are under review. And then the school policy committees get to generate an additional five questions that are added to the survey so that there are multiple constituencies adding, kind of contributing to the process of collecting data that then informs the review committee's kind of understanding of what's going on in the school.

([01:45:22](#)):

And the survey is just one part of the review process. The UFC level policy requires those questions to actually receive formal approval from the university faculty at council before they go into effect. We did that for the core school deans at the October 31st meeting. We're now trying to sort achieve similar results at the level of the Bloomington campus so that we have the pieces in place. We need to conduct reviews for deans who are actually in charge of campus level schools. So these questions were actually generated. I will tell you this process in the existing policies is actually contemplated as a fairly regular thing, right on an annual basis or every few years. The existing policies imply that, sorry, imply that the UFC executive committee should actually be reviewing these items. It's not clear how often that has happened in the past, but we're trying to get into the practice of doing that.

([01:46:24](#)):

This explains the nature of the review policy. It's as a provost and president to the faculty of the Bloomington Faculty Council shall convene a review committee. The provost shall provide the review committee with the description of the duties and responsibilities of the administrator under review. That's easily done. The review committee shall have latitude in establishing its own procedures, provided that in its final report the provost contains a frank evidence-based assessment of the reviewee real or perceived strengths and weaknesses as a unit leader, including an assessment of how the reviewee has impacted the unit's performance, along with a constructively framed set of recommendations for how the reviewee might address any real or perceived shortcomings in their performance moving forward. So that's the spirit of the review process as stipulated in our policies. As I mentioned, the survey includes 10 questions from the BFC five questions from the unit specific and also an opportunity for people to provide written comments. We have developed a list of questions that are kind of in accord with the questions that were recently adopted by the UFC. And basically what we're here to do is to seek the council's approval to adopt these as the survey questions coming from the faculty council for the coming cycle and for the foreseeable future until the issue is revisited.

([01:47:41](#)):

After much discussion, we decided that it would actually make sense for the purpose of producing data that would be useful to do a kind of two part approach, attend questions that employ a Likert scale with text boxes included under each of the questions that not only allow but invite expansion, kind of circumstantial comment. And these are the questions that, like I said, in an appropriate form were recently adopted by the UFC and that we would like to see the BFC adopt for the purpose of these review processes. Questions about communication, which I think is very important.

([01:48:25](#)):

So wanted to deal with that. Questions about leadership and the promotion of intellectual vitality. The fourth question deals with consultation and active participation in the enterprise of shared governance. The fifth question, partly because the review process is conceived as a review, not just of the individual but of the unit under the individual's leadership asks about perceptions having to do with the nature of appointments that have been made by deans, the quality of appointees in associate dean positions, chairships, directorships, et cetera. A question about hiring and retention, a question that was really meant to get to whether or not faculty perceived deans to understand what the faculty understand to be the strengths of the faculty in the unit. A question about the dean's demonstrated commitment to diversity and inclusion and a question having to do with the dean's perceived adherence to policies and procedures having to do with tenure and promotion. So those are the questions that we would like to see adopted, nine of them at least for the purposes of conducting dean reviews. And if people have any comments or questions about the comments or questions, we're happy to entertain them, but otherwise we would just like to seek an up or down vote on that proposal.

Shrivastav ([01:49:48](#)):

Thank you, Colin. It's open for discussion

Johnson ([01:49:57](#)):

And I will say my understanding is that some of the deans were mildly annoyed by some of these questions, which leads me to believe that they're probably good for that reason.

Shrivastav ([01:50:08](#)):

Elizabeth,

Housworth ([01:50:11](#)):

The dean of the college might be slightly annoyed because chairs are usually nominated by their departments and the dean would probably be scolded viciously if he didn't appoint the nominee and the nominee may or may not be an effective leader.

Johnson ([01:50:30](#)):

Touche.

Shrivastav ([01:50:34](#)):

Other questions? Seeing none. Are we ready to vote? This is an action item. Oh, I see Lisa. Oh, there's one more.

Thomassen ([01:50:47](#)):

Yeah. Hi, I have a question. I apologize if I'm not prepared for this meeting, but actually two questions. The first question was is what's currently done? Is this replacing something or is there a procedure that is already existing that this is supplanting? My next question would be to whom does this go? Who is going to be completing this as faculty, staff chairs, et cetera? Thank you.

Johnson ([01:51:08](#)):

So Lisa, I didn't hear the first question. I'm sorry.

Thomassen ([01:51:10](#)):

The first question. Yeah, the first question is this proposed survey, and I'm not going to get into questions of methodological construction, we're just going to come up with a five point scale. My question is, what is currently done? Is this replacing an existing procedure?

Johnson ([01:51:29](#)):

So the existing, it's an excellent question. The procedure, these policies were actually updated last year. They used to actually contain a set of questions that were written into the fabric of the policy. And one of the problems with those questions from our perspective and from the perspective of proceeding executive committees was that they asked a lot of questions about things that I think a lot of people had concerns that the faculty actually would not have access to the information they would need in order to respond to the questions. So I can't remember, there were a couple of, we talked about them, but they were questions about the, like how well has the dean advocated for the unit's interests in the context of the institution. There are ways in which that question could be answered, but it was also very clear that deans advocate for the interests of their units all the time.

