

Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
February 27, 2018
1:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M. (EST)
University Hall, Room 1006, IUPUI

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Applegate, Rachel Applegate, Ed Berbari, Cassidy Clouse, Judah Cohen, Cheryl Duncan, Alyce Fly, Charles Goodlett, Diane Henshel, Robert Kravchuk, Chera Laforge, Moira Marsh, Robert McDonald, Michael McRobbie, Nasser Paydar, Monica Solinas-Saunders, Kenneth Smith, Alex Tanford, David Treves, Jeff Watt, Joe Wert, Jack Windsor, Susan Zinner.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Tina Baich, Shai Bhagat, Simon Brassell, Ange Cooksey, Alan Dennis, Andrew Downs, Marc Mendonca, Nur Yusuf, Lauren Robel, Elaine Roth, Jodi Smith, Rebecca Spang, T.J. Sullivan.

GUESTS: Jenny Kincaid, Karen Lee, Elizabeth Pear, Monica Shannon.

Agenda

1. Approval of [Minutes of November 28, 2017](#)
2. [Memorial Resolution for Bruce Cole](#)
3. [Memorial Resolution for Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis](#)
4. **Executive Committee Business** (10 minutes)
Rachel Applegate, Alex Tanford, and Joe Wert, Co-Chairs of the University Faculty Council
5. **Presiding Officer's Report** (30 minutes)
Michael McRobbie, President of Indiana University
6. **Question/Comment Period** (10 minutes)
Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to President McRobbie or Co-Chairs Applegate, Tanford, and Wert by emailing ufcoff@indiana.edu.
7. **Revisions to the [Intercollegiate Athletics Programs](#) policy** (20 minutes)
[Action Item]
Carrie Docherty, Chair of the Athletics Committee

[U13-2018: Proposed policy](#)

8. **Revision to the [Bylaws of the University Faculty Council](#) to establish a Budgetary Affairs Committee** (10 minutes)
[Action Item]
Rachel Applegate, Co-Chair of the University Faculty Council

[U14-2018: Proposed amendment](#)

9. **Revisions to the [Bylaws of the University Faculty Council](#)** (30 minutes)
[Action Item]
Alex Tanford, Co-Chair of the University Faculty Council

[U15-2018: Bylaws amendment 1](#)
[U16-2018: Bylaws amendment 2](#)
[U17-2018: Bylaws amendment 3](#)
[U18-2018: Bylaws amendment 4](#)
[U19-2018: Bylaws amendment 5](#)
[U20-2018: Bylaws amendment 6](#)
[U21-2018: Bylaws amendment 7](#)
[U22-2018: Bylaws amendment 8](#)
[U23-2018: Bylaws amendment 9](#)
[U24-2018: Bylaws amendment 10](#)

10. Update on teaching initiatives (30 minutes)

[Discussion Item]

Michael Rushton, Associate Vice President of University Academic Affairs and Director,
Strategic Planning

11. Discussion on student withdrawal from courses (30 minutes)

[Discussion Item]

Susan Zinner, Member of the University Faculty Council

Transcript

MCROBBIE: So, ladies and gentlemen, why don't we get started with this meeting of the University Faculty Council? We have....I believe there in front of you...there are minutes from the last meeting. Everybody should have the minutes. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes, please?

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 28, 2017

R. APPLGATE: So moved.

J. APPLGATE: [INAUDIBLE] order [INAUDIBLE]

MCROBBIE: Yes.

J. APPLGATE: [INAUDIBLE] in the quorum?

MCROBBIE: I rely on the staff to tell us that. Do we know?

R. APPLGATE: I don't think so.

MCROBBIE: What's the quorum?

R. APPLGATE: That's the next set of questions. [INAUDIBLE].

MCROBBIE: Do you want to go home, Bob? Does that...?

KRAVCHUK: [INAUDIBLE] probably get some work done at home, Michael.

TANFORD: As long as you stay, we're okay. We just need fifty-one percent.

MCROBBIE: And do we have a quorum?

KRAVCHUK: [INAUDIBLE] checking. I was just [INAUDIBLE].Read the bylaws.

MCROBBIE: Did you count everybody on this end?

R. APPLGATE: Yes. Well, we couldn't do business, we just can't fold on things. I think it's the...I mean, we could have discussions.

TANFORD: And I would point out as a former parliamentarian that if no one suggests the absence of a quorum, we can do business.

R. APPLGATE: That is true. That is absolutely true.

TANFORD: And we have very important bylaws that need to get amended, and now they cannot. And I am just....I'm irritated.

WERT: How many...? [INAUDIBLE].

R. APPLGATE: Eighteen.

WERT: We're missing three.

MCRROBBIE: We're missing three.

R. APPLGATE: We're three short.

SPEAKER: [INAUDIBLE] quorums, [INAUDIBLE].

[Indistinct conversation]

TANFORD: [INAUDIBLE] read the resolutions and go home?

MCRROBBIE: Hold on [INAUDIBLE] checking again?

WERT: You could continue and see if more people show up.

MCRROBBIE: Well, I think that's probably sensible because we don't get down to needing to vote until seven. I've got a couple of things to report on and it will take a little while...and there's memorial resolutions...so I'd suggest that we do that and hope some other people turn up. I don't know if there's anybody who can get on the phone rapidly or text rapidly to see if we can whip up a few more people to come to the meeting.

R. APPLGATE: [INAUDIBLE].

WERT: Karen? No.

MCRROBBIE: And so, given that we can't approve anything, that includes the minutes, let me defer that as well. And so why don't we start with the memorial resolutions? We can at least honor the dead at this meeting. So, why don't...John Applegate is going to read the resolutions and the [INAUDIBLE] to resolutions, and the longer versions will be what appears in the record. So John, would you like to start with the resolution for Ken Gros Louis?

AGENDA ITEM 3: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR KENNETH R.R. GROS LOUIS

J. APPLGATE: Yes, certainly. This is a resolution. The full set of resolutions are from professors Don Gray, James Craig, Susan Gubar, and James Ackerman, and I'm just going to read a portion of the one from Professor Gray.

Ken Gros Louis began his long, varied, and distinguished career at Indiana University with a joint appointment as an assistant professor in the Departments of English and Comparative Literature. He came to Bloomington in 1964 after his education at Phillips Exeter Academy (1955), Columbia University (BA magna cum laude, 1959; MA 1960), and the University of Wisconsin, where he completed his doctorate with a dissertation on versions of the myth of Orpheus in medieval and Renaissance literature. Ken's achievements as a teacher and administrator have obscured his early contributions to the scholarship and understanding of this rich body of writing, which in the 1960s he explored in essays in some of the most important journals of literary studies. In those same years he became known as a strong and versatile teacher of undergraduate and graduate courses, especially of large lecture courses offered to the entire campus. Even before he was awarded tenure, Ken won the Ulysses G. Weatherly award for distinguished teaching in 1970.

Ken's gifts as an academic administrator were also manifested early. He served as assistant chair and then acting chair of Comparative Literature in 1968-70, and he was appointed an associate dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in 1970 and chair of the Department of English in 1973, less than a decade after he had joined it as a brand-new assistant professor. He then moved into campus and university administration, serving as dean of the College of Arts and Sciences from 1978 to 1980, when he was appointed as Vice-President of the university and Chancellor of the Bloomington campus. During his tenure as Chancellor he also chaired the Commission on Institutional Cooperation, a consortium of universities in the Big Ten and the University of Chicago, and the governing body of the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago. He retired in 2001, but in 2004 he was called back to serve as Interim Vice-President and Chancellor, titles which were replaced two years later by that of University Chancellor, an office which had been previously held only by Herman B Wells, whom Ken regarded as a mentor and who for him as for many others served as a model of leadership in a big public university.

Ken once described university administrators as "facilitators, expeditors, implementers of academic priorities." He knew more intricately than almost anyone how the university and the campus worked, and he put his command of its machinery and politics steadily in the service of colleagues who wanted to change or invent ways in which knowledge is made and taught. As chair and dean he looked for ways to connect the university with communities off campus, as in a program in which his faculty colleagues in English taught courses in some of the state's prisons. As dean and chancellor he enabled or nourished the development of new departments and schools, such as those in informatics and communication. He closely attended to the appointment and advancement of women and minority members of the faculty, and his support of the center for gay, lesbian, and bisexual students was crucial to its creation. He thought that undergraduate education was central to the purposes of the university; he commissioned several studies of the undergraduate curriculum, and he consistently, if not always successfully, tried to create first-year seminars to introduce students to the practices and pleasures of liberal learning. He always made time and created opportunities to meet with students, and he kept in touch, to the very end of his life, with the student leaders he had known and counseled during the decades of his leadership. He brought to all this hard work his wit and gift for easy familiarity. When he supported a program in which faculty members regularly dined with students in residence halls, he often joined them. At one memorable event (I was there), an amateur night in Briscoe Quad, he entertained by tap dancing while twirling a baton lit at both ends with live flames.

Throughout his decades in administration Ken remained a teacher of literature. In 1974, along with James Ackerman in Religious Studies, he edited and contributed to a two-volume collection of essays on the U12-2018 interpretation of the Bible as literature. He wrote a couple of very interesting essays on the requirements of this kind of study, one of which won an award from the journal of Biblical studies in which it was published. Until the end of his long tenure in the office of Chancellor he conducted each year a seminar for Wells scholars on King Lear or other plays of Shakespeare. And he was well-known for his recitation of poetry at every commencement and any other public event during which he could fit in a poem, converting the occasion into a kind of classroom in which he demonstrated how literature illuminates the puzzles and satisfactions of ordinary living.

The purpose of higher education, Ken wrote in an essay early in his service as a vice-president, is to provide a “training in vision.” By that he meant the ability “to see complexly,” to recognize patterns of meaning and connection in what other people believe and do, and to understand ourselves and our own ways of living with other people. Michael Wilkerson, who worked with Ken in the Chancellor’s office, wrote in a fine tribute published in the local newspaper that Ken was thinking of writing a book titled “The Poetry of Administration.” By that Ken might have meant that he learned from literature, and from his long experience in its exercise, lessons in the availing or the reckless uses of authority. “Everything you need to know is in King Lear,” he said. (Michael Wilkerson adds that Ken also mentioned Machiavelli.) And Ken might also have meant that his practice as a reader and critic of literature had helped him to see connections, to understand motives, and, like a good teacher, to lead others to make good on their own possibilities and ambitions.

Bruce Cole.

MCROBBIE: Why don't we... I know we are not going to vote on these at this point. I hope we get the opportunity to do that. I'll just comment on Ken and maybe we can just take a minute of silence. I, of course, knew Ken for about twenty-five years. I knew him very well. I worked very closely with him for a lot of that time, and of course, he will be greatly missed. He was a real institution of a kind that doesn't really exist anymore in the university. And with that, can I ask maybe we just have a moment of silence for the late Ken Gros Louis? Thank you. If you'd like to do Bruce...

AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR BRUCE COLE

J. APPLGATE: Bruce Cole 1938 to 2018.

All of us at Indiana University are deeply saddened by the passing of Bruce Cole, one of our university’s most renowned scholars and public servants, who achieved great distinction both within his field of art history and in the broader arts community. A distinguished scholar of Renaissance art, he possessed a deep and broad knowledge of art and architecture that he applied to all of his scholarly and public-service endeavors, many of which he dedicated to highlighting the importance of understanding the past in order to preserve and strengthen our democracy and culture. He was also the first IU faculty member to be appointed to the university’s Board of Trustees in modern times, and during his long and accomplished tenure at

IU he served as a powerful champion for celebrating and enhancing the university's renowned traditions in the arts and humanities.

When he was sworn in as NEH chairman, Bruce said that "defending our homeland requires not only successful military campaigns; it also depends on citizens understanding their history, their institutions and their ideals. The humanities show us what it means to be an American, and why America's ideals are worth fighting for."

Bruce devoted his life and career to these ideals and, hence, his will be a lasting legacy within the field of humanities and for all of us who will carry on his work to preserve our nation's cultural heritage.

We at IU were extremely proud to serve as Bruce's academic home for so many years and benefit from his extraordinary accomplishments and service to the university. He will be greatly missed, and our thoughts and condolences go out to his family, friends and former colleagues here and all around the nation.

MCROBBIE: Thanks, John. Bruce...I think this may be known to some people here, I knew Bruce...again, I only got to know Bruce after he left the university, went to the NEH, and then got to know him very well. And he was actually a very good trustee for the university. I think he did a marvelous job as head of the NEH. And as someone who spoke his mind publicly, he really was someone I think we could be proud of. Even though, he was not always agreed with by everybody. And with that, can I also ask colleagues if we could take just a moment to...have a moment of silence, to remember Bruce Cole. Thank you. Thanks, John. With that, let's move to agenda item four, the business of the Executive Committee. Rachel, are you going to start?

AGENDA ITEM 4: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

R. APPLGATE: I don't really have anything except what is already reflected in the agenda, the Budgetary Affairs Resolution.

TANFORD: The only thing that I have is, which you may have already noticed...is we've gone paperless to these meetings. As an interim measure, at least for this meeting, we brought a few hard copies. But in the future, the...all circulars and documents that you need will be attached to the electronic agenda. The electronic agenda is sent to you both by email and appears under meetings on the UFC website. And we will anticipate that those of you who prefer to see things in paper can print them out in advance from your office.

MCROBBIE: Thanks, Alex. Joe, do you have anything?

WERT: Just that the Regional Faculty Council met this morning. We had a joint meeting with CIRCE. We had an excellent discussion on the future of the regional campuses...where we want to go in the next couple of decades. This will be an ongoing conversation and I'll leave it at that.

MCROBBIE: Okay, okay. I've got a couple of matters I wanted...actually five matters I wanted to report on and mention to you. And a couple of these are of some importance publicly too. So let me start with DACA, the Differed Action for Childhood Arrivals program.

AGENDA ITEM 5: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

1. Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA)

First, I want to make a few comments on the status of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, or DACA.

Two federal district courts, one in California and one in Pennsylvania, have entered injunctions halting the administration's plans to end the DACA Program as of March 5, 2018. The Administration sought to appeal the second decision directly to the U.S. Supreme Court, and yesterday the Court denied this appeal. Instead, the Supreme Court said they expected the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals to hear the appeal expeditiously.

The Supreme Court order leaves the lower court decision in place while the appeal is pending. The lower court not only entered an injunction prohibiting the administration from ending the DACA program on March 5, it also required that applications for renewal of DACA status or initial applications for DACA status be processed.

This effectively ends the administration's attempts to end DACA, at least until such time as the appeals are exhausted. It appears that the DACA issue will need to be resolved legislatively. However, with the time pressure of a March 5 deadline removed, it is highly likely that Congress will not reach agreement before the mid-term elections. We are holding a series of Town Halls to make our students aware of what this important ruling means for them and their status as being lawfully present in the United States.

The DACA program protects some 700,000 undocumented immigrants, brought to the United States at very young ages, from deportation. Ending it without a replacement program would potentially mean that all 700,000 would be at risk of deportation to countries they do not know, where languages are spoken that they may not speak.

2. Fetal Tissue Litigation

On December 22, 2017 we received the welcomed news that the judge in IU's lawsuit challenging the Indiana statute which made it a felony for fetal tissue to be used in research had entered an opinion declaring that portion of the statute unconstitutional. This is the third decision by the federal courts in Indianapolis on the ill-advised House Enrolled Act 1337. Other portions of the statute, which sought restrictions on the ability of a woman to obtain an abortion, were already declared unconstitutional by two other judges in the southern district of Indiana.

IU attempted to convince the state not to appeal the decision, but as they have done in all three lawsuits, the state filed its notice of appeal. Since the judge had ruled against us on the issue of

whether academic freedom prevents the state from limiting research in this manner, we have cross-appealed on the academic freedom issue. It is important for IU to continue to defend vigorously the principle of academic freedom.

The briefing schedule for this appeal runs through June 4, so it is very doubtful that we will have a decision before fall on this important issue.

The state's position on the scope of the fetal tissue research ban was extremely broad. The state opined that under the statute, it is illegal for a researcher to use any tissue from an aborted fetus no matter whether it is use of cells taken from the tissue or of cells derived from such tissue.

Many of our researchers would have been unable to complete much of their basic research on cell lines that have been in existence for decades. Prior research grants were also at risk because those grants required us to be able to transport cell lines to other researchers for them to replicate our results. Replication is, of course, a fundamental part of science. The statute not only criminalizes the conduct of the research but also the receipt or transport of any fetal tissue. Thus, it was essential that IU challenge the statute.

We were disappointed that our colleagues at other research institutions did not join us in the lawsuit. However, we are optimistic that we will prevail at the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals.

The present short legislative session is almost at an end, and to date there are no bills pending that would address this important issue. However, as was the case with House Enrolled Act 1337, the Legislature could still attempt to insert this at the last minute. Our government relations team is watching this very carefully.

3. Sexual assault and sexual violence

The recent news of the tragic consequences that can follow when administrators, staff, and faculty do not take seriously the complaints of victims of sexual assault has played out across America as many watched in horror as the victims of Dr. Larry Nasser at Michigan State University confronted him and the institutions which had let them down.

In response to this, I have sent a memo to all chancellors on this subject and asked that they communicate on this matter to their campuses. The IU Bloomington Provost has sent a previous memo to that campus in response to a recent finding by the Office of Civil Rights at the US Department of Education.

In this memo I noted that at IU we remain unwavering in our commitment to stopping sexual violence and all forms of sexual misconduct. Furthermore, as guided by our university-wide Student Welfare Initiative, we continue to strive to be a nationwide leader in sexual assault prevention and in providing support to students who have experienced any form of sexual misconduct.

I emphasized that we must all take seriously our responsibility to create a climate that sends the unmistakable message that any form of sexual misconduct is unacceptable and to allow our students to pursue their education with maximum confidence in their personal safety.

Finally, I asked all at IU to redouble our efforts to ensure that campus environments are such those who experience sexual misconduct on any of our campuses are comfortable seeking

assistance and reporting their experiences and are confident in the university's ability to objectively and thoroughly investigate reports, and where all related proceedings are conducted in a manner that ensures due process, as well as fairness and dignity to all participants. I asked that as part of our continued effort to review and adopt best practices, all members of our campus communities share their input and ideas at care@indiana.edu.

4. Monthly President's Updates

One way I attempt to keep the university community informed about recent developments and matters of importance is through my semi-monthly updates. The latest of these, which is focused on the health sciences and related matters, was just released yesterday by email. If any member of the UFC does not receive these and wishes to, please contact my office.

5. Establishment of the new School of Health and Human Sciences

Last December, the IU Board of Trustees approved the establishment of IU's latest school, the School of Health and Human Sciences, which will begin operating on July 1, 2018. It has been formed by the merger of the School of Physical Education and Tourism Management and the School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences. The two new schools of education at IU Bloomington and IUPUI will also commence operating on the same date.

This brings to 10 the number of new schools established at IU in the last less than seven years. In chronological order of establishment, these are:

- 1) The Fairbanks School of Public Health
- 2) The School of Public Health-Bloomington
- 3) The School of Global and International Studies
- 4) The Lilly Family School of Philanthropy
- 5) The School of Informatics, Computing, and Engineering
- 6) The Media School
- 7) The School of Art, Architecture, and Design
- 8) The School of Education, Bloomington
- 9) The School of Education, IUPUI
- 10) The School of Health and Human Sciences

This is the largest academic restructuring in IU's history. It makes a lie of the oft-expressed view that universities are impervious or slow to change. Hundreds of faculty and staff have supported this change and are to be congratulated for their clear-sightedness and commitment to ensuring that IU offers the best and most contemporary education programs and can carry out the most important and relevant research.

So, that's an enormous amount of change that's happened in the institution. And I think really does belie the criticism that we often have at universities on being impervious to change. But change is not always a good thing and sometimes tradition has to be guided. But I think in these particular cases, the university across its campuses has shown itself to be very strongly in favor of changes that are both good for our students, and good for faculty, and good for the institution. And my congratulations and thanks to all of the hundreds of faculty...hundreds and hundreds of faculty who have been so strongly supportive of all this change over the last six years, or so. And with that...that completes the five matters I wanted to report on. I'll be happy to take any questions you have for me, and the co-chairs will be happy to take any questions you may have for them.

AGENDA ITEM 6: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

R. APPLGATE: We have one more person on the way. We will have a quorum, as soon as he gets here, as long as nobody leaves.

MCROBBIE: Right. Lock the doors. Vote, vote, and vote.

TANFORD: Again, as parliamentarian, if somebody does leave and no one notices, the quorum continues until such time, as it is noticed, that a quorum is likely.

MCROBBIE: That's right.

R. APPLGATE: So the word quorum is not going to be used in any negative way, as soon as we get the third person here.

MCROBBIE: Any questions? Any questions? Any questions? We have a quorum.

R. APPLGATE: Yay.

MCROBBIE: Okay, terrific. We have a quorum. Okay. So, we'll now go back to the minutes to approve the minutes and then we'll jump to agenda item seven. So, I think I had a motion from somebody.

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 28, 2017

R. APPLGATE I moved approval.

MCROBBIE: Rachel. Second? Okay. Any discussion on the minutes? Any changes, additions, edits to the minutes? Anybody? There being none, I'll put the motion to approve the minutes. All those in favor signify by saying, "Aye."

SPEAKERS: Aye.

MCROBBIE: Against, same sign. The minutes are approved. So, let's move to agenda item seven, and that's going to be Carrie Docherty. Carrie?

AGENDA ITEM 7: REVISIONS TO THE INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS PROGRAMS POLICY

DOCHERTY: Thank you so much. So, my name's Carrie Docherty. I am the Chair of the Faculty Athletics Committee in Bloomington and Associate Dean in the School of Public Health, Bloomington. So, thank you for having me here. I'm bringing to you a revised policy that were included in the notes. Just for a little history on this policy: it's been relatively long standing. And at the beginning of this year, when the Bloomington faculty, or Faculty Athletics Committee met, we saw that there were some aspects that weren't quite consistent with what we were doing. So, with John's advice we looked to revise that and update it. But what we found is that, while it was a campus-wide, university-wide policy, it really wasn't reflecting all the differences that are occurring on our campus. So, what the Athletics Committee is proposing is that we actually separate this. And we are working on a Bloomington focused Athletics Committee Policy—simply because athletics at Bloomington is quite different than some of our other campuses. But then also within this policy, it stated that the Bloomington Athletic Director was the University Athletic Director, which again, is no longer consistent with what we're doing. So, we wanted to update this to make sure it reflects what is actually occurring now. So, ACA-58 that you have in front of yourself is the policy statement that simply has the mission and the goals, as well as some more specific authority and responsibilities that really can be consistent campus-wide. I know we also took this to the chancellors of all the campuses.

J. APPLGATE: Right. And they were fine with it.

MCROBBIE: Does that complete your...?

DOCHERTY: It's a pretty straight-forward policy. I can...I'm happy to take questions.

MCROBBIE: Sorry, you took me by surprise. I thought you were going to have more than that to say about it. But, I mean, all of this seems to make extremely good sense. But...any questions from anybody? Yes.

K. SMITH: On Item E, it seems to duplicate a Faculty Senate Committee on the South Bend campus. Is that...are there supposed to be two committees now?

DOCHERTY: So, you're looking at item E under number two on the regional...

K. SMITH: The faculty senates with appointee chair. It's normal Senate Committee on Athletics. This Committee would be appointed by the Chancellor, so it's either in contradiction of the Constitution or it's a second committee.

J. APPLGATE: Or the Chancellor could simply appoint that Committee.

MCROBBIE: Oh! Sorry, Alex.

TANFORD: I'm sorry...Behind you

MCROBBIE: And I couldn't see. Alex?

TANFORD: As I read this, this was a line added after the original version, presumably at the request of the regional campus Chancellors.

DOCHERTY: Correct.

TANFORD: I don't like it for exactly the...in Bloomington, some members of the Committee are appointed by the administration and some by the faculty. I think what...if anything, that the last couple of years have taught us, it is that faculty oversight...that faculty involvement in athletics is important, and I guess I would move to strike that sentence at the end of E that says, "On the regional campuses, this committee will be appointed by the campus Chancellor or designee." And leave it then, back up to the traditional practices of the campuses on the involvement or the relative involvement of the faculty and the Chancellor. So, I move to strike that sentence.

K. SMITH: Could be a faculty method already in place, or it could be a Chancellor's method, if no faculty method is in place.

TANFORD: Yeah, we'll leave it up to the campuses to be consistent, because each campus shall have a committee that includes representation from the various interest groups. And it does not specify. I would take out the specification for how each...that on the regional campuses it is appointment by the Chancellor, because that bypasses the elected faculty representatives.

K. SMITH: Don't know if that would be seen as a friendly amendment or not.

TANFORD: No. I think it's a hostile...there's no such thing... As a former parliamentarian, I can tell you there's no such thing as a friendly amendment. It's an amendment that requires a second.

MARCH: Second.

MCROBBIE: Okay, and we'll take it as have being moved from the Committee, so that would've been...

TANFORD: Right. So, this is a proposed amendment to the main motion moved by the Committee.

R. APPLGATE: [INAUDIBLE]

MCROBBIE: Yes, Rachel.

R. APPLGATE: Just as a matter of background at IPU, we have sort of a hybrid. It would be a combination of those. We have an Athletic Affairs Committee that is in our Constitution. The Constitution specifies that it has a majority of faculty and that it is sort of jointly appointed by the Chancellor and the Executive Committee, which is the Committee on committees for everything. So that's...in a sense, we combine them into one committee.

K. SMITH: I don't recall, we do have committees that are jointly appointed like that. I don't recall...

R. APPELATE: Not too many. That's...that may be one of them. I mean, we have other committees like... We don't just have ten committees on campus; we have like one hundred committees on campus. But that is one of the Faculty Constitutional Committees.

DOCHERTY: Well...and I just want to make sure I'm clarifying here and reflecting what we do on Bloomington. So, recommendations of membership come from the Bloomington Faculty Council, but then are appointed by President McRobbie.

MCROBBIE: That sounds [INAUDIBLE]. So just to make sure people understand. What's being proposed is under 2E. If I've got it right, under two E, the sentence is supposed to be added in red...is to be dropped. Does anybody want to speak in favor of preserving that sentence at all?

WERT: I think it would be the underlined sentence and you have a copy of the...The sentence in the...

MCROBBIE: It's not a red...sorry, it is red on my copy here. It's underlined, yeah. It says that...it reads, "On the regional campuses, this committee will be appointed by the campus Chancellor or designee." It's that sentence. Anybody want to speak in favor of keeping that? Okay. So, then I think that we have that motion in front of us. So, I'll put that motion. All those in favor of the motion to amend as stated by Alex and seconded signify by saying, "Aye."

WERT: Aye.

MCROBBIE: Against, same sign.

R. APPELATE: Against. Against.

MCROBBIE: You're against.

R. APPELATE: Yep.

MCROBBIE: One percent.

R. APPELATE: I don't mind losing but I...

KRAVCHUK: I like people of principle.

MCROBBIE: Okay. So that sentence is struck now. The motion is still in front of us to adopt the whole of these amendment conditions. Any further discussion or comments or suggest for amendment to anything here? Carrie, anything else you want to add at all? Any other proposed changes...amendments? All right. Well, let me put the motion to adopt this new policy ACA-58. All those in favor of adopting it as amended, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SPEAKERS: Aye.

MCRORBIE: Against, same sign...policy is adopted. Thank you, Carrie. I appreciate it. And with that, we move to agenda item eight, which is the revision of the UFC bylaws to establish a Budgetary Affairs Committee and this is going to be Rachel, the staff.

AGENDA ITEM 8: REVISION TO THE BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL TO ESTABLISH A BUDGETARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

R. APPEGATE: Yes. I hope that this is fairly straightforward. At the last UFC Committee meeting in the fall, we looked at the draft of this. It was more...if I may summarize okay with the concept of this Committee. And some concerns about the staffing of the Committee, how it will be created. The Executive Committee has discussed this. I coordinated...or I communicated with John Sejdinaj, so that we would have something known as workable on his end as well as covering what we want. And after those back and forth, this is what we have. Let me point out that basically it has... What? I'm very sorry. This one that you're looking at is wrong. Yeah. This...what we wanted was one that...and now we'll just amend it on the fly...that there was to be a large committee with one representative from each campus. Then there was to be an Executive Committee of the Budgetary Affairs Committee that would meet more often with John Sejdinaj. And that one, I believe has three or six members.

TANFORD: Six. This one says six.

R. APPEGATE: What number am I looking on? Okay. Thank you. We'll look at his version. Eleven...so, it should say to number eleven. Yep, that one's correct. I don't know what I was looking to. So, if you see, the larger one should be eleven and the Executive Committee should be six. And if that's what you're looking at, then you're looking at the right one and not me. So, as I say, this has been vetted basically on the administrative side and at the Executive Committee. So, if anybody has any comments or...? Yes.

KRAVCHUK: As I read this and correct me if I'm wrong. As I read this, it's possible for the entire Committee to turn over every two years.

R. APPEGATE: We would...the initial one would be staggered. So, you would elect people...any new committee when...I mean, I don't know that we need to write...

KRAVCHUK: That's not what it says though.

R. APPEGATE: Okay. Parliamentarian, usually when a new committee is created, everybody wants to stagger stuff. And so usually, you vote the first people in, half of them for like a one-year term and half of them for a two-year term.

KRAVCHUK: Something like that, yeah.

R. APPEGATE: So I know that the...

TANFORD: We can. There's a problem. We can do that by separate. In other words, the Executive Committee serves as the Nominations Committee. The Executive Committee also has the power

to interpret rules and to act on behalf of the full UFC to correct procedural issues. So, I would say the Executive Committee as the Nomination Committee has the power to stagger terms.

KRAVCHUK: The Executive Committee of the Faculty Council...

TANFORD: Of the...

KRAVCHUK: Or the Executive Committee of the UFC.

TANFORD: No, of the UFC. Because they have to appoint the initial group of people to the Budgetary Affairs Committee.

KRAVCHUK: Okay. On your word then, I withdraw my comment.

TANFORD: You're going to get [CROSSTALK] can't get out of it.

MCRORBIE: That could noted in the minutes [CROSSTALK] interpretation here. Okay. So, it is, I think, the version that you have, which is...

R. APPLGATE: Yes, that's correct.

MCRORBIE: And be highlighted and everything like that. That is the...

R. APPLGATE: Yes, it is.

MCRORBIE: Okay, people. Yes. Yes. Jack.

WINDSOR: [INAUDIBLE] would also try to link that to the campus's PAC?

R. APPLGATE: Yes. That should be the responsibility of the people who are named to this...to go back to their campuses.

TANFORD: There were...if I may?

MCRORBIE: Yes.

TANFORD: They were in it, and last time I know, as this process was moving through. There was extensive discussion about whether or not to require the membership of this to also be on campus Budgetary Affairs Committee. And then under that could put too much job responsibilities on otherwise busy people and sort of end up with an understood preference for people with experience on the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee. It could be someone stepping down from a couple of years on a campus committee but, yeah, the Executive Committee as Nominating Committee is a hundred percent with you on that.

R. APPLGATE: And there's a sentence, "Members must have experience in school or campus budgetary affairs governance."

HENSHEL: But wouldn't it make sense to at least have the chairs? One chair from each Budgetary Affairs Committee. Well, that would be a problem on the regional campuses.

R. APPLGATE: We're leaving it up to each campus to figure out the best way of doing that, basically.

MCROBBIE: Okay. So that motion again has come to us from Executive Committee.

R. APPLGATE: Yes. Yes.

MCROBBIE: So that doesn't need a second.

KRAVCHUK: Second.

MCROBBIE: Doesn't need one.

KRAVCHUK: Doesn't...?

MCROBBIE: But we'll have one then. If you'd like Bob, just for the...

KRAVCHUK: Sure.

MCROBBIE: Any further comments on this bill? Anything? Anybody wants to raise about this? Any suggestion for amendments or anything? Okay. There being none, I'll just put the motion to add this Committee to the committees of the UFC. All those in favor of the motion that's stated here, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SPEAKERS: Aye.

MCROBBIE: Against, same sign. It is adopted.

R. APPLGATE: Yay.

TANFORD: Yay.

MCROBBIE: Very good. Now we move to agenda item nine. The revisions to the bylaws of the UFC. Alex?

AGENDA ITEM 9: REVISIONS TO THE BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

TANFORD: Thank you. You have attached to the agenda ten proposals for amending the bylaws. These were announced in general terms at the previous meeting of the full UFC. They have been discussed at least twice in front of the Executive Committee of the UFC, which recommended several changes that have been incorporated. So, basically here's...and the best idea of each one is free standing. Any one can be voted up or down without affecting the others. Basically, this is our good government session. And so, let me present them one by one. And my suggestion, Mr.

Chairman, is to present them, discuss them, and vote on them one by one, rather than trying to vote on them collectively.

MCROBBIE: Unless there's no objection to all of them, in which case we could vote on them collectively. Do you want to vote on them individually? Even then...

TANFORD: It would be useful to vote and as we go through...discuss them one...since I've separated them out.

MCROBBIE: Okay. So, you want to start, go through them all, discuss them, and then come back and vote on them?

TANFORD: No. Discuss them one by one. Because they're not related to each other. Discuss [CROSSTALK]

MCROBBIE: All right. I got this. Go ahead.

TANFORD: Okay. So, the first proposal apropos is an amendment to the bylaw on the quorum, which we...the current bylaws say that the Executive Committee can act on behalf of the full body, except in amending the bylaws, of course. But what this says is that for the full UFC meetings in the absence of a quorum, the meeting may continue under the terms of subsection 2 and 3 of bylaw 11C. Bylaw 11C section 2 and 3 are those that say, if you don't have your bylaws with you...they...that says, "The Executive Committee may take any action that falls within the authority of the UFC on behalf of the full Council, and the action shall have the same authority as an action approved by the UFC itself, as an action approved by the UFC provided that, there is unanimous consent of the Executive Committee and agreement of the President." And "The Executive Committee action is communicated to the Council and no more than four members object." So, what it would do is, if we had a situation like today and our fifty-first percentage person had not shown up, that we could hold the meeting, hold the discussion, and then the Executive Committee would take the formal vote as the Executive Committee on behalf of a full Council. It becomes just like the actual full Council, as long as it's communicated and no one objects. It basically allows us to proceed at these meetings, even if we're one or two people short of a quorum. Doesn't mean we have to proceed if it's a snowstorm and three people show up. We don't have to proceed, but it allows us to proceed. And the reason obviously at the moment is, if we only meet once a semester and we're one or two people short, we might as well just fold our tents.

WINDSOR: On behalf of the what is the quorum for the EC?

R. APPLGATE: It doesn't say.

TANFORD: It does not say.

WINDSOR: [INAUDIBLE]

MCROBBIE: Sorry Jack, say that again.

WINDSOR: I'm in favor of the motion. I just didn't know whether we had any requirements on how many EC members had to be present to make such decisions.

MCROBBIE: You mean, does this become recursive and [INAUDIBLE]?

TANFORD: I would say...my guess is, having been on the EC a couple of times as I did my several years in faculty governance, is that the EC would be reluctant to take action if there was neither a quorum here nor a majority of the members, but would if it were, I mean, some kind of emergency were some action have to be taken.

HENSHEL: Well, I would suggest number one, that you define a quorum for the EC in this bylaw... in this amendment.

TANFORD: You'd be out of order. I have to define it elsewhere.

HENSHEL: Right. Or in B, you made a comment as a bi-comment that this wouldn't be appropriate for changing of the Constitution itself and the bylaws of the Constitution itself. So, that's not clear and...could you clarify that? And then the third piece is, in bylaw 11C, the Executive Committee actually is communicated to the Council with no timing specified and no more than four members of the Council notify the co-chairs their objection to the action within seven calendar days of such notice being sent. And I could see circumstances where the communication is within that seven days, but very close to the end of the seven days. And then, that people don't have time to respond. So, those are all kind of issues that I would like to see something addressed.

TANFORD: To address the first issue, is the amendment to the quorum requirements specifies that we follow procedures number two and three, not four in bylaw 11C, which means that the... we can never amend the Constitution [INAUDIBLE] but the bylaws. The current limitation on the Executive Committee contained in the bylaws prohibits the Executive Committee from amending the bylaws. What this says is, when the Executive Committee is acting on behalf of the full UFC because we don't have a quorum, it is not subject to that limitation. It could approve an amendment to the bylaws, which would then be subject to sending it out. And if four people objected, it would not go through. And it also, of course, requires the unanimous consent of all Executive Committee members and the President to proceed.

HENSHEL: In which case then, I suggest there be an amendment to 11C number three to be more specific about that timing issue.

TANFORD: Okay. As the parliamentarian, we can't propose an amendment to the bylaws that hasn't previously been discussed. But what we can do is, if we put this, you can vote something down, of course...or having done sort of one pass through... Every time you change something in the bylaws, the next weak link emerges.

HENSHEL: Right.

TANFORD: And there's nothing that says we cannot...couldn't in fact...I think that's both the suggestion that we define a quorum for the Executive and that we think about the language in 11C. I think are both good ones.

HENSHEL: 11C3 specifically?

TANFORD: Yes.

HENSHEL: Okay.

MCRORBIE: Would you be agreeable for that to be looked at [INAUDIBLE]

HENSHEL: In the future? Yeah. I actually...

MCRORBIE: For the next meeting?

HENSHEL: Yes.

MCRORBIE: Yeah. Okay. Other... Yes, Rob?

KRAVCHUK: Alex, I'm very happy to see this amendment obviously. And I owe you a fifth of bourbon and if that doesn't let me off the hook then I...

TANFORD: Then we'll drink it together when I appoint you to the Budgetary Affairs Committee.

MCRORBIE: Other questions? Other questions or comments? Other questions or comments? None? Okay. So then, that's the motion. This is the motion. Obviously, there's a quorum coming from the Executive Committees. The motion in front of us. I'm going to put the motion. All those in favor of the motion as stated signify by saying, "Aye."

SPEAKERS: Aye.

MCRORBIE: Against? Same sign. That is adopted. Congratulations, one down.

TANFORD: One down.

MCRORBIE: Alex, next one.

TANFORD: Thank you. Bylaw proposal number two has to do with the election of UFC members, a procedural rule for electing UFC members. It merely changes the dates. This one has dates on which the various campuses and their bodies have to have held their local elections and notified people. And the original dates were way too early in the year and no one was complying with them. So, this simply changes the dates on which this information about who is being elected to the UFC. It pushes the first deadline back from October 15th to December 31st and the second deadline back from April 15th to August 1st, and makes one other slight change, which is previously...the faculty head in each campus...it said it certified the election to the co-chairs of the UFC, as if we would know what to do with such a certification. This simply changes that, that it goes to the Faculty Council Office, which is where it would have ended up anyway.

MCRORBIE: Anything else, Alex?

TANFORD: No, that's...

MCRORBIE: Okay. Any comments or questions on this? Seems pretty straightforward.

TANFORD: One other thing, it also deleted reference to the IPFWs.

MCRORBIE: Any other comments? Questions? All right. I will put this as a motion. All those in favor of this motion [INAUDIBLE] by saying, "Aye."

SPEAKERS: Aye.

MCRORBIE: Against, same sign. This is adopted.

TANFORD: All right. Bylaw amendment number three. This had to do with the elected...the data for the record of who is a faculty member on which campus, from which...on which the elections were based. And it was a process where a faculty member could request the Council's Executive Committee to determine which campus they were on for voting and allocation purposes. And gave the Executive Committee the authority to determine, for our purposes, what campus you were affiliated with. I have never in my forty years in the university known anybody who used this procedure. It is also handled administratively, and allocation of seats is done on a representational basis of two hundred faculty per seat. So, it cannot possibly make any difference to an election if a handful of people want to switch campuses. So, the proposal is that this bylaw which has never been used, be deleted.

MCRORBIE: Anybody want to defend it? No one want to defend it. Any other comments? Questions only. All right. That being none, I'll put this motion. All in favor of this motion as stated, signify by saying, "Aye."

SPEAKERS: Aye.

MCRORBIE: Against, same sign. It's adopted.

TANFORD: The next one is bylaw amendment four. This addresses bylaw number eight of our bylaws. The officers of the UFC...it...the existing policy used the wrong name for the co-chair representing IU Bloomington... Nobody really cares. It consisted of several sentences that were redundant of each other...and it specified how...we specified how the Regional Faculty Caucus was to select its co-chair. What this does is basically takes out some unnecessary and redundant language and changes the requirement that specified how the Regional Faculty Caucus must select its chair up to the language that says the regional campus co-chair shall be chosen by the Regional Faculty Caucus. And leaves it up to them to decide how to choose their member.

MCRORBIE: Okay. Questions or comments on this proposal? Okay. Seems pretty straightforward. Any questions or comments on this? Okay. There being none, I'll put this much in the stated [INAUDIBLE] in favor of the legislation, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SPEAKERS: Aye.

MCROBBIE: Against, same sign. It's carried.

TANFORD: All right.

MCROBBIE: You're doing very well.

TANFORD: Right. I'm on a roll. I think I'm going to get to...I don't know there are any [INAUDIBLE] We'll find out. Bylaw amendment five. Mostly, bylaw amendment five amends bylaw ten. Bylaw ten placed all of the policy and administrative duties of the University Faculty Council on the three co-chairs. Well, we have a University Faculty Council office that has an Executive Director, whose job it is to do many of the administrative things. So, the basic part of this is, it divides existing bylaw ten into two. Bylaw ten, which addresses...which continues to address specifically the duties of the co-chairs and Bylaw 10.1 because it cross-references in the bylaws. Adding it as 10.1 rather than calling it eleven and renumbering everything, in which case everything...can't find it anymore...so, it moves the administrative duties to the Faculty Council Office and adds one duty to the co-chairs—and that is to appoint a secretary from among a member of the Faculty Council, who will prepare the minutes and the annual summary. Our Constitution specifies that we're supposed to have a parliamentarian. But nothing says anything about a secretary or the preparation of minutes and indeed for years no one has prepared minutes, although we're supposed to. So, this simply says the co-chairs can go around and try and coerce one of you into being the secretary to take and prepare the minutes and prepare the annual summary.

MCROBBIE: Okay, this is...

R. APPLGATE: [INAUDIBLE]

MCROBBIE: Yes, yes, Rachel?

R. APPLGATE: There was a difference of opinion at the Executive Committee, I', just reporting. Some people felt that the office of secretary to be filled by a faculty member was important. I'm just reporting that. And others thought that it was something that could be taken care of by staff. I mean [INAUDIBLE] Because the person who made one of the other points isn't here, I just wanted to make those points as part of your thought about the role of the secretary.

MCROBBIE: Okay.

TANFORD: [INAUDIBLE]

HENSHEL: Well, I'm just curious, when was the last time minutes were promulgated and where were they sent to?

TANFORD: They were promulgated based on the last meeting. I prepared them. They were attached to the agenda. Today, was the first time we had actual minutes. What we had done in the past was just posted a recording of the transcript. Right?

R. APPLGATE: Yes.

TANFORD: We were recording a full transcript, so it was very difficult if a question came up, as it is coming up frequently now as we engage in policy reviews, to find out whether something that was at one time listed in the faculty handbook was in fact ever a policy adopted by this body. Because there are no minutes where you can say policy A31 was adopted. So that really, in my memory, never been actual minutes kept.

MCROBBIE: So, this looks a touch daunting. But I think it's pretty straightforward.

TANFORD: Yeah, the second page where it moves for responsibilities to the Faculty Council Office does not change the wording of any those responsibilities. It just moves them from the category "duties of the co-chairs" to a new category, "duties of the Council Office." Does not change in any way.

MCROBBIE: Okay. Any questions or comments about this? [INAUDIBLE] number five. Nothing? All right. I'll put this motion. All those in favor of this motion stated, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SPEAKERS: Aye.

MCROBBIE: Against, same sign. Then it's carried. Number six.

TANFORD: Bylaw amendment number six. This is a purely semantic bylaw. It governs sort of how the Executive...who serves on the Executive Committee. And the existing language alternated just... I found it very difficult to read as to who is on ex officio, who is voted on, how many additional people other than the chairs are put on or voted on. So, this did not intend to change the substance in any way. It simply specifies that...the method simplifies how people are elected. It gives the number.

FLY: Never mind. I'm sorry. I just saw something that answered my question.

MCROBBIE: Okay, okay. Any questions or comments on amendment number six from anybody? Again, pretty straightforward, I think. Any comments? Okay. There being none, I'll put the motion to approve this motion as stated. All those in favor, signify by saying, "Aye."

SPEAKERS: Aye.

MCROBBIE: Against, same sign. It is adopted. Alex?

TANFORD: Proposal number seven, this one actually has some substance. [INAUDIBLE] last meeting will recall that we had to go into Executive Session. And it turned out that nowhere in the bylaws did it specify what an Executive Session was, who could attend, how it was called or anything like that. The language had existed which said, "At the request of the President or by action of the Executive Committee on its own motion, the Council may meet in Executive Session," period. The Council is made up under our bylaws of both, voting and non-voting members. There was some...this proposal says that only the voting members have an automatic right to go to the Executive Session, but the Council. The voting members can also invite others. But there was some discussion about whether the non-voting members should be automatically

entitled to go to an Executive Session. The consensus in this proposal was, no, voting members only. And then if they want to invite anyone else, they can. A particular vice-president, or somebody who's important to that session, they can be invited. The second matter in which there was some discussion was the presence of the Director of the Faculty Council Office, who is the Chief Administrator of this body. There was just some question about that. According to Robert's Rules of Order, the usual Executive Session does include the administrator of the organization. Doesn't mean it has to. So, I'll say the two things that there was some discussion about was the automatic presence of the Executive Director, or not, which we decided, yes, automatic presence of the non-voting members, where we decided no.

MCROBBIE: Like I assumed, this seems like a wise clarification. Any comments or questions? Yes, Alyce.

FLY: Where is say special invitees, who invites those? Does that mean any member of the Council could invite someone, or should it specify who invites?

TANFORD: The intent, you're right, it is unclear. The intent was that it would be by vote of the voting members of the Council. So that one can, without prior notice, amend the proposed bylaw amendment to make it say what its proponents meant it to say. So, it would [INAUDIBLE], special invitees by vote of the Council?

FLY: No.

HENSHEL: A vote of the majority of the Council?

TANFORD: And...

MCROBBIE: Agreed to by the Council?

TANFORD: Agreed. Agreed.

FLY: As invitees are authorized by vote of the Council?

TANFORD: So, here's what I have at the moment. This is the first draft. Voting members, Director of Faculty Council and others agreed to by vote of the Council.

SPEAKER: [INAUDIBLE]

TANFORD: John?

WERT: So, it sounds like, the way this is worded, that Executive Vice President Applegate would be excluded unless he was invited.

TANFORD: He's non-voting.

MCROBBIE: I thought he was a voter. I think he's a voting.

R. APPEGATE: [INAUDIBLE]

TANFORD: No, I think he is non-voting.

MCROBBIE: You think he's non-voting or voting? Non-voting.

TANFORD: He's non-voting, so he would be [INAUDIBLE]

MCROBBIE: That's interesting. I think he voted once before. Gonna strike that from the minutes. Yes?

FLY: I think the intent of invitees is because we would need the experts on whatever issue that we're discussing in the session. So, if he particularly were the expert on whatever issue we need in closed session, we would invite him.

R. APPEGATE: You might want to list him though, if you want him there.

FLY: He doesn't have to go to everything.

TANFORD: And it was in fact his role that prompted some of the discussion on whether non-voting members should be automatically invited. I suppose my view is just because right now, at this current state of the administration, John Applegate's role and his status within the administration makes him sort of indispensable policy person to this Committee. Doesn't mean two years from now that it'll be structured the same way. So, I think that was ultimately because of uncertainty about which administrators in which situations would be needed. We didn't name any, but feel free to.

MCROBBIE: Are you a voting member in this? I can't remember.

WERT: It's not certain, I'm not sure. I don't think I am.

PEAR: "Executive Vice Presidents of the university are ex-officio, non-voting members of the University Faculty Council."

TANFORD: Shoot! I counted you in the quorum earlier.

MCROBBIE: What quorum?

FLY: Yeah.

MCROBBIE: Okay, so we have...we'll take that as an amendment from the mover. So that becomes... We'll make that become the motion, I think.

TANFORD: If you're not keeping the minutes...I'm sure I can get it straight.

MCROBBIE: Yeah. So, it really becomes...after the comma it becomes...and others agreed to "by vote of the Council." Any questions or comments on that from anybody? Questions or comments

on that? Okay. There being none, I'll put this motion. All those in favor of approving it as stated please signify by saying, "Aye."

SPEAKERS: Aye.

MCRROBBIE: Against, same sign. It is adopted. All right, number eight.

TANFORD: Number eight, the current bylaw twelve says, in addition to the Nomination Committee the UFC shall have the following committees. Well, we don't have a Nominations Committee, so this simply strikes that language. We have elsewhere in the bylaws...it says, "When you need a Nominations Committee, the Executive Committee serves that function." We don't have a separate Nominations Committee anymore. It's just a housekeeping matter.

MCRROBBIE: Again, anybody want to defend?

TANFORD: Anyone who does is going to be named the Chair of that Committee.

SPEAKER: Give them something to do.

MCRROBBIE: Any comments or questions? Okay. Being none, I'll put this motion. All those in favor signify by saying, "Aye."

SPEAKERS: Aye.

MCRROBBIE: Against, same sigh. That's adopted. Number nine.

TANFORD: All right. Number nine, in our bylaws was a page and a half micro-managed policy on the retention and disposition of Faculty Council files. It was inconsistent, to put it mildly, with the current state of Indiana's public records law, with the policies of the University Council, and with policy ACA 73. I think there's a policy enacted by this body on the retention of files with historical or academic purpose. There was no reason for this and it was in fact dangerous in my view as a lawyer, because it contradicted other university policies on records retention. So, it deletes our entire records retention policy and substitutes, "The University Faculty Council office shall retain Faculty Council files in accordance with university policy and in consultation with University Council."

HENSHEL: So, could you clarify what the university policy is about this?

TANFORD: On which policy?

HENSHEL: Well if we're referred...

R. APPLGATE: Records retention.

HENSHEL: Yeah. If the UFC is no longer going to retain records for a set period of time on its own determination but it's reverting it to the Universities Document Retention and Destruction Policy, could you at least tell us what that is?

TANFORD: Yes, to some extent. But it would take a while. I can tell you that one thing to do is you can look up, I think it's policy ACA 73 about the retention of academic...

R. APPLGATE: Preservation ACA 73. Preservation of University Records. Great. That's nothing.

TANFORD: Yeah. It's misleading because it turns out more to have to do with preservation of things like exam papers and archives and things like that.

HENSHEL: Then don't we want to have some sort of determination of how long we keep the files now that we're doing non-physical files?

TANFORD: I don't think that we are...It's the opinion of the University Council's office, which you may or may not feel bound by, that we are not free to have our own policy that contradicts theirs.

HENSHEL: But if [INAUDIBLE] isn't saying anything about retention of files, then it would make sense that somewhere there should be something that determines the retention of files. Because this thirty-three-year-old policy is at a time when we were not living in a digital environment. And the problem is that UITS, the university level, or otherwise makes arbitrary decisions about retention of things.

MCROBBIE: No, it doesn't. No, it doesn't.

HENSHEL: Well, sometimes it feels that way.

MCROBBIE: Well, it may feel that way, but it doesn't though. There are strict policies that guide these things and if we need a presentation of details on them we can arrange to have that. And maybe we should just defer this until we do that.

R RAPPLEGATE: Yeah that would be nice to clarify.

HENSHEL: I mean, it just seems like at this point in the digital age, if we're reconsidering this thing, we should have some sort of consideration of retention of the files.

MCROBBIE: Absolutely.

HENSHEL: On documenting.

MCROBBIE: Yeah. Absolutely.

HENSHEL: And if it's not in the University Document Retention and Destruction Policy, it needs to be some place.

TANFORD: It's my understanding that the university policy does not...It's one tailed, not two tailed. That is...it requires that records of certain kinds be preserved in certain ways. And that we cannot contradict...but it does not require that other records be destroyed. We can do whatever we want to. I can keep student exams for a decade in my office, but I can't destroy them after six months.

HENSHEL: I'm good for that, Alex. I'm just requesting that before we vote on this we get clarity.

TANFORD: And I want to know what clarity. I'm unclear. The reason for this is that we cannot have a Records Retention and Destruction Policy that differs from the university. We are a part of the university.

HENSHEL: I understand that.

TANFORD: And that's all that it says.

HENSHEL: My point is, if it's not made clear at the university level, then it needs to be made clear some place.

MCROBBIE: You would like a presentation on details of the university policy in this area before voting on this?

HENSHEL: I think it's appropriate before we discuss this amendment. Yeah, I do think [INAUDIBLE]

TANFORD: As acting parliamentarian, I would take that as a motion to postpone the discussion of this item.

MCROBBIE: Right.

TANFORD: Which is not debatable and requires a second.

HENSHEL: Second.

MCROBBIE: Okay. So, it's not debatable, in which case I'll put it. All those in favor of this motion, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SPEAKERS: Aye.

MCROBBIE: Against, same sign. [INAUDIBLE]. Sorry. Excuse me...There were two opposing?

TANFORD: Two opposing.

MCROBBIE: We don't want to do a count or anything?

TANFORD: No.

MCROBBIE: Okay. We'll take this as postponed to the next meeting, at which point we'll also provide details on the full university policy.

TANFORD: I'm just writing myself a note here. All right. Final bylaw amendment number ten. Robert's Rules of Order requires every set of bylaws to have contained within them a process for amending them. We have no such process. And it has been a sort of an awkward procedure to even get these various proposals in front of a body that only meets once a semester. So, this is a

proposal to add at the end of our bylaws a method of amending them. Which again is...and again, you might want to talk about this. Because the problem that the normal way that bylaws are amended by a body that meets regularly is in two successive meetings. So, there is plenty of discussion and notice, but we're a body that only meets twice a year. So that it means that if we adopted the two successive meetings rule, we could go...it would take half a year at a minimum to amend the bylaws. So, this tracks an alternative proposal in Robert's Rules of Order for bodies that meet irregularly. [INAUDIBLE] This one. And so, it says that, first of all, it adopts the two-thirds vote we've been...we haven't even known...as we've been voting on these bylaw amendments today. How many of us must vote for them? Luckily, they've all been unanimous...no, except one. And so, this specifies the standard two-thirds vote for a bylaw amendment. It specifies again, because of potential weather and quorum issues...how many people are here? Two-thirds vote of the voting members who are present, not of all of them. So, it means that if we got a quorum, we have enough people to vote on a bylaw change. And...but the proviso...and here's the substitution for if we met every week. The two successive meetings proposal is that the amendment must have been submitted in writing to all voting members at least one week before the meeting. Everybody must have plenty of notice that a bylaw amendment is going to be suggested, so that they have the opportunity to think about it and to attend. The other thing that it does is, it clarifies that the Executive Committee may update the bylaws at any time to reflect changes in the names and titles of university offices, officers, or programs. So that our bylaw amendment that says we no longer have a Nominations Committee, so we have to vote to strike that language, will no longer have to be brought to the body. If there were no longer a Nominations Committee, the Executive Committee could simply remove it from bylaws. Right now, it specifies...it names executive vice presidents; it names bodies. It had the IPFW campus by name in the bylaws. And all things like that are subject to minor changes as administrative structure rearranges itself. And if they rename...if they take John Applegate's Executive Vice President position at some future point and divide it into two responsibilities. If there's just a name change of an office unit or department, or program, allows the Executive Committee to make that change without bringing it to the full body. So, whether you want to give the Executive Committee that power strikes me as something that you may disagree with. And whether you think the submit in writing a week before the meeting is adequate notice to everyone on a bylaw change, those struck us in discussion as the two debatable items.

MCROBBIE: Alex, would you be agreeable to amending to add to voting and non-voting members, so that non-voting members get the material as well?

R. APPLGATE: Well, you can take out voting?

TANFORD: We'll take out... Yeah. That's the easiest way...is to take all members and take out voting. Okay.

MCROBBIE: Okay. I'll take that as done.

TANFORD: Yeah, it was not into [INAUDIBLE] again, that's consistent with this. Which it was supposed to be a notice provision, not an exclusivity provision. So, I think that is in fact more consistent with what we meant.

MCROBBIE: Okay. Okay. Questions or comments on this? Questions, comments? Yes?

COHEN: This strikes me as something that potentially could be misused. And I just want to bring that up in the event, for example, that there's an officer for a regional campus, for example, that opposes. Or that is opposed in terms of creating, for example, a situation that might change an office or create an office or something like that. That the Executive Committee could then by fiat perhaps change the name back or, in other words, that this could be served as a way to resolve a conflict via fiat. And I just want to...just bring this up as a question.

TANFORD: We've had this provision in the Bloomington bylaws for years, and for example, it's in our electoral unit that the School of Art and Design is mentioned. We show up on campus one day, and it has become the School of Art, Architecture and Design. Now, do we have to go through the full? And that's the kind of change... This is a reactive, not a proactive thing where the name of it, like a unit, has changed. The titles of people holding administrative positions, I mean, can change. And it really was designed for that not to address controversies through the Executive Committee, and to some extent the Executive Committees of all these bodies. Particularly this one that doesn't meet very often, has a lot of at least unofficial power. So, elect your Executive Committee carefully. And you've got to some extent trust that these powers are not misused.

MCROBBIE: Other questions or comments? Anybody? All right, there being none, let me put the motion to adopt these amendments as stated. Those in favor, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SPEAKERS: Aye.

MCROBBIE: Against, same sign. It's adopted. Ten out of eleven. Well, with one deferred.

TANFORD: Yeah?

MCROBBIE: Very good. Terrific. Thank you, Alex for all your work on this too. A lot of detail went into pouring through all this and cleaning it up. I think it will be much appreciated in future years.

TANFORD: And I would suggest anyone...there's several people who probably didn't know we had bylaws up to this point, and so they are looking at them. Anyone who sees things...they think ought to be changed or unclear. Now that we have a procedure in place for amending the bylaws, send them to me or one of the other co-chairs. I think that this body need...one of things that I would like to do this year, next...sort of in my role here is to help this body function well procedurally. So that we've got a smooth election process, a smooth discussion process, a smooth process for enacting policies and moving forward. And so, everything you can see in the bylaws that helps that, let me know. We'll get them done.

MCROBBIE: Okay. Thanks, Alex. We now move into two discussion items. And the first is an update on teaching initiatives and Michael Rushton is with the associate VP and John Applegate's office, who will brief us on this. John? Mike, sorry.

AGENDA ITEM 10: UPDATE ON TEACHING INITIATIVES

RUSHTON: Yeah. Okay. Thank you very much. This is just a discussion item, an update, on activities that are taking place regarding the initiatives set forth in President McRobbie's State of

the University Address regarding teaching. So, I just wanted to give you an update on, sort of, what's happening on each of these items. I am not personally running any of these but I will be glad to take any questions or comments you have, and convey them to the people who are actually convening groups to discuss these issues in discussion. So, I'll begin with a number of items are being coordinated by our Senior Assistant Vice President, Rebecca Torstrick, who is a faculty member from IU South Bend and also our Senior Assistant Vice President for Student Completion Success. So, she is beginning by sort of conducting a scan...a review of university-wide and campus teaching and learning programs, just to find out what's out there. Gathering this information, creating a complete inventory of what we have assembling, then assembling a university committee review of these programs that are going to compile these and look for various gaps that we have in our programs ideas that we can disseminate more widely and university-wide future needs. And so, that's sort of a first step in what she'll be doing. That's going to be taking place this year. And then following that, once that's been done...then we want to look at sort of an assessment of these programs that we have. And that would be essentially the second step to see, you know, what are the schools and campuses doing on programs for assuring teaching best practices and issuing a summary report. That is something where...that would be in progress, but expected to report on 2019 rather than in 2018. A third aspect that's [INAUDIBLE] is convening is on translational research where we are looking at sort of taking research, and best practices on teaching and learning, and actually implementing them. And so, she is going to be compiling a report, one for each campus. She is working with the various campuses put this together and then be able to issue a report on that. So, she, again, is working with all of the campuses individually to pursue that. Fourth item, we are pursuing. There's a question on the creation of a...and a master-teacher rank and that's not a name that is set in stone, but a proposal that would eventually come to University Faculty Council for a new rank that recognizes distinguished teaching. So, this would be very much an elite...very distinguished category and award for particular faculty members. That is being coordinated by Eliza Pavalko at IU Bloomington. And she is also working with Margie Ferguson from IUPUI and Uric Dufrene, the Executive Vice Chancellor from IU Southeast on bringing together a proposal that would eventually come ultimately to this body, after a progress report to the President. Fifth item, we are reviewing our teaching awards. Again, trying to gather information on just exactly what awards do we have, both on all of our campuses in different schools, and also from outside the university, that award our faculty on teaching to have a report for review and comment. This is being led by Kelly Kish from the President's office and Michael Morrone, who is from our FACET office. On prototyping grants, we are looking at grants programs placed to investigate plans on results on teaching and learning, and that is being coordinated, again, across all campuses, involving Dennis Groth from Bloomington, Kathy Johnson from IUPUI...and Bill McKinney is coordinating the effort on the regional campuses. Bill McKinney reports to me that he's already receiving proposals in...already. There's end of March deadline for that, but he says there's some very exciting ideas that are already coming forward on that. Decisions will be pending. And of course, the results of all of this would ultimately be disseminated widely on a teaching IU website. Final issues, we are reviewing the teaching criteria in promotion and tenure documents. Here, we are looking to campuses to assure that the criteria for teaching excellence are reliable for applicants, rigorous, well documented...that we are identifying any obstacles in university policy to implementing best practice standards. And so, this is being compiled. This is going to work through school promotion and tenure committees, up to Campus PMT committees for review and report. And then ultimately, a report to the UFC, again, to look over any possible recommendations there. The final thing I would mention here, is also looking at career paths for

non-tenure track faculty. In terms of looking at ways to enhance their retention. And to look at promotion and possibly, even the creation of a new rank. In that line, the third rank, again, as yet unnamed...again, Eliza Pavalko is leading the efforts on that. There's also efforts at IUPUI. Ultimately, a progress report is due to be issued by the end of May. And then, we will look to forming a committee out of UFC to review any proposals. There...so those are all of the things that are going on. And I think, that covers essentially everything that was in the State of the University Address.

MCROBBIE: [INAUDIBLE] questions that you [INAUDIBLE] me [INAUDIBLE] Rachel.

R. APPLGATE: For the...could you clarify this? Master, Teacher, you use the word rank. And sometimes, that implies to me that there's a series, like Professors have Assistant Associate full.

RUSHTON: Yes.

R. APPLGATE: But, Distinguished Professor's a title.

RUSHTON: Exactly. Yes, yes.

R. APPLGATE: So, what are we talking about?

RUSHTON: For the Master Teacher rank, this is looking at the title, not the...so I should not have used the work rank. But it is a title, like a Distinguished Professor. Although, unlikely that we...you might not use the same word, "Distinguished." Although, it would be something conveying the meaning of Distinguished.

R. APPLGATE: Okay. That's fine, I...

MCROBBIE: Yes, Ed?

BERBARI: Is there any reason why the current Distinguished Professor title couldn't be conferred on a Master Teacher?

RUSHTON: I think, they're looking at that...an issue that you have. And I can certainly raise this with them. Is that because we have a...the university has a tradition in how the Distinguished Professor or title is awarded. And it may cause confusion as to what it represents in terms of that title. But I do know that that is a question that the group is grappling with [INAUDIBLE].

MCROBBIE: Yep. Alex.

TANFORD: I want to express a deep concern, and that is that traditionally and under our Constitution the creation and definition of academic ranks, the promotion and tenure process in the academic mission are within the legislative jurisdiction of the Faculty Council not the administration. I have heard lots of people express deep concerns that the various campus governance bodies have not been integrally involved at step one, which is the brainstorming process. In your description here of what's going on, all you mention were administrators, Eliza, other administrators... You say you you're talking to campuses. I'm President of the Faculty

Council of the faculty on the Bloomington Campus, and no one has talked to me. So, I'm not sure who these campuses are that you're talking to. But I suspect, they are not the elected faculty representatives of those campus. It is not, in my opinion, adequate that you come to us at the end of the process with a fully developed proposal. Which, because faculty frequently move more slowly and deliberately than administrators want. Sometimes, by the times we get those proposals, they are essentially fait accompli. I...no, we have no power to tell any administration they can't do anything they want, and I'm not suggesting that. But I am suggesting that...quickly...that if there are...that because these...many of these same things based on President McRobbie's statement and our ongoing issues... We have bodies, appointed and elected in committees of our faculty that are looking and considering many of these same things. I worry about that we've got two groups that aren't talking to each other. And I guess I urge those of you and other people who were involved on thinking about these initiatives from the administrative side to get to talk to the elected faculty representative of the campuses. Get people...get them involved early on at the brainstorming session. This is promotion, and tenure, and teaching, and ranks, and entities, and all that. That really falls within our expertise. This is who we are and what we do. And, as much as I, at least, at Bloomington campus...I love Eliza. I could trust her with almost anything. Just as a matter of protocol and procedure, and not unnecessarily setting up conflict down the road on the procedures that are used, I guess, I would urge you to reach out, to contact people, to get faculty involved, create the working group...create them in ways that have a realistic faculty input.

MCROBBIE: Alex, let me give you the outcome, the [INAUDIBLE] the commitment that will happen. Well, I'm not sure. I'll talk to John...talk to Michael. I don't know. It sounds like maybe not enough that has happened...I'm not certain what's gone maybe off the rails here. But let's make sure that we get that done. Yes, Nasser? We'll just let Nasser's people...

PAYDAR: Just a quick perspective from this campus. So, P&T, as was mentioned by Michael, was referred to our campus or Executive Vice Chancellor. We then sent a note to every school, invited their faculty to work and look at the P&T Committees...the P&T guidelines when it comes to teaching. So that is the part that Michael maybe did not mention, that it did come to the camp. At least here it was referred to every school to look at their P&T by their faculty, because it's in their jurisdiction to look at P&T not our...

TANFORD: But when you say referred to the school, my guess is it goes to the Dean, or the Executive Dean, and maybe it should go to the Faculty Council.

R. APPLGATE: [INAUDIBLE]

MCROBBIE: We actually have some people in mind.

R. APPLGATE: I'm sorry.

MCROBBIE: And I don't know whether Michael wants to respond first. Cause maybe some certain issues can be clarified before we go on with the other people. And then, John and...

RUSHTON: I think we can go on. I'm taking these notes and will refer them to Becky Torstrick and Bill McKinney.

MCROBBIE: All right. Joe.

WERT: I can say that on the southeast campus it was referred to the deans. And the deans have asked the people who worked with faculty who were involved with P&T over the last couple of years to look at this... So, at least on the southeast campus and I assume also on the other regionals, that the faculty had been involved.

MCROBBIE: Yea.

HENSHEL: All right. So, Faculty Affairs Committee of the BFC has been dealing with the career path for NTT. And as you know, Alex, cause you were interviewed...cause Provost Robel specifically asked that we interview every member of the BFC. And we have interviewed most of them by now.

TANFORD: I was actually not interviewed with.

HENSHEL: You're listed down. You're on the spreadsheet. Somebody talked to you.

TANFORD: My memory is not that bad but wait...Rachel.

HENSHEL: Well, anyway, I think it was Alan who was supposed to have talked to you. So, had you had a discussion with Alan you might not have realized what was happening. So, and we did, I think it was in the fall, or late fall, anyway, we did pull together a number of different teaching criteria, but we didn't do it systematically. So, I'm not sure where Eliza is going with that. We've been more focused on NTT recently, than we have been on the teaching criteria. So as far as the NTT goes, it is squarely in the BFC fact on the Bloomington campus.

MCROBBIE: Rachel.

R. APPLGATE: At IUPUI and what I hear about the regionals...but anyway, campus governance and the administration are working very closely, because it's...for success you need staff that's there. I will say, though, from my perspective, that I have great confidence in my campus exploring, understanding our needs, the faculty expressing what they need, and all of that. What worries me a little bit is, if something comes to UFC that impacts the campuses in a way that doesn't...it's...the major thing we have with this new system is, if a proposal comes from one of this committees to the UFC, the UFC does not have enough time to think about how it applies. And we need for it to fit well with the campuses, and their own particular ecosystems. I think we have the responsibility to take care of our campuses, and I think we're working hard in many ways, as you say. But I worry about things coming to UFC without some notice.

MCROBBIE: Yes.

COHEN: In light of the recent, really good results associated with the presidential initiative to reduce administrative barriers to academic excellence. I'm wondering if there will be a parallel initiative with teaching?

MCROBBIE: Well, I mean, if they're administrative barriers, then that would come under the purview of that particular working group. If the administrative barriers that impact on teaching...I'm not quite certain what you're referring to.

COHEN: It would seem, I mean, for example, that there are...I know at IUB and other places that... or I would speak from IUB that essentially there are a number of barriers, specifically associated with the structure of the way that classes are created, taught, cross-listed, associated, assessments with our teaching, and so on, that are, in fact, now essentially piling on to members of the faculty in ways that are, I would say, kind of not meeting in the mission of the university. I was one of the people who mentioned issues with teaching in terms of addressing matters with this particular presidential initiative. I don't believe that I was heard. And one of the concerns that I have here is that the focus on research in particular, and the focus on other kinds of expenses may have outweighed concerns associated with the administrative barriers to teaching. I think it would be worthwhile to sort of see if there is a conversation about what's specifically associated with these kinds of teaching initiatives, if other kinds of concerns might come up.

MCROBBIE: Would you be willing to write a brief note about this, put it down, and send it to me directly?

COHEN: Yes.

MCROBBIE: And let me feed it in and make sure...you said, you believe you weren't heard. Let me feed it in directly to see if you weren't heard, why you weren't heard and the merits of what you're talking about. And whether there's some other process that should be looked at to deal with that.

COHEN: Sure, I'd be happy to.

MCROBBIE: But specifying exactly what it is that you are concerned about.

COHEN: Yeah. All right.

MCROBBIE: Yes?

MARSH: I wanted to thank you for giving us this update. I think, because it answers a lot of questions that I've had and I've heard from many, many of my colleagues. We all know there are things going on, discussions going on, but nobody seems to know when, or where, or what. And following up on Alex's comment, it may be partly perceptual, but it's a perception that people are taking very seriously at least on our campus. And I wonder if it might not be worthwhile taking a leaf out of the silly administrative work regulations initiative that we just completed, which was very transparent.

MCROBBIE: Do you mean what's called a PIRAP Committee?

MARSH: The what?

MCROBBIE: PIRAP, the Presidential Initiative for Reducing a Minister in Paris.

MARSH: That's the one, yes.

MCROBBIE: Yeah, it's ongoing. It's not just completed. It's an ongoing process, yeah.

MARSH: Ok. It's an ongoing... But the great thing about that was that we all seem to know from the beginning who we could go to provide input, or to get a report on what was going on. I know there are lots of different initiatives under the teaching thing there, but if just that there were a webpage or a listing of what all those were, and who one could contact if one had some interest in, that might go a long way to improving relations on this.

MCROBBIE: Other comments? Anybody? All right. Okay. Let's move on to the final item, agenda item eleven. Susan, that's you. All right?

AGENDA ITEM 11: DISCUSSION ON STUDENT WITHDRAWAL FROM COURSES

ZINNER: In the Executive Committee meeting of the IU northwest faculty organization a few weeks ago, faculty started talking about an idea we had...it struck us as student-friendly. So, you probably know that the automatic withdrawal date occurs in the middle of the semester. This semester it is March 11th. It's always the Sunday after the ninth week. So, we started talking about...it might be student-friendly approach if we just moved that up and we start thinking about how far we could move that up. And perhaps we could move it up to finals week. And so, we thought that seemed like a good idea. We did talk to a couple of people about the implications of such a policy. So, for students there is going to be SAP implications. They have to be making satisfactory academic progress. So, they would still get the W, which could in fact, impact their SAP status. But still it would be better than getting an F, which would impact their GPA in a bad way obviously. Another issue that came up was their...and the other negative is of course they would lose their tuition. So, with the understanding that they would lose all of their tuition which would occur...it does occur now if they withdraw at the ninth week. Another issue that came up is the automatic withdrawal date is on the common calendar, okay? So, that means that if we were to think about adopting this, this would probably have to be adopted on all the IU campuses, okay? And we talked to our Registrar who talked to Jeff Johnston. And he said that that's the only financial aid implication...is the fact that this is on the common calendar. There were no other implications. So, our faculty seemed to think that the fact that this date is at the ninth week is kind of arbitrary. We feel that it might help with student retention, if we were to move it up to finals week. We'd like some [INAUDIBLE] and see what the rest of you thought.

MCROBBIE: Yes. Alex.

TANFORD: We also had some discussion. There were some people that they were concerned if you move it back to the week before the exams, that students would game the system somehow and we thought two things. One is of course the fact that they lose their tuition money. The kids...for a lot of them it's some deterrence. And then we talked about requiring a faculty signature to withdraw at the late minute also, as a way of kind of providing some barrier to gaming the system. But a lot of us liked it because like everyone has had at least one student who has had some personal, or family, or health crisis, or something that occurs after the ninth week. And they're often in a very kind of administrative limbo.

MCROBBIE: Yes.

TREVES: I was under the assumption there is already a policy for late withdrawal.

ZINNER: There is a policy that if you meet special circumstances...so, if there's a, I think, a health emergency or some other emergency that's kind of [INAUDIBLE]. So, if you meet those criteria, you can. If your faculty member and your dean sign off, then that will happen. This would broaden the circumstances under which a student could do that.

TREVES: So, I think the policy says at IUPUI something to the effect of approved by the dean. But it cannot be used for reasons of failing a course. That kind of the exception.

ZINNER: Right. I imagine that the student has to be passing. Right?

WERT: It has to be passing and something comes up. And then, I think our Academic Affairs Committee look at it IUPUI...and ours was the latest of all the campuses. Four...five years ago, when we were looking at it. And we looked at all of our peers and it turned out that most of their last day to withdraw was closer to the fifty percent mark of all semesters. And so, we were the latest of our peers. And so, they encouraged us to move it more toward the center of the semester. I think ours was at the seventy-fifth mark...[INAUDIBLE] of the semester. So, we moved it forward because of that. I would be interested in what our peers, you know, the Big Ten schools and so forth [INAUDIBLE].

ZINNER: I don't know the answer to that.

TREVES: Because we were looking at IUPUI [INAUDIBLE].

MCROBBIE: Other...? Excuse me, yes, Ms. Roach.

FLY: When the Executive Committee talked about this on the phone, I think that there was a sense of...it was hard to come up with a compelling reason not to do it. Because...and the stipulation that students be passing? Sometimes their life crises are of a longer term. They don't realize they're in that much trouble. And so, they may not literally be passing if you count all of their missed assignments as zeroes, you know, when you go to drop. And so, it seemed to me on the phone call that many of us, again, had these references to vastly more students would benefit from this than people would game it. And the people who gamed it...everybody loses their tuition. Pretty much, everybody loses tuition. So, everybody's penalized that way.

MCROBBIE: Yeah?

COHEN: I wonder what this would do to enrollments for second eight-week courses. To me, this is a matter. And this would not be students who are failing courses, but other students who are not doing well in courses that they might wish to switch into a different course for the second half of the semester by pushing the W back a little bit. That might actually change the decisions that they make. But I have no idea. And to me this is a really interesting idea. I just want to...you know...

ZINNER: I don't know. I mean, I'm teaching an eight-week course right now. And this is actually a [INAUDIBLE] a student and for the eight-week course you have four weeks and she's in trouble.

MCROBBIE: Any other comments or thoughts on this matter?

WATT: As I said earlier, I'd like to see what our peers do. But I'd also would like...you know...in people going to professional schools and pre-med's always looking at different GPAs...I'd like to understand that better on this gaming situation, on how that would be affected. The days we had before you could do grade replacement, people would not take the final exam to be able to get the F. To do the grade replacement with the F...you know...I know that's changed, but that was historically what they were doing. So, in the School of Science we've got a lot of pre-med majors. They'd play that game by not taking the final. You are going to fail me. Right? Because I don't want the C, I don't want the B, I want to be able to take it out of the GPA. Professional school is a little smarter at that, but I really want to understand that dynamic a little bit better to be fair to all students with their GPAs.

MCROBBIE: Alex, you...

TANFORD: Again, you have to build in an error one way or the other...whatever policy. Right now, we have a policy that if it makes a mistake it punishes people with life crises...If you do it the other way. If its mistake is...okay, a couple of kids get away with gaming the system. At least my students are already gaming the system. We're not really doing anything different. And I know when I've got a student gaming the system. Okay. I suppose if they're really good at it I don't, but for most of them, I could tell. And if you are paying...you're using any kind of an equivalent of red flagging system...If you're identifying the students doing poorly early on, and you're engaged with them in counseling them and talking about their options, and then we require the faculty member to approve it. In other words, the old substitute grade was pretty much automatic in the hands of the student and the professor couldn't say, I know this kid is cheating. This would say...we have the ability to say, no you can't, because I watched you just hanging out in the hall with your buddies and not coming to class. To me, it's not perfect. And you can put more strictures on it, faculty, and Dean of Students. But I've had at least a number of students over the years that would have benefitted from this program. Particularly those...right now, there's a big concern on a lot of campuses, including ours, about mental health issues. A student having a mental issue may be unable to withdraw by the ninth week. And they get caught in this, depending on who recognizes it and what signatures they get...whether they fall into certain categories.

WATT: Okay. Well, let me just make sure. Cause at IUPUI what we do is...when that occurs...I happen to be one of the Dean of Students for the School of Science. We refer those all to the campus's Dean of Students, who automatically acts as the advocate to withdraw that student from all their classes when a mental health crisis comes, or those type of issues that...

WINDSOR: It could be after the fact.

WATT: Yeah, it could be after the fact that they'd go back and change the grades.

MCROBBIE: Jack. