

Transcript BFC Meeting November 18, 2025

[Shrivastav]

Good afternoon. Welcome back. It is November 18th and I call this BFC meeting to order. As always, let's begin with the approval of the minutes from our last meeting, which was November 4th, 2025. I need somebody who has read the minutes to pass or ask for a motion to approve. Seeing none. Motion to approve. Somebody wanting to second that. We've got two people seconding that. Any questions or shall we go right ahead? There is a question from Beth.

[Buggenhagen]

Thank you, Provost. Srivastav. As you know, I represent Social and Historical Sciences. I brought my eraser that President Ramos had given us. I was contacted through Travis O'Brien by a faculty member in the Borns Jewish Studies Program. They would like to have clarification please of the minutes. Hello Chancellor Ryan Gold. Regarding your comments about the appointment of the director. The faculty members indicated that when they had listened to the minutes, you might have said something along the lines of you had met with the Executive Committee when in fact there is no executive committee, but you may have meant the Faculty Affairs committee, but in fact they say they hadn't met with you about the director transition. So, they've asked me to ask you for clarification and they contacted Travis O'Brien about having that clarification reflected in the minutes from the last meeting, please. Thank you so much.

[Reingold]

Thank you for that question. As I recall, I did not meet with the Executive Committee of the Jewish Studies program. The dean met with the Executive Committee as I understand it, of the Jewish Studies Program.

[Buggenhagen]

I'm sorry. They do not have an Executive Committee.

[Reingold]

I'm not quite sure then what the exact name is, but the faculty council or leadership of that department.

[Buggenhagen]

Yeah, and I think that's the question and then maybe that's a question that we can move to discussion that my colleagues and Social and Historical Sciences raised.

[Shrivastav]

If you are okay with it. Can we vote on the motion knowing that there will be a correction to that one piece in the minutes? Is that feasible?

[O'Brien]

I believe so. I don't recall that that specific statement made it into the minutes. It would be in the report, which I'm happy to both reflect this conversation in the report for today. I think what I'm saying is that I think we're okay to vote on the minutes because I don't believe there's an amendment to the minutes themselves. Okay.

[Buggenhagen]

My colleagues in Jewish studies saw that the minutes when they contacted you, they said that the minutes were not an accurate reflection. Well, there was a confusion about what was actually said. What was said.

[Shrivastav]

The minutes should only reflect what was discussed here. Everything else is in the report or you can be in a discussion question.

[Buggenhagen]

Right. So, they didn't want it in the minutes that the dean of the college and the executive associate dean of the college had met with the Borns Jewish studies faculty because there is no Executive Committee. They had not met with the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Graduate Committee or the Undergraduate Affairs Committee and the faculty don't feel that they were consulted.

[Shrivastav]

So, Travis, could you just strike that off and the rest of the minutes can be recorded with this group's approval?

[Reingold]

What was conveyed to me, and for whatever it's worth, just in terms of clarification on this, the report that I received from the dean was that he met with that group.

[O'Brien]

Yes. So I will clarify the report. The minutes do not make mention of specifically what you're saying, Beth. It was the report that made that statement and yes, I will make that clarification.

[Shrivastav]

So, the report will be modified. The minutes stay the same seeing any other question? There's one more in the back. This is just about the minutes by the way. Please don't have any...

[Furey]

Can I have a question about the statement that the chancellor just made?

[Shrivastav]

No, let's hold that for the discussion section. This is just for the minutes. Yes, Julie?

[Hardesty]

Yeah, I'm confused about what the minutes are. The agenda is linking up to a document that's the meeting report and it does have that statement in there about you remembering that the dean met with the executive committee, but that is not the minutes.

[O'Brien]

Virginia might be able to clarify. So I believe what is linked there is not what should be linked. That is a copy of the report, not the minutes. So, I believe we don't actually have the information to vote on what we need to be voting on that was not circulated inadvertently.

[Shrivastav]

So, we can table the minutes. We can table the minutes and try and vote on both last meeting's minutes and this meeting's minutes at the next meeting. Is that acceptable procedurally? So I guess somebody has to pass a motion to table the minutes. Anybody to second? Okay, so we are tabling these minutes. We will come back to this at the next meeting. Thank you very much. Let us kick off the next item in our agenda and as we always begin our meetings this week we will have a memorial resolution for our colleague Herbert Brantley. Carrie.

[Docherty]

Thank you. Herbert "Bert" Brantley was born on June 2, 1929, in Nash County, North Carolina, the son of Bertram Clifford Brantley and Mavis Broughton Brantley. He graduated from Spring Hope High School and then attended Appalachian State Teacher's College where he met Juanita "Johnnie" Grant, who became the love of his life. They were married on August 20, 1950. Their marriage would last over 70 years until she predeceased him in 2021.

Early in his career, Brantley served as a Russian linguist in the U.S. Army (1952-55). After receiving his bachelor's and master's degrees from the University of North Carolina (in 1956 and 1958, respectively), he was a coach and teacher in public schools from 1957-62. While serving as an instructor in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at North Carolina State from 1962-66, Brantley earned his Ph.D. (1966) from the University of North Carolina with concentrations in higher education, student personnel services, and recreation administration. During his 21-year career at Clemson, Brantley was the first-ever department head for the school's recreation and park administration program, later becoming associate dean, then acting dean, of Clemson's College of Forest and Recreation Resources.

Brantley began his career at Indiana University in 1987 when he was recruited away from a distinguished career at Clemson University to chair the Department of Recreation, Park, and Tourism Studies (then known as the Department of Recreation and Park Administration) at the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. Soon after his arrival, Brantley initiated a challenge cost-share agreement contract between IU and the U.S. Forest Service, a move that strengthened the department's outdoor recreation resources management program.

Under Brantley's tutelage, the Department of Recreation and Park Administration experienced significant growth, adding curriculum options in tourism and sports management, and seeing the number of majors and student credit hours more than double. During his tenure as department chair, the National Center for Recreation Resources, the National Center on Accessibility, and the Epley Institute were established. Management of Indiana University's Hilltop Garden and Nature Center was also formally transferred to the Department of Recreation and Park Administration during his tenure. Brantley was president of the National Recreation and Park Association, which also honored him with a distinguished professorial award; president of the Society of Park and Recreation Educators, which honored him with a fellow award; a founding member and president of the Academy of Leisure

Sciences; a member of the board of directors of the American Academy for Park and Recreation Administration; chairman of the NRPA Council on Accreditation; and chair of the NRPA Congress Program Committee. He retired in 1994.

Brantley's professional philosophy is perhaps best summarized by his words in a 1994 issue of the American Academy for Park and Recreation Administration: "Through leisure activities, we have a great opportunity to add dimensions to our lives and to the lives of those whom we serve. It is through leisure that we experience the dynamic development of self, a state of mind in which we experience an integration of activities and through which we gain a better understanding of man's role in society." Thank you.

[Docherty]

Thank you, Carrie. If you're able, please stand for a moment of silence. Thank you. I next invite Bill Ramos, faculty president for the Executive Committee report. Bill.

[Ramos]

Thank you, Provost. Welcome back to our fourth of ten meetings and our last gathering together until 2026 with Thanksgiving just around the bend. Then into final weeks and final week, finals week, and onto winter break. If I could. I'm going to take some privilege with the memorial. I'd like to add some information about Dr. Bur Brantley. This happens to be the second person this year that we've memorialized who has been directly connected to my career and I don't know what Karma's telling me if anything, but it really struck me. In his later years, Bert and I often had lunch while he was a resident at Bell Trace in town and what many might not know, and I think you mentioned Russian. He was self-taught and fluent in Russian and served time working in covert situations with the military while still being a faculty member. He loved and wrote poetry and would often during lunch just break out in prose and challenged me to do the same. He was incredibly influential in establishing the academic program, which resulted in my home department. He also has an outdoor education center named after him at Clemson University. So thanks for letting me have a little additional time. A special thanks, a special thank you if you were able to contribute to food or supplies to our Pack the Hall event. If you looked in the hallway, it is packed, so thank you for that. I was on a call with Student Affairs and there is no doubt the need is great on campus and across the Bloomington Monroe County area. Anyone who's watching the news can see that. So I thank you for providing the gift of giving. It looks like we have a successful event, and I wanted to give a special shout out to Virginia in the BFC office for jumping in with the logistics on short notice. She's learning that when you work with me sometimes there's just sparks, and we go. So thank you for being involved with that. I'd also like to thank Student Government, GPSG Staff Council and those in Bryan Hall who, again, quickly joined in. I think Student Government, we're picking up your barrels tomorrow, three to four packed barrels, I think. Yeah, so great feeling. And also a reminder as I was talking to people from Hoosier Hills that this is the time of year we think about it, it has momentum, but certainly coming out of the holidays they also see a need because we've all kind of come past the holidays and maybe a heightened awareness of giving. So we can think about that. We did include the QR code, so if you would like an opportunity to donate in that way, you are more than welcome. Everything goes through Hoosier Hills Food Bank who also works closely and helps make sure that our Crimson Cupboard is stocked as well.