([01:52:20](#)):

They usually do it behind closed doors, however, with the people who are in positions to be making decisions about it. So it was the sense of different people who looked at those that those were kind of unfair and ultimately not very useful questions to be posing to the faculty. So what happened was at both the UA level and the BFC level, the specific questions were stripped out of the existing policy and a provision was simply put in place that said the BFC executive committee will identify these questions on a fairly regular basis and approve them so they can be tweaked and adjusted as really our experience with this form of data collection teaches us more about the kinds of questions we need to be asking. That was done at the UA level as well. So this is kind of our first shot at circumstantially produced.

Thomassen ([01:53:08](#)):

Okay, great. Thank you very much for that background. The second question, or the second part of the question is to whom would the survey go is

Johnson ([01:53:15](#)):

This, so currently policy requires that these surveys be sent to all faculty in the unit. That includes tenure track faculty, non-tenure track faculty, a number of academic specialists who are sort of classified full-time faculty. It excludes visiting appointees because they're not seen as having, they're not imagined to have as a default, the kind of experience with the unit that would be needed to usefully kind of contribute to this process or precisely the same stakes in its outcome.

Thomassen ([01:53:43](#)):

Super. Thank you.

Shrivastav ([01:53:48](01:53:48)):

Go ahead, Israel.

Herrera ([01:53:51](01:53:51)):

Yeah, I have some questions regarding the meaning maybe I don't know if it's because I am an international faculty, but number seven, the dean understands the strength of the faculty in the school, in the college is in the sense it's number seven, right? Yeah, number seven. So in what if the dean understands we are good faculty or it's something like values or maybe acknowledges because understands, I don't know if it indicates he knows who we are.

Johnson ([01:54:42](01:54:42)):

I mean, I would say, I would just remind you, and this is part of the reason that each of these questions have a text box that's text box beneath them that says, please expand if appropriate. I think would precisely be, I mean the kind of conceit is that would precisely be a space where people could kind of proactively specify or question the question, the premise of the question. But I think the balance with these, so the concern is noted. I think the idea is you would prefer to see greater specificity in that question. So how would you propose that it be adjusted?

Herrera ([01:55:26](01:55:26)):

If there is a possible amendment? I would see values or recognizes or acknowledges the strength of the faculty, the strengths of the faculty in the college.

Johnson ([01:55:42](01:55:42)):

Okay.

Herrera ([01:55:45](01:55:45)):

And also Colin, I don't know, that's my suggestion for number seven. Maybe I'm wrong for number points. What is that? The points number five, if the deans appoint the chairs, does it happen in all the schools in the college? What

Johnson ([01:56:17](01:56:17)):

I mean ultimately it's the dean's prerogative to appoint people to units, make recommendations, and deans can choose to appoint, approve them. But deans can also prove not to do that.

Shrivastav ([01:56:30](01:56:30)):

Yes.

Dau-Schmidt ([01:56:32](01:56:32)):

I am just a little surprised that none of the questions say anything about faculty governance. So I might add a 10th point, 10th.

Johnson ([01:56:40](01:56:40)):

Question number four says the dean initiatives and decisions.

Dau-Schmidt ([01:56:43](#)):

Oh, okay. I'm sorry.

Shrivastav ([01:56:50](#)):

Yes,

Thomassen ([01:56:52](#)):

Some minor comment, but this seems sort of kind of top down. It would be nice to see something included about evaluating the dean, whether they advocate for their faculty or their success in advocating for their faculty. I know there are a lot of, as you mentioned, negotiations that go behind the closed doors that we're not aware of. We don't always know when deans are advocating for their faculty, but it might not be a bad idea to see something about included about whether they're evaluated successfully doing that. And this might go along with Israel's comment about understanding the strengths of the faculty, understanding or evaluating, but advocating for the

Herrera ([01:57:27](#)):

Right.

Johnson ([01:57:29](#)):

So I think as a timing issue, I mean one thing is we can accept formal motions to revise if people would like to do that and we should probably do it. The other thing I would remind people of is all the units have the opportunity to add five additional questions of their own design. And so if people feel, for example, that those suggested additions are best dealt with at this level, and remember all of these questions have to apply to every single dean. That's another provision of the existing policy. You don't get to pick and choose. Once we adopt these, they apply to everybody. So if people feel strongly about the fact that those adjustments should be proposed as motions here, then I would suggest going ahead and informally making them. I would say that I do think it's important for there to be, we have one minute to do it though, so

Shrivastav ([01:58:14](#)):

We have one minute to do this. So is there a motion to change? Number seven, as Israel suggested we need a motion and a second to change. Seven. The dean acknowledges, acknowledges and values the strengths of the faculty in the school college. So move second. Is there a second

([01:58:40](#)):

You? Oh, you're seconding that. Okay, so we have a motion and a second. So this is up for vote. All in favor of modifying number seven to read. The dean acknowledges and values the strengths of the faculty in the school slash college. Please raise your hands. Will you count Lana? Looks like there's majority here. Okay, so that is approved. So that change needs to be made. And now in one minute over time we will have to call a motion to approve the revised version of these questions. Is there a motion? Elizabeth says, is the motion is there a second? Kate seconds it. All in favor of accepting these questions. I think it's pretty close to unanimous. Motion passes. Thank you very much. That is the last business of the day. Motion meeting adjourned.

Johnson ([01:59:39](#)):

I'm going to call us on time. We started like three.