Working on the event made me reflect on where my own sense of giving came from and the awareness of the impact. This is a five-year-old Billy Ramos. If you go home with me on Thanksgiving, I'm still Billy. And this was an event that my parents started us in when we were very little. It was to help the Children's Research Foundation, which was my parents' big cause at the time, and we would shine

apples and then those apples were sold and that money went to fund research for children. Of course, when you're five you don't know what you're doing, you're making a game out of shining apples. It wasn't until later that I realized the impact of every apple and what it made a difference in people's lives. And then again, as karma kicks you in the rear sometime, I'm at the faculty awards event, which was phenomenal by the way, in this hall. I don't know, how many total people did we recognize? 80? Teaching Trustees Awards, the Sonneborn, Provost Professorships... And I was introduced to Dr. Joel Wong who actually studies gratitude, what an amazing thing to study. So I reached out and thanked him for his work and its impact I have linked later in the slides, he has a site about 30 principles of gratitude, the impact it has on society, our own lives, our own wellbeing. So, I just kind of wanted to put that out there into the universe as it all kind of came together for me and he was just awarded Provost Professor. So I'll leave this up for a little bit longer and then we'll take it down as we proceed. As a follow-up to the resolution passed by the council around concerns with the Trump compact, it has been shared with Dr. Hormuth, the chair of the Trustees, and he's in the process of digesting the content and all things related to its implications.

As many of you heard UFC University leadership and including some initial conversation with Trustees have taken place around moves to adopt the highly respected Chicago Principles related to free speech as a move to reaffirm our commitment as well as move towards healing for all members of the IU community. At this time, the UFC Executive Board has been asked to submit nominees from each campus to serve on a task force that will work to forge the call to the Trustees to adopt the principles. The hope is to work quickly to get a primary adoption with the bigger concept put on the table and then continue to work to develop the pieces that are needed to make sure the rubber meets the road. It cannot be a flash in the pan, it has to have momentum behind it. I truly feel this has the makings of an incredibly positive moment, but it may require us to level some doubt, mistrust, frustration, anger, and in some cases perhaps learned helplessness. So, I ask you to just reflect and stay tuned. It came to us very quickly. It has momentum out of executive. So again, I'm hoping we need a moment and I'm hoping we can find a moment in this. As president of the faculty, I plan to move forward with all the possibilities, opportunities and healing that this can bring us.

Finally, a note that the 2026-27 volunteer forum is now available on the BFC Teams site. You're welcome to start showing interest, believe it or not for next year. More reminders coming, but feel free to take a look. And of course, this will all be led by the Nominations Committee, which will take over January 1st. And last but not least, finally, I'd like to give a warm thank you and see if we can get a round of applause for David Taylor. This is his last meeting with us today in the faculty council. David, somehow the balloons didn't make it out. I'm sure that's on me somewhere. They're in the back. We will get them to you. You're going to grab them. Thank you. Alright, so David has served with us and really was just incredibly important as we searched for a new director. Virginia's in that role and he did dual roles but helped keep the faculty council going and before that he had a halftime position. Now he'll move on full-time into the Chancellor's office and then Virginia will take over full-time with us. And with that, I thank you again for sharing your time and talents with the BFC and turn it back over to the Provost.

[Shrivastav]

Thank you, Bill. And before we go on, I just want everybody to know that David now has his balloons. Congratulations David.

[Ramos]

Timing is everything.

[Shrivastav]

Thank you.

[Ramos]

Thank you, David.

[Shrivastav]

Thank you, Bill. I now invite Chancellor Reinold for the campus leadership report.

[Reingold]

Alright, thank you and good afternoon, all. As always, it's wonderful to have this opportunity to share updates with this group. It's hard to escape the external narrative that has called into question our commitment to free inquiry and free speech at Indiana University Bloomington in these recent weeks. In response, I feel it is appropriate while I have an audience with this group to voice my commitment to these foundational values of higher education. As an intellectual beacon, excellence in teaching and scholarship must always be our north star. At that public university to the north where I spent a decade, I became quite familiar with organizations such as FIRE in my role leading that campus and its initiatives around free inquiry and free speech, which earned it a top ranking among public research universities for free speech. As a social scientist, I have questions about the methodology of FIRE and how they go about computing their rankings. Some of their calculations reflect a lack of depth in discerning personnel actions related to legitimate bad behavior versus those that might point to free speech suppression. But whatever we think about their methodology, they can play an important role and I believe they do play an important role in holding universities accountable to free speech principles and their impact in the media is undeniable. There are universities convening thoughtful and important discussions on the topics of free inquiry and free speech. I have worked closely with our colleagues to the north at the University of Chicago and their leadership who are responsible for standing up something called the Chicago Forum, which is their center for efforts related to free inquiry and free speech. And I've had regular conversations and working relationships with a number of free speech alumni groups around the country, including one at the Massachusetts Institute for Technology and at that other public university to the north in West Lafayette. I worked closely with the trustees to adopt the Kalven Report, which is a precursor document to the Chicago Principles and one of the foundational documents that gave life to what is now known as the Chicago Principles, which is focused on supporting institutional neutrality on social and political issues in university life. All of these will inform efforts to preserve IU Bloomington as a place that reflects the commitment to light and truth emblazoned on our seal. We will remain vigilant in our commitment to freedom of inquiry and the dissemination of ideas for the benefit of our students, our community of scholars, and the broader community around us. Our laboratories and performance spaces must remain home to the best scholarship and creative activity our colleagues can create. Our classrooms must provide space for varied perspectives guided by faculty to make sure that even across differences classroom discussions are productive, intellectually rigorous and rooted in academics, not advocacy. Our students must be introduced to and embrace the norms and values of free inquiry and free speech as members of our intellectual community. Efforts oriented around this will emerge this coming year. In all of our actions, there must be no doubt that we welcome spirited thoughtful debate in an unquestioned commitment to discovery and creativity that celebrates and respects a wide range of points of view and honors the most scholarly traditions of Indiana University Bloomington. As I mentioned earlier this semester, a committee has been assembled to create a campus program to

commemorate the 250th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Last week, details of an internal grant competition were published in IUB Today. Proposals will be accepted until December 15th and will provide funds for program costs for those winning submissions. I want to encourage you to share this opportunity with your colleagues. I'm confident we'll see many creative and thoughtful proposals that will be a part of a memorial slate of activities. Again, I hope you'll encourage colleagues to be a part of our campus celebration of the 250th. These events can and should be one element of how we make certain that our IUB students understand and respect the commitment to free speech that is central to the founding of our country. At the same time, they can develop in our students the civic literacy that is needed to be informed and engaged citizens. I hope this group will engage around that topic and lead efforts to make certain this is part of their education here on the Bloomington campus.

So that concludes my report. As we mark the final meeting of the semester, I want to thank you for your service to this group and even more your services as faculty members of this great campus. Your commitment to your teaching and scholarship are the heart of the IUB campus. Your work here is what makes this among the most important public research universities in America and it honors the legacy of those who came before you. I want to wish each of you a happy Thanksgiving and a productive end of the semester and a restful and restorative winter break.

So, with that, I know we have a number of questions. I was going to try and answer and address several of them and then hand them off to others to dig in. We received a question on food insecurity which follows up on President Ramos's presentation. So, following the last meeting, we got some questions about food insecurity and SNAP benefits, federal food assistance. It was also included as a question about how faculty can help students in need. Since that meeting, SNAP benefits, I think if you've been following the news, have been fully reinstated for the month of November, as I understand it. On campus, the Student Care and Resource Center includes the Crimson Cupboard, our IU food pantry in Campus View Apartments with a satellite location at the IMU. Today's donations will benefit Crimson Cupboard. Please note that donations tend to decrease in January and February, so your continued support at that critical time of the Crimson Cupboard efforts, whether in the form of food donations or financial support are much appreciated. Received another question about Emeritus status and I wanted to make sure that all were aware that earlier this semester the Chancellor of Indianapolis and I appointed a working group that was co-chaired by Fred Cate from here at IU Bloomington and Brandon Maxcy from IU Indianapolis to look at this question of Emeritus designation. And they were asked to review current Indiana University practices regarding awarding Emeritus status to retired faculty and were asked to offer their recommendations. In summary, they recommended, and this was just their report was just submitted, so I'm reporting back, they recommended that Indiana University award the title Emeritus to retired faculty who have made significant contributions to their academic discipline, student learning and advancement, and the people of Indiana University and the IU community. They outlined a set of criteria to qualify for Emeritus designation. They also outlined a six-step process for nomination. I would summarize overall their report supported and restated existing processes across our campuses and emphasize the need for consistency across all units on each of our campuses. And I'm happy to provide that report to our colleagues here if that would be helpful.

We also received a number of questions on general education, post-tenure review and a few others. I'm going to hand it over to the Provost and let him work through those.

[Shirvastav]

For questions on post-tenure... Thank you. For questions on post-tenure review, I'd invite Carrie Dockerty to respond and following that there were some questions on the general education effort that

is ongoing. I would invite co-chairs Daniel DeSawal to respond that perhaps, and then Luoheng Han is here as well. The two co-chairs could probably respond to that. So Carrie, if you're ready?

[Docherty]

Sure. So for a post-tenure review, there was concern about how these evaluations were going to occur. So, we've had a series of workshops, we also continue to have open office hours for anyone who would like to come and talk about the process. What we have been talking about and sharing and what I would love to remind everyone today is that the post-tenure year productivity review is grounded in the annual reviews that occur, and those annual reviews and the criteria utilized for those annual reviews are created by the faculty in those departments. And so when those annual reviews are successful and productive, then the post-tenure review in many ways is a foregone conclusion. So, I think the work that you all are doing now to create your annual review criteria are really going to be the important foundation that will drive what the post-tenure review looks like.

[Shrivastav]

Thank you, Danielle.

[DeSawal]

Great. So, we had four questions regarding the general education reform process and most of the questions are ahead where the committee is in the actual process within looking at the gen ed reform model. So, there are questions about how the proposed general education will affect flexibility of degree programs, how the revisions will impact interdisciplinary programs and minors and if a plan to integrate language learning into interdisciplinary or global competency requirements are present. Since the group is not at the point where we have the initial recommendations for the reformed general education model, we aren't able to answer those specific questions at this point in the process. What I will note is that as we shared earlier this semester, our goal is to provide recommendations and a model for faculty feedback in January. And you should have all seen from the IUB Today the link to the website where we will be placing all of those recommendations for faculty feedback. And this also starts to address the final question, which was about faculty involvement. So, multiple stakeholders will be engaged to provide feedback in the spring, which will include the BFCs Educational Policies Committee as well as the schools and the college policy chairs, the BFC, and then recommendations will be on the website with a link to a location to provide feedback.

[Shrivastav]

Thank you, Danielle. We have a few minutes left if there are other questions from the floor. Moira.

[Marsh]

Two quick follow-up questions if I may, for the Chancellor concerning the emeritus task force and report. First of all, will that report, I really strongly urge you to share that report with this body.

[Reingold]

Yeah, yeah, absolutely.

[Marsh]

Okay. And then related to that, will there be any mechanism for the usual faculty review processes to apply to the implementation of whatever changes are made to that practice? Number one and number two, the second question, can you confirm or deny whether current people are applying for emeritus status now and are being either turned down or delayed and a lot of confusion and rumor and misinformation about and concern about that? Can you confirm or deny whether any actual changes in practice are already happening and if so what they are?

[Reingold]

So, my read of the Emeritus working group report is that it does not suggest that there be substantial changes, and I agree with that. So, in terms of the implementation piece, there are a few suggestions there that I think are worth or consideration and some discussion. I think for instance, there was some question about sort how Emeritus faculty are presented on public web pages. So, some Emeritus faculty members are quite active and engaged in working with students, some are not, particularly among graduate students, and there was some suggestions about how can we reflect to the broader world whether or not Emeritus faculty are sort of still engaged in their scholarly work and working with students or are off working on other things, so that there's sort of truth in advertising in terms of what students might experience if they were to come to a particular program. So, I thought there were some helpful suggestions that we were going to share with the deans and the academic leadership of the campus and see whether or not those were things that might be constructive and helpful. Very much look forward to getting some feedback from this group on whether or not those are efforts that are worthwhile. When I started in June, I think there was a significant backlog of Emeritus cases. I think we have worked through the bulk of them. These things go by the calendar of the Board of Trustees meetings because they are, that is the final stop for those appointments, and I think we have made our way pretty well through the backlog on it and have to say, I'm not aware, I hear this, I've been over to the Emeriti house twice now over the past couple months and had a number of wide ranging discussions and I think that there is some misinformation that is floating around there. I'm not aware that there is a large number of backlog cases I think, but it does take, the timeline is probably longer than maybe people expect. And to be honest, and I think we got a question from you Moira that we didn't get in time to answer in more detail for this meeting, but we'll do it at the next one on some figures about sort of the number of what does the pipeline look like and how have the cases landed. And absolutely we'll provide that level of detail here at the next meeting. But I'm not aware that there is a substantial backlog and I'm not aware that there are substantial number of cases that have been denied. There are some, and I think that there are reasons behind them, but they are a small number when you look at the overall volume. I'm talking about less than a handful overall that are in that. And there are some that are under some maybe one or two that I think there is a sort of considerable thought going into and a close look in terms of the merits of the case. But those are still under review but only we're talking about maybe one or two.

[Shrivastav]

Okay. We have one minute left. So, can we go with Jane?

[Furey]

Yes. That is just a very quick question because the important points you made about faculty governance, the spirit of faculty governance and free speech. And I just wanted to just clarify, Chancellor Reingold. So, are you saying that you are in possession of report from the executive dean Rick Van Kooten stating that he consulted with the faculty committee in the Borns Jewish Studies program? So, that was just one question apart from any definition of what that committee was called. And then are you stating that you

did not, are you on record as affirming as I understood from the report last time that you did not discuss the position with the now interim director in May, as he said at a faculty meeting with the core faculty of the Borns Jewish studies program that you had discussed that position with him in May and offered it to him in May?

[Reingold]

Thank you for the additional questions and opportunity to provide some clarification. So, in the discussions with the dean, there were questions which I had for the dean about the process that he was going to follow in making this appointment. And within the context of those discussions, it was shared with me that one of the steps that was taken or was going to be taken as I understood it, was that there was going to be a consultation with, what I thought at the time, maybe I'm misspeaking, was the Executive Committee of that particular program, and he described it as being a small group of the faculty that had leadership roles in that particular program. So, what was reported was that that there was going to be that consultation, and that consultation had taken place. So, as far as that part of your question is concerned, and yeah, in the discussions with the dean about the anticipated search for the next leader of that program, which had been long scheduled, this dates back to, I don't know how long, but quite some time into last year or maybe the year before, that there would be a search for the next director in this current academic year right now. In discussions with the dean over the summer there were questions about, okay, well what is the transition plan? How is the search gone unfold? Is the sitting chair or director going to continue? Is there going to be an interim director? And there were discussions about that including some discussions about who might, if there was a need for an interim director or that was thought to be a course that we would pursue. The current interim director was discussed. I think I did have an informal conversation with him to ask if it's anything that he would be interested in doing if that opportunity became available and that was the nature of it.

[Furey]

I'll just mention that I don't think the external review of the program did mention the need for an interim director, just noting that.

[Shrivastav]

Okay, thank you. In the interest of time, we will continue to move with the next item, which is a report from the Associate VP for International Affairs. We have John Wilkerson with us. So John, if you're ready, take it away.

[Wilkerson]

Sure thing. Oh, there's my slide. Great. Hello. Thank you for inviting me here to talk a little bit about the Office of International Services and just the state of affairs really in terms of international student mobility, global learning, things like that. I have one slide just to hit bullet points because I imagine there is going to be quite a bit of questions and answers, hopefully answers, given the state of the world, particularly as it pertains to international students. The first thing I thought would be of interest are some data points that we've gathered related to international enrollment. So, I will run through some of those and I'm also happy to share this data for purposes of the notes. Alright, so right now at Bloomington we are hosting 4,428 international degree-seeking students. That is a decline year over year of 11.1%. That's very much in keeping, it actually outperforms, the national trend that's been provided by the IIE fall enrollment snapshot, which is not the same as the Open Doors Report that was just released this year or this month. The Open Doors Report lags one academic year. So, we participate,

leading institutions participate, in a snapshot to get an idea of how did this class come together and how are things looking for the next cycle? So, what they were seeing in terms of the snapshot was a decline of 15% in new graduate students and overall decline of 13%. So, we slightly outpaced, performance-wise, loss of overall enrollment, small blessings where we can find them. For graduate students, for comparison, the enrollments of international students still lead the international population. We have 2,245 graduate students, that's across all academic levels in graduate studies. That decline is 13.6% year over year. So again, outpacing the 15% figure. Undergraduate, we're down 6.7%. That's a mixed bag and we can chat a bit about that. We did in fall term enroll 369 undergraduate students, which show in the census. We did accommodate late arrivals for international students within a certain time period who were not able to obtain visas due to various issues with the government. So, the total number right now is actually right around 373. So, our target was 381. We landed pretty well, apparently quite well according to the snapshot data, which shows a significant decrease. Interestingly, what that snapshot data also revealed is that the largest enrollment hits and application hits for this term have occurred within Institutions who have a selectivity rate of 25% or less. That seems to be a product, it is supposed by the researchers, that this is a product of increased government scrutiny and reductions in funding, opportunities for students to be funded through research dollars and so forth. For undergraduate international student recruitment, for which our office is responsible, Common app data right now for the fall 2026 cohort is showing an overall decline in undergraduate applications of 9%, led by declines from India by 15%, declines from Asia overall, the lion's share being China, is down 9%, and declines from Africa overall down 18%. The standout there is Ghana, which is showing a decline of 43%, again, attributable to various things, but most often what is cited in that data are restrictions, visa restrictions and threats to OPT, Optional Practical Training. For comparison, that Common, or for a point of reference, that Common app data is particularly of interest to us as 97% of our international undergraduate applicants do come to us through the Common app right now. Those of you who may have access to application reports, enrollment reports through dean's portals and so forth, would see that it looks as though we're trending 15% down in undergraduate applications. That's a product largely of a new application process that was put in place this year and so the point in time comparisons are not particularly even. When we look at our slate application system data, we are showing relatively flat, possibly a slight increase and we see those numbers on a daily basis in increasing and catching up. That's encouraging.

That is it for enrollment of students. For scholars, this is a hot topic right now of course and related very much to the conversations around the H1B restrictions and the imposition of the hundred thousand dollars fee for certain H visas. There are a couple of points that I'd like to ensure are known in that regard is that the university is still able to support and issue H1B applications. That will be especially important to remember for any scholars who currently hold an H1 and are doing, and there's an annual process for renewal, so this will apply only to new students. There are at least three lawsuits right now hoping to litigate that. It's being led by the US Chamber of Commerce, so very much private industry is involved in this as well. Our message to you is, as you, because H cases are so specific, as you are working with any H holder, visa holder, or working through any potential hiring process, please consult with OIS, with our scholar team, early and often. There may be other options if H is not feasible, there are other visa types which may be suitable.

So that's the update for enrollment. Campus programming and student life, we have seen some shifts there in terms of student participation. We have found that changing demographics have shifted attendance at events, mostly in a positive way. And part of the concern that we are working through right now is that declines in one demographic specifically or another can influence the overall cohort. Using our students from India as an example, those students as a cohort tend to be very social and engaged and interactive across all demographics. And that has energized significantly a lot of our

student programming and it's been very helpful in holding programs that host both undergraduate and graduate international students. So, as we see our India numbers decline, that's something that we're looking to continue to capitalize upon and we're restructuring programs, accordingly, doing more events. I mention that only because you may hear a little bit more about what we're doing, see a little bit more. We're working quite a bit with UCM to get messaging out around that. We do participate, we have an active seat on the care team. So, as international students and scholars are facing these challenges, like to encourage faculty, staff, anyone who feels that a student or scholar may need some help to reach out to the Care Team, which is part of the Dean of Students. But certainly, if it's an international student, feel free to reach out to me or to Jenny Bowen, our Director for International Student Services.

We're planning enrichment for students and scholars. The enrichment activities are meant to showcase more about the state of Indiana than just social events. So, we're looking at opportunities to work with other campuses within the system to find programming relative to the Midwest or relative to Indiana, but these are much more substantive. One program that we are very interested in pursuing is a program, it's a reading program whereby international students go to local elementary schools typically and read with students during story time. And part of that also includes presentation brief Q&A, some fun facts about their country of origin. So, we're looking again for opportunities to really dig in deeper into the service to the state. And that's just one example of our new and evolving initiatives. We will also be adding additional workshops and Q&As for students and scholars given questions that are happening right now and oh, you can't see my monitor. Okay. Trends we've chatted about in the admissions and enrollment funnel, one thing that we have noticed that is a bit different in the funnel, so that being from prospective student through to enrollment, one thing that we've noticed is that students are acting later than typical. And we're also noticing increases in, we saw this in National Clearinghouse data, that students were applying to more universities than is the norm and more universities outside the US is what Project Atlas is showing us. So, competition is fierce. Students are taking more time and to deliberate and weighing various factors. This is not just political, oftentimes it's cost-related and various factors. For exchange scholars and etcetera, we still continue to see robust, very robust growth in that area. So that is the J scholars, the researchers, the lecturers that are brought to campus for classroom or lab work. That is a very enriching part of the student experience and it's been a bright spot for us to continue to see those J visas increase. So certainly the academic departments are engaged in fostering an international dialogue within their scholarship, so I appreciate that very much. And then just a professional update from IU Global. I think it's helpful for the faculty council to know the extent to which the entirety of IUB or, IU Global rather, is engaged in our professional associations. We hold senior leadership roles in each that I could name, including several presidential positions, board positions and so forth. That is particularly important to us right now as the associations with whom we work are often at the forefront of advocating at a national platform. So, IU is very much involved with those associations and doing what we can to support global mobility. With that, questions?

[Shrivastav]

Thank you. Thank you, John. We have a couple of minutes for questions, if any. Yes.

[Scheuerman]

Yeah, Bill Scheuerman, in Social and Historical Sciences. Since the declines in international enrollment, obviously stemmed from the policies of the Trump government, which frankly are racist and xenophobic, and, also frankly from the policies of our state government, which are in sync with President Trump, and since we know President Whitten has quite close ties to Senator Banks and the governor, at least as far as we can tell, anytime I look in social media, they seem to be hanging out

together and praising one another, has OIS worked with the president to try to take advantage of some political capital to try to reverse some of these policies?

[Wilkerson]

Well, directly, we work closely. In fact, we have standing meetings with our government relations at both state and federal levels. And part of what we do in that space, in that work with them, is to help provide aggregate data that advocates for our students. Mostly that's done through AAU, council of graduate schools, and so forth. So, the president is very much aware of that and receives a report from our interim associate vice president, but in terms of direct work, it's really through the government relations team. And I will say they are fantastic supporters of international students and scholars in the work that we do and are also very well-positioned within those associations.

[Shrivastav]

Thank you, Jonathan. Travis?

[O'Brien]

Just a quick clarification. So, near the end of your notes, you talked about the involvement in professional associations. Could you give maybe an example because I'm not sure I'm following what you're talking about.

[Wilkerson]

Sure. Professional associations, for example, NAFSA, the Association of International Educators. They are the largest education entity in the world as a professional association. Right now, we have one board member serving on the National NAFSA board. We also have two members of national committees, one who is in the chair stream to serve ultimately as chair, we hold the presidential position, the chair position, sorry, for our region of NAFSA, region six, and, in fact, we just hosted a tri-regional conference in Indianapolis just maybe four weeks ago. So, that's one example. But also, we've served on admissions and enrollment practices committee for NACAC, the National Association for College Admissions Counselors and we hold committee leadership positions within the international arm of that as well. So, those are the kind of voices that are present from IU.

[O'Brien]

Thank you.

[Shrivastav]

Thank One more question, Diane.

[Henshel]

Just as a follow up question because I'm a little confused. Do you follow when our faculty and our scholars are involved in the international professional community outside of your immediate societies?

[Wilkerson]

To what extent? Just in terms of just membership and engagement?

[Henshel]

Serving as president, serving on boards? Yeah, things like that.

[Wilkerson]

Oh, I understand. Yeah, no, we do not. We'd love to hear about it, but that is not information that is readily collectible or often shared, frankly. We would love to include that in any pride points that we put together.

[Henshel]

It's on, whatever, I guess it's called Element now, guarantee it's there.

[Wilkerson]

I am sorry. I'll take note of that, again.

[Shrivastav]

Okay.

[Wilkerson]

Oh, Element. I'm sorry.

[Shrivastav]

Thank you, Diane. Thank you, John. Let's move on to the next item on the agenda, which is an update on the Faculty Misconduct Review Committee. This is led by Jeremy Allen and Jonathan Michaelson, co-chairs of the Faculty Affairs Committee and joined by Diane, who's also supporting Marianne from the FMRC.

[Henshel]

She can't come.

[Shrivastav]

It's alright.

[Michaelson]

Thank you. Great. Thank you very much, Rahul. So, last year our committee took on D22, we brought it to this, sorry Bill, you were pointing at something. What's that?

[Ramos]

I think there's a slide deck that goes with this.

[Michaelson]

We're low tech here. Yeah. Alright, all. Well, we'll pause while we, we didn't have a dress rehearsal, so. Well, shall I continue, or would you like me to wait?

[Ramos]

Do we know, is there a slide deck available for this presentation? Virginia? Did it get that way? Okay?

[Shrivastav]

Should be somewhere. Let's give it a minute and see if we can get that loaded.

[Michaelsen]

Well, I can continue, and we can pull things up. Anyway, we did D22 last year and brought it to this body and this body sent it back to us and we brought it again and sent it back. But, anyway, we got it passed. And that policy deals with grievances and the review process with the mediation committee and with the FBR. So, this year we're going to take on D27, which is faculty disciplinary procedures and sanctions. And also, it constitutes the role of the FMRC, the great.

[Ramos]

Yeah, those aren't yours. Keep going.

[Michaelsen]

Yeah. Okay. I'll just keep talking. And in this we'll need to bring D27 into compliance with certain new laws and university-wide policies. BOT-15 outlines the conduct complaint process and sanctions university-wide. And this policy of course, then is over D27, and it deals with misconduct complaints made and they're made initially to the dean or academic officer and then we go from there. The academic officer or dean may try and solve things informally, but if there are then sanctions that are in the offering, this then would go to this, our committee. The difficulty is that the language is very clear in BOT-15 that it's only in terms of severe sanctions. And so, some of the things that we're trying to clarify is what a severe and what a common sanction is and whether the FMRC should be involved in all sanctions or whether it's only in cases of severe sanctions. And this would mean then, if it's all sanctions, that the university policy would need to be changed. So, it'd have to go above us to somebody else to sort of change that language from severe to common. And so that's one of the issues that we'll try and sort out and deal with. BOT-15 does set out, has a clause that says individual campuses can have bodies, can have committees that look into sanctioned cases. So, our current committee, the structure is there. I think what we feel like needs to be examined a little bit in terms of work with the Provost and work with Carrie, is the timing, how this works. When a sanction comes, does it come to, first to the academic officer who says, okay, here's what the sanction's going to be or does the complaint come and immediately goes to the committee who starts to work on it? And we frankly need to figure out the world how it works best with the upper administration to make this efficient and to make it clear and fair and the procedures really in place. And currently, I don't think we really know quite, okay, well, so the plan comes, who does it go to and how do we figure that out? So, that's certainly something that we will look at, frankly, how much can the committee know in terms of delicate cases, where are the boundaries there? How can they make judgements on things if information is not forthcoming? And again, those are the sort of questions that we have. So, those are the issues that we will sort of take on as we go through this to bring it into compliance, D27 into compliance with the newer university policies to work with the Provost and Carrie to sort of figure out, okay, what's the most efficient way to do this? And then the idea that we would like to consider changing the language in the larger university policy to say more than not only severe sanctions, but just all sanctions, have the opportunity to come before this particular committee. I think frankly, that comes out of a little bit of angst over even common sanctions now seem to be difficult, can be damaging. And so, we feel like this would be a good, good process. And

just one last thing for my, I'd like to thank very much our colleagues here on the current FMRC and our colleagues on the Faculty Affairs Committee.

[Allen]

Yeah, thank you Jonathan.

[Shrivastav]

You do have your slides up now just in case you need to use them.

[Michaelsen]

What's that? Oh, okay.

[Allen]

It was really just the one. That's it.

[Michaelsen]

There we go. Well.

[Allen]

No, Jonathan explained it pretty well. We did mean to take on revision of D27 last year and time got away from us. And as Jonathan said, we're grateful for FMRC for really clarifying what exactly the conflicts are right now. And we are in this state in which so many policies, including all of those which have been renamed as Board of Trustees policies, are being revised and reconsidered. And I hope everyone is checking the ten-day review site because there's a lot going through. And so, everything is in motion, and it is a little bit difficult to get ahold of it, but to explain what we were seeing, and I think I hope that Diane will talk a little about FMRC's perspective on this. But what we see between BOT-15, which used to be ACA-33 for those of you keeping track of that, and D27 is that there are two what could be interpreted or seen as parallel misconduct review processes that don't necessarily reflect on each other. BOT-15 says that the deans or campus academic officers can undertake, can receive complaints, undertake investigations, seek informal resolutions, come to a conclusion. And it's only when a severe sanction is being suggested that then our campus-level faculty advisory group, which we see to be FMRC, would be brought in for consultation. FMRC under D27 has a different process and which one gets triggered is kind of the question I think that FMRC and Diane can speak to. This doesn't see it as much of an open question as one might, but in completing this work, we are going to be seeking some historical information about when in the past FMRC was used and how things have gotten out of alignment here. But the main crux of this, and I hope you'll read this, is the FMRC report, which is included in the minutes today, which outlines the FMRC's concerns about how the numerous avenues of misconduct reporting and investigation have gotten a little bit, well, I don't know that it's more fractured than it had been, but there are a lot of different things going on. Neither of these policies address sexual misconduct or research misconduct. But then we also have the new SEA-202 law, which last year we asked all of our units to come up with policies, or rather, procedures on how to address SEA-202 complaints. We have OCRC complaints, which that used to be Office of Institutional Equity, that's Civil Rights Compliance. And those kind of go through VPFAA at the end, but that's not really where they're considered. So, finding a way to recommend some faculty activity in this process is what we're going to be trying to do. And our hope is that the work that we do isn't immediately turned on its head by a BOT-15 revision that's going on at the same time. But we'll deal with that as we go on. This line at the bottom

here about the severe sanctions, this is what Jonathan and I were referring to. Campus faculty governance organizations can have a policy that includes the involvement of a faculty advisory body, but if that's only in the case of severe sanctions as the FMRC is pointing out, then there are some missed opportunities to weigh in on sanctions that might end up accruing or accreting and becoming severe for the faculty member at that point. I know you all have these policies memorized, I've just got some summaries of these though. But this is kind of how D27 works and the difference that I note is where the complaints originate and then how they're handled through there. But the FMRC, ultimately if a complaint comes to them, we'll make a recommendation to the Provost, which the Provost can take or leave and it's subject to appeal. As I said, I hope you've read the FMRC report or that you will. And Diane, if you'd like to draw attention to any particular aspect of it, I'd welcome that.

[Henshel]

So as a point, the FMRC historically has had very little work to do because historically there has been very little misconduct on this campus outside of sexual and research. And I will say that when there has been sexual and research misconduct, those are dealt with by different policies and different laws and it's not a part of this at all. And until UA10 was instituted and Carrie just drew back, you just did this, I know, I just watched you. There really was very little reason for FMRC to start being worried about the situation. But UA10 instituted a policy that caused letters to be in a fair number of faculty files for doing something that was effectively constitutionally their right to do but was decreed against the policies of IU by UA10. That in fact got changed over time, but the sanctions remained in their files and then with a significant amount of pushing from a number of different parties, not just FMRC, the "sanctions" were resized, rescission letters were put in addition to the letters but not removed from the files. And all of that would've been fine if it weren't for Board of Trustees Policy 24, which includes in its categories, two categories that, so as a reminder, BOT-24 changed the categories that we've always used from excellent, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, and does not meet expectations to exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations and unsatisfactory, and both does not meet expectations and unsatisfactory in BOT-24 both have lines on them still to this day, at any rate, whether or not it changes in the future, that says that any, oh shit, now we're missing the word that you and I fought about David, sustained. That's right. Any sustained sanctions in their file could be used as a means to call somebody unsatisfactory and therefore able to be fired immediately. And when I will say Chancellor Reingold was challenged on this language two sessions ago or so, he said he believed sustained to mean existing multiple times over time. And I also have looked up the word many times and sustained also means that it still exists. And that means that any sort of sanction that still exists in your files with or without a rescission meets the BOT-24 requirements of allowing somebody to be declared unsatisfactory and therefore fired instantly. And we do not think that this is an appropriate situation to have even happen, but we certainly don't want it to happen going into the future. And therefore, because obviously making noise on campus at 11 o'clock at night really is not a major misconduct problem and would never have been considered a major misconduct problem under any situation prior to, was it a year ago now? My God, a year ago August. We think that that changes what the FMRC needs to do because the Faculty Board of Review explicitly only comes in after a sanction is applied and the FMRC is the only faculty voice that's there for prior to sanctions and providing some input on whether or not a sanction is appropriate of any kind. And at this point, with sanctions being something, regardless of how small it is, being something that could cause somebody to be fired, this becomes important.

[Shirvastav]

Thank you. We have a few minutes for a couple of questions, so any questions or comments? Bill?

[Ramos]

I'm just thinking first of all, thank you for the update and we just wanted to bring it so the group understands that this work is in process and the general flow of the BFC is we tend to find more presentations and things to get us moving with more action items in the spring. I think we would expect this to come for a first reading, second reading. One of the things that just jumped in this, you said you're going to talk with Carrie's office and the Chancellor and the Provost, so we were going to slow roll some changes, but this is one where I noticed the Provost name is in. I don't know if the Chancellor, if we need to have a conversation, if maybe the Chancellor wants to take that position. Just a note in the conversation.

[Shrivastav]

Anything else? Yes, question.

[Washburn]

Sandy Washburn research scientists. So, is there not a list of common sanctions and severe sanctions? No distinction?

[Michaelsen]

We find it sort of remarkably vague. Thank you. So, no. BOT-15 has a list of behaviors that are considered, I guess sanctionable, but the actual definition of what a common, which I sort find interesting that word, but anyway, common sanction versus severe sanction. We haven't been able to sort it out.

[Allen]

Out. Yeah, if you check out D27, you'll see a number of possible sanctions that FMRC can recommend. That range from common to extremely severe. Pay reduction all the way to dismissal. Severe sanctions are defined, and I'm sorry I don't have it in front of me, but as something that impedes a faculty member's ability to do the job they have been doing. Yeah, so there is a description of that, but as far as what makes a common sanction, I think that's a question of practice. Probably.

[Washburn]

I have one more question. So does the faculty FMRC or the review board do anything when a process is not followed? It says that it starts with taking the complaint to a dean and proceeds from there. What happens when that process is not followed?

[Henshel]

We're left out of the process.

[Allen]

Someone from the FBRI, would love it if you clarified this. I believe the review process through FBR, the procedure does involve the process specifically not so much a re-adjudication of the case, it's about whether the process was followed.

[Shrivastav]

So, I thank you for identifying that, Sandy. You will notice this is one of several points of confusion with the policy as written and that's what this group is trying to resolve. The other thing while I have the opportunity to highlight is as much as our dear colleague Carrie Docherty gets blamed for a number of decisions, the vast majority, almost everything, I would say, are investigations done by other people. Even if the letter comes from her office, which is part of our policy, the investigation almost always happens with OCR for civil rights, Title IX issues, for research for research misconduct issues per BOT-15 or formerly ACA33 by a local person. It's either the dean or the dean's delegate or the chairs. So, the letter may have Carrie's signature. The investigation and the decision, I don't know, 99% of the time, maybe 90% of the time is not done through her office and I do not believe that has been changed over the last several years. Last question Beth.

[Buggenhagen]

Sure. I might invite my colleague Moira Marsh to jump in. So, this year I'm chairing the Faculty Board of Review last year, Mara chaired it. We also have two other Faculty Board of Review members here who might want to jump in if that would be permissible, but I think it's really important to have this conversation and to give time. I think it will save us time in the end if we discuss this as a faculty and administration today.

[Shrivastav]

So, how about we bring it up in the new business, although that's changed now, right? That's not a quick Q&A.

[Ramos]

Someone Can make a motion to have that item....

[Buggenhagen]

Well, let me answer Jeremy Allen's point. So, what we're finding in the faculty board of review and what we found for a little while is that every sanction is a severe sanction and so we're almost not able to do our work because it seems that maybe the administration and the entities that are involved, like the OCRC and whatever, don't use FMRC but also don't use common sanctions anymore. And in fact, what we found is that some 40 to 50% of IU policies list termination of faculty as the outcome without a faculty review, without faculty input. And I think we all need to be thinking about this as we think about FMRC, mediation, and the Faculty Board of Review and the new policies as they're discussed and come up.

[Shrivastav]

A lot there, but let's move on to the next item on our agenda today, which is a report on the Bloomington Campus Policy Committee CPC proposal, Bill Ramos and Danielle DeSawal.

[Ramos]

Great, thank you. And I'll ask Danielle to chime in and again, I'll preface with the fact that she was on the UFC co-chairs when this was all put on them in a very quick manner to come up with a framework at the university level. And if you remember in the original, last meeting, we went through what's happening at the UA level and now this is sequel number two. So, great time to go get some popcorn, settle in. We don't know if the sequels are ever as good as the first one, but we'll see. So, where that takes us, and I'm going to go through the front-end slides pretty quickly. I want to get to the charts that kind of outline

what the committee has recommended to the Chancellor and now we're putting out for comment. So, at the end of this slide there's a QR code and we can also push out a link and then the slides are also available to you as well. Let's see there. It's, so a reminder, our charge is to work with the Chancellor on a Campus Policy Committee. So, there was the Policy Executive Committee at the university level and then the Chancellor is charged to work with us. We created a committee and came up with final recommendations. So, each Chancellor must create a Campus Policy Committee for their own campus with the authority to review and approve campus policies. So, that's where we are. A reminder on number three that the university level is called the PEC, we will still connect back to that as a campus as part of this overall alignment process and we will continue to use a glossary of terms. BOT-02 is basically the driver throughout this process. The key recommendation from the group is that we ask administration for personnel support. This is a heavy lift because it will require us all to work at a campus level to do inventories, to do reviews, to look for alignment, to look for possible retirements, whatever that might be. So, we've asked for potential short-term and long-term support through administration. That's in the report that was included. We have a campus-level workflow for policy and procedures and, as we mentioned last time, what we're going to start seeing is larger policies held up in higher places with the procedures homed in more local places. And if you look at many of our things we call policies, that's actually already what's happening. That includes guidelines as well. So it's kind of separating those out into their proper places and making sure we have larger policies in line that we're all working from. We'll go over the structure and then we'll talk about next steps.

So again, we're going to talk about the workflow. So, getting to the diagrams quickly, you'll find that this mimics the committee, the task force that was working on this, which included several members from the BFC as well as a dean and then people from all over campus because remember, this is not a process that's just for academic policies and you'll see later when we review it, it has a heavier focus because that's probably what's going to happen at the campus level. But this is review of all campus-level policies, so from all areas within the campus administration. So, it starts with the support staff, something's submitted, we'll have certain level of agents that can submit in representation of schools or departments or the BFC, for example, so not every single individual will be able to just throw in a policy into the system. It'll come through a representative. The CPC, the campus policy committee reviews it, decides to move it forward or not. Is it in line? Is it working with the bigger picture of what needs to happen? And if so, then it goes to, if no, then they'll get notification and maybe that helps adjust another submission. If yes, it goes up to the PEC again from the highest level to make sure it's in line and working and in line with other policies. I think we had an example from a fact just now about how things can get out of alignment and then it moves forward. What's important to note in the policy development phase is the CPC does not do the policy development work. They are, if you want to think of them as gatekeepers and checkers for alignment. But the work is still going to be done here because we have the systems, we have the committees, we have the operation to make that happen.

So, policy development, if it's moving forward happens, it's sent out for notification. You can see there's opportunities for gathering feedback. Right now, we're currently putting in the ten-day business review and then it can go on to final approval once it's done and goes into votes and then moves on from there to the Chancellor just for notification at the end of the process. So again, I think what's important to note is BFC process is still involved. There just are people making sure that everything's aligned, matching not poorly interacting with each other and that it's fitting this bigger vision of policy alignment that BO-202 has charged for us to get to.

[DeSawal]

I think a couple other things to note is, so to echo Bill's point that the CPC when you see that committee structure is not the ones who do the work, the policy development is the process in which the

stakeholders are consulted. So, you'll see that the group also put in place that a draft will be sent to all the deans, the VPs and the VCs on campus so that there's a notification that this is underway and in process, so that if somebody who is on the list misses it, there's somebody else there to also catch it, to make sure that that information is being distributed down to the faculty especially to know that this is underway. But it also then takes care of paying attention to our staff and our students to ensure that they're also aware of what's happening. Because again, all of the policies will be for the entire campus for all of our units that'll be looked at. I also want to point out too, when we think about ten business days, it's after all the stakeholders have been consulted, which means that there'll be multiple times where you'll be notified that this policy is under development and folks are going to be asked for input and ten business days as a response to all of that work really is almost two weeks. So 14 full days, so half of a month for a response to initial feedback of the work that has already been completed. So, I think that's important because I think folks get confused and think that it's happening in ten days and that's not what's happening. That is just the time post all of the development of the work and the stakeholders that have been consulted.

[Ramos]

Yeah, I think a way I think about it by the time it goes out for the ten-day process, it's not a raw product, it's a pretty well-developed product looking for additional information. And then I completely forgot the next slide, because it's one of the big differences here. So, this is the process for policy. So, policy still happens, we're still involved in the process. We still meet the intention of BO-202, but we also have a separate process and this one's important because this is where we start talking about how procedures now are going to be handled different than policy. And what you'll notice, it's basically the same format, but we don't have to go above to work on procedures. Procedures are all ours to work within our campus level because again, the procedures are what we're going to pull down from these larger grand policies and bring home. So, it looks almost exactly the same except you'll see the PEC part is not included in that for procedures. We gave some definitions. This is also up for comment. We do know we need to add a librarian into the mix. Our CPC committee will have more faculty appointed to it than the PEC just because of the nature of the amount of academic policies and things we'll be doing, but again, you can see it pulls in stakeholders from Student Life and Research, Human Resources because these can be changes to policy at all levels.

[DeSawal]

I want to also point out that staff and students are also included in the process and that was critical to us to make sure that that was going to be present.

[Ramos]

Yeah, all voices. So we'll start doing kind of a comprehensive review once this goes into effect, which I believe the plan is January when we come back. As a matter of fact, what we're doing with the policy we just talked about may be a first run through for this and we are looking for feedback so, you're welcome to scan the QR code. It's in the slides that are posted and if you're not a QR person then we can get a link out as well and we'll keep that open for feedback. How long?

[DeSawal]

First week in December.

[ramos]

Okay, so it's coming. So, please take a minute and look through that. We sent them a little bit early, and I guess we can take questions at this point.

[Shrivastav]

It's open for questions. I see a lot of phones out. Yes.

[Polley]

Hi. Ted Polley, IU libraries. So, a colleague of mine who's on the BFC International Affairs Committee mentioned that the committee had been tasked this year with reviewing campus-level policies related to international affairs and making some recommendations. Where exactly does that work fit into the workflow? Is that the stakeholder engagement? And also are there other BFC committees engaged in that work?

[Ramos]

Yeah, so that was a general sweeping charge I gave most committees and that's falling under that inventory because I'm not even even sure we know what we have. So, the call was just look around. I think initially the email I received from them was we don't even know if we have any policies. So, that was the moment. So, the charges go out, review your policies that you think intersect with the topic of your committee. I mean some will have many more than others and just start getting a full understanding of what we have and how we may need to look at this in relation to the alignment. If something, I will say again, as different as it seems and it is a culture shift, trust me, I'm now what, six months in, starting to see it at the PEC. So for example, HR came and found probably seven policies that were no longer valid. They don't even, one for example impacted only three people and they're grandfathering the three people in, but the policy's just going to be retired. So, there is something bigger about a cleanup, something more manageable and maybe more effective down the line. And again, we did benchmarking and this is kind of what came out of the process. So, sorry I meandered there a little bit, but it's kind of a survey and inventory of anything that may intersect with the topics of that committee.

[Shrivastav]

Travis.

[O'Brien]

So, as I understand the name and acronym, Campus Policy Committee, CPC, originates from BOT-O2 and so the decision is to go with that name to maintain parallels across the campus. I would like to recommend that we add the modifier Bloomington to the beginning of that as a representative from the College of Arts and Sciences who has a College Policy Committee, also CPC. I think there is a real possibility of actually a lot of confusion just because of the institutional memory that's associated with that.

[Ramos]

Well, I agree as well because if each campus makes a CPC then we have lots of CPCs.

[Shrivastav]

Other questions? Moira?

[Marsh]

I guess it's just more of a suggestion than a question, but I can phrase it in the form of a question, if you'd like. There's a lot of work going on here. This is a massive undertaking. Would it be possible to consider, as some other institutions have done for policy work in general, to create a sort of open website that's at least available to everyone in the IU authenticated folk that just lists all the policies that are being revised and or mooted and where they are in the process, so that everyone, if they're interested, and there are a few of us nerds out here who are, can know what all's being worked on?

[Ramos]

Yeah, I don't think that's a big ask at all. Again, it might mirror what's happening.... Can I do a raise of hands again? How many people are signed up for notifications at the university-level right now? Okay, it's getting there. So, we have that option, Moira, to look at what our process looks like at the campus level.

[Shirvastav]

Any other questions? Seeing none. Thank you, Bill and Danielle. We are three minutes ahead of time so we have time for any new business that anybody would like to bring up. Seeing none, this might be a record. Oh, we have one. Heather?

[Akou]

I defer.

[Shirvastav]

Yeah, go ahead Beth.

[Buggenhagen]

I know there are many issues on the table to discuss today, so I'll only make a motion to bring the discussion back to the FMRC, but I don't want to use all of new business for that discussion. I know there are other topics that are relevant like the Borns Jewish Studies Program.

[Shrivastav]

So, we have a motion for discussing the FMRC report further. Anybody wants to second that? We've got a couple of seconds, all open to having this discussion continue, please raise your hands.

[Buggenhagen]

Actually, I'd like to ask the parliamentarian. I don't think we need a vote. I think we just need a motion and a second according to Robert's rules.

[Shirvastav]

Okay, well then.

[Buggenhagen]

We want to conserve our time chat.

[Shrivastav]

We have a motion and a second. So, this is open for discussion, questions on the FMRC discussion. I think Carrie wants to open that conversation.

[Docherty]

Yes, thank you and thank you for your kindness and giving me some power here. I do want to clarify just a couple things and then definitely welcome continuing this conversation. So, I want to start by just all those people that are serving on the Faculty Board of Review. I just want to acknowledge the gargantuan task and service responsibility that is. And so I'm incredibly grateful for all the work that you all do and I want to highlight the four big buckets that the FBR typically address because, as Beth was speaking, I want to echo the sentiment that it feels very scary and worrisome when you consider, as Beth said, that 40% of the things that come to the FBR result in severe sanctions. So...

[Buggenhagen]

That's not quite what I said. I said 40%. I'm sorry, if I may, I am sorry to interrupt, but I think it's important that we have a clear conversation so that we don't get distracted. 40% of IU policy list termination of IU faculty. I think it's like 46%.

[Docherty]

Okay, thank you.

[Buggenhagen]

So that's not of the number that come to the FBR, that's just the number of IU policies that list termination of faculty without FMRC mediation or Faculty Board of Review without a hearing by an elected body of your peers, which is AAUP principles.

[Docherty]

I really appreciate you clarifying that because again, that even underscores more sort of the scariness and the worrisome that could result here. So, the FBR looks at four big buckets where they can go through. One is related to any salary reviews and issues, okay? The second is related to procedural issues with promotion and tenure, they address those. The third are grievances, which I think is where a lot of this conversation has been grounded in. And the fourth is decisions that come as a result of what formerly was the Office of Institutional Equity, now the Office of Civil Rights Compliance, OCRC. Another, from my experience, more the severe sanctions, and again, I don't even want to use that word because when something utilizes the policies that go through OCRC, which is UA-03, it's either a level one or a level two sanction. So, I think again, just from making sure we're consistent in our terminology, and those are a lot, those OCRC-related investigations are I think a lot of what the Faculty Board of Review has seen over the last few years. So, I want to partially provide that clarity but also again, recognize and underscore that these are serious issues that are being reviewed and that the FBR is, again, very thoughtfully and meticulously going through and participating in. So again, Beth, I want to thank you for that clarity and I also wanted to provide that additional context.

[Shrivastav]

Beth?

[Buggenhagen]

I don't are both level one and level two of UA-03 considered severe sanctions?

[Shrivastav]

Carrie, you might have that response.

[Docherty]

I think it's an apple and an orange, you know what I mean? So...

[Buggenhagen]

Are you saying one is a common sanction and one as a severe sanction?

[Docherty]

There was a decision made in creating these policies not to make them the same. So, I can give you examples of a common sanction could be a reprimand or a letter in someone's file that could be defined as a common sanction. That could also be a level one sanction, which is utilized in UA-03.

[Shrivastav]

Heather?

[Docherty]

And I would love to align the wording and the way we go about doing this work as well,

[Shrivastav]

Heather.

[Akou]

So, UA-03 is the university's policy on discrimination, harassment, and sexual misconduct and I'm sure that there are a certain stream of cases that go through the university every year around those concerns, but my concern, and I imagine that this is shared by many of my colleagues, is not with issues of discrimination harassment, but with issues where faculty are removed from their classrooms or even terminated from the university without any due process and without any recourse to the FMRC. There's just no faculty involved whatsoever as those sanctions are being levied. And the thing is that it's not just a matter of it impacting the individual faculty member who is removed from the classroom, but it also impacts their students. And so it is not only a modification of their job responsibilities, but it also has significant ripple effects on the university community, which is why I think that the FMRC or at least some other faculty body should be involved in that process. I think it's really critical that we sort out some way for peers to be involved when we are talking about removing faculty from their classes.

[Shrivastav]

Again, that's, Diane.

[Henshel]

I just want to add one other piece that hasn't really been talked about yet today but has been talked about many times in the past and that is the problems with SEA-202, which also can lead to sanctions, which also is being about relatively indiscriminately applied, especially because at this point, as far as I know, the university still is using anonymous complaints as a way of feeding in complaints from SEA-202 or related to SEA-202, which, by the way, is against the law.

[Shrivastav]

Other questions, comments, Beth?

[Buggenhagen]

To follow on Diane's question, I would love to know why SEA-202 doesn't follow the same complaint process as any other situation going through faculty bodies.

[Shrivastav]

Let me invite the Chancellor first.

[Reingold]

Yeah, and I'm going to kick that one over to Carrie. But, the last two comments, I guess I think it's important to just say that when we have faculty members who are struggling in the classroom, there are lots of ways that faculty members can struggle in the classroom and sometimes that is manifest through student complaints. And I guess as it relates to the specific sort of 202 constellation of complaints, I've said this to the deans, I've said it to the Chancellor's leadership group, I'll say it here. I really do hope that we approach these from the standpoint of how do we support our colleagues in their role as educators? And I think faculty members are, we're human, sometimes we have bad days in the classroom, sometimes we make honest mistakes and sometimes I think everybody that I know who's ever been in the classroom always thinks that they can do better. And I guess I just really hope that as we do have complaints from students about things that are happening in the classroom that are legitimate, I guess I'll underscore that, they actually do have merit, and that is, I think the question in terms of these processes of trying to sort out when does a student complaint have merit?, but when it is determined that in fact there is some merit to the complaint that it is handled as the question of how do we support our colleagues in their role as educators. And I think we have lots of super resources here to do that and I really do hope that we will look at these from that angle. And my sense is that most faculty members, when there is a hiccup in their classroom, they know it and I think that they're open to trying to work through it anyway. So, I really do hope that that is our first approach. I'll also say that as far as the 202 environment that was established here prior to my time, but as far as I know this was something that was that process, I believe, and don't shoot the messenger on this, my understanding is it was really, it was not done centrally, it was rolled out intentionally sort of at a localized level because that is what I think either this body or other groups thought should be the approach. I see Diane shaking her head that may, but my sense is that if we don't like it, we should change it. And I want to plead on folks to say, if we don't like it, let's change it.

[Shrivastav]

Carrie.

[Docherty]

So, in direct response, SEA-202 does utilize BOT-15. So, the same grievance process in addition to whatever local policies/practices, I'm having a hard time determining which language we should use with that, that was developed by the individual units and I think last year our former president of this body really worked with all the policy chairs in the creation of local policies that would review the SEA-202 cases. And I also want to underscore what our current president has said, let's revisit it. If there's something in the procedures that is happening at the local level that we're not happy with, let's fix it. Let's update it. And I think collectively there's a lot of support to do that.

[Shrivastav]

Diane.

[Henshel]

Okay, just to start, we're not talking about cases where somebody's in the middle of a divorce or very sick and therefore having trouble in the classroom. We're not talking about that. That was never an issue. That is always an issue where people go back, the dean goes, what are you going to do about being more responsive to your students because you're too caught up in whatever personal things are going on? It's not that. This is invariably freedom of speech issues. This is invariably issues where students are in the classroom, to my knowledge being challenged to think differently just to take the one that's not from this campus, even though it was on this campus, but it's processed through IUI, which is the social work one, right?, not sociology, social work one where it's one slide that has MAGA and white supremacy and a number of other 20 different other things that are all associated with these are challenging to think about and more complex than just, here's some of the other things. I mean, I've looked at the slide for all of five minutes, so I'm sorry if I'm not really excellent on the slide details, but I do remember that it's MAGA and the white supremacy being juxtaposed in the bottom half as being the problematic piece and that deserved more than just a discussion at all is unbelievable to me that it involved a faculty member being suspended from their class is just mind blowing to me. And if you're talking about freedom of speech, if you're talking about trying to challenge thoughts in a classroom, if you're trying to get students to think about controversial issues, which the whole course is about, that's what the whole course is about, then I don't understand. Or the case that's on this campus we're a similar sort of thing where there were parallels being drawn to what was going on currently and that was raised by a student anonymously. It just doesn't make any sense. This is what we're talking about. We are not talking about somebody struggling because of illness or divorce or some other personal psychological issue that is not the issue here.

[Reingold]

And I didn't mean to suggest that I underscored it, that when we have complaints from students about their educational experience, it could be for any manner of reason. I've been in the classroom for 30 years and many of us, we've seen lots of reasons why students may have an issue. How we approach those complaints I think is really a matter of how do we support our colleagues in their role as educators.

[Henshel]

Yes. However, currently SEA-202 complaints can end up with severe enough, with any sanction at all, with any mention in the file could as currently construed by Board of Trustees 24 end up firing our faculty members. And just the fact of what happened at IUI was enough to cause every single person on this campus who knew about it to draw back and go, this is not okay.

[Reingold]

And I guess what I'm suggesting is that I'm mindful when we do have student complaints, it is a question of how we manage them, alright? And I think you are describing one way in which they are managed, there are other ways to manage them and I'm pleading on us to manage them in other ways.

[Shrivastav]

Before I move on, Carrie, do you have a response to this issue? I saw you raising a hand at some point.

[Docherty]

I do. And again, I want to reassure folks in two ways. First, the department chairs in the disciplines where we're getting, where these complaints have come in and the deans of the academic units in 99% of the situations are working with the faculty, talking to them, thinking about the ways in which their teaching and really having robust conversations that lead to unsubstantiated cases. So, if a complaint comes in and the department chair who inherently knows the nuance of what should be taught in the discipline has a conversation and it can be unsubstantiated. I will also say that in situations where additional clarification and conversations need to occur, those are also happening at the disciplinary level. So, the department chairs and the deans are very heavily involved in this process. They're running these processes. And again, I want to assure folks that if there is insufficient information, then it is not moving forward. If it is unsubstantiated, it is not moving forward and these conversations are happening right there at the local level.

[Shrivastav]

Thank you. Danielle.

[DeSawal]

I want to air echo what Carrie shared as well. The decisions last year to place the control in the schools and the college's policy hands is exactly because any complaint that comes in, no matter where it comes from, always gets punted down to the dean of the school in which it's happened and then it follows a local process. The immediate outcry was that we have so many processes that are localized and our disciplines are so unique that that focus needs to be the piece that happens first. And so, raising something to a campus-level initially may make it worse than to have the discipline-specific conversations first. So, as we think about what works and doesn't work with SEA-202 complaints, I think we need to also recognize that we have some nuanced differences in our schools and the college. And some of the schools are very happy with the processes that they have in place to have those conversations. And so, we may need to think about do we align those more together and do we help to continue to support each other locally? And then if something needs to escalate beyond that point, then what are the processes that are in place to make that happen? Because those are the ones that are going to be that 1% that are excelling beyond what is happening at our local level but we also need to not completely take it out of the hands of our colleagues to be able to have those conversations and to be collegial and figure out the solutions so that the students become and remain at the center of what it is we're trying to accomplish as well as the academic mission of this institution.

[Ramos]

Yeah, I brought this up before. I've talked to the deans, I've talked to the policy chairs and I've put this on the table to reaffirm, edit, change. I mean, these are local, in our hands. My hope is to collect those by the spring, maybe a little later and sit down with administration and say, here they are. Kind of like

what you're doing with the criteria that's done right now for annual review. Sit down with you and say, here's what we have. Does this track? Does this map? I mean, is there something here you can't support for some reason? I mean, I think maybe that was a step in the chaos of all this happening. So, I'm looking at just reaffirming giving us who will have control of the process right now time to look at it, edit it, change it, or just reaffirm it and then come to the administration and say, let's come together on these. It's not one. It's how many total? It's a lot.

[Shrivastav]

Moira?

[Marsh]

Just speaking to all of this, not just the SEA-202, but also UA-03 and actually all of our policies that might potentially result in some kind of sanctioning. A simple thing that can be done to the procedures for all of these things that needs to be done desperately is that in many cases there is what's called interim measures, correct me if I'm wrong, Carrie, that may be applied to a faculty member who's the object of a complaint or an accusation or whatever. And those are supposed to be applied in cases where there is credible risk of self-harm or immediate harm to the campus or anyone in the campus community. We have found in the Board of Review that they are being applied. Those interim measures are being applied much more broadly than that. And they are unappealable, which means an interim measure, it could be indistinguishable in its effects from a severe sanction in many cases. For instance, being suspended immediately from your class before a complaint has been investigated. Investigations need to happen. They take a long time and they should if you're doing it right. But there needs to be a process I think on our campus where wherever an interim sanction is applied, the faculty member has the ability to appeal just the imposition of the interim section, whether it's appropriate or not and that appeal should be handled by a faculty-driven process.

[Shrivastav]

It's a good point for the group to consider. Daniel, I think you had your hand up.

[Kearns]

Yeah, I just want to comment on the example that Diane raised. For me, I think the problem is the disconnect between what I'm hearing and the intent of trying to manage this situation and what seemed to have actually happened. I mean, it seemed to accelerate so fast and in a way that didn't make sense and resulted in bad, in my opinion, bad press for IU. This is where my concern comes from. I hear what everyone's saying, it's just I'm not seeing it. That's all.

[Shrivastav]

Yes, in the back?

[Brown]

Hi, I am an alternative for Joseph Varga, Labor Studies, but I'm in the School of Social Work where this situation with Jessica Adams has occurred. And I think if the administration really wants to get it right, I think looking at her situation from beginning to end is a case study on perhaps what not to do in the pursuit, might be helpful in further moving this along. And the other thing too is, as a faculty member here, I feel like it's becoming more top down. And what I'm wondering is that, can faculty report on

administrators who are committing harm or harm doing to faculty? What is that process? Let's have the arrows move in both directions, not just top down. I think there needs to be equity in that. That's all.

[Shrivastav]

Diane.

[Henshel]

First of all, I appreciate that comment. That was excellent. Thank you. I hope somebody's written it down. Travis? I have a question. What is the role of the General Counsel in developing policy and what role has he played in various policies over the last three years? Can you elucidate

[Reingold]

I'm not in a position to answer that question.

[Henshel]

This is a Rahul question. Sorry, David.

[Shrivastav]

To my knowledge, not much except when it crosses legal issues. So, when, 202 is a good example, it's a state law, so when policies are written or discussed by committees, we often have a General Counsel representative making sure that whatever is emerging is compliant with the law. I think in a lot of the 202 discussions, somebody from the General Counsel was in the room for questions as needed. But beyond that, I'm not aware of a big role.

[Henshel]

And what role did he play in UA-10?

[Shrivastav]

I have no idea because that was a trustee policy, so it's opaque to me. Yes, Sandy.

[Washburn]

So, speaking of the negative press that was mentioned and the issues of loss of academic freedom and free speech, are there conversations happening among the administration about damage to IU reputation?

[Reingold]

Well, I think the university leadership, the campus leadership, is always surveying the landscape and assessing those kinds of questions and in this particular case, I think that there is clearly a desire to want to move forward in a direction which will put us in a better position and I think that the President's request to look at the Chicago Principles by the leadership of the various councils is an indication of that. And so I guess, I think the short answer is I think the leadership of the campus and the university are always assessing those situations.

[Shrivastav]

Thank you, Chancellor Reingold. It is 4:30, so I will go ahead and adjourn the meeting. Thank you very much and have a wonderful Thanksgiving.

[Ramos]

Thank you all for your donations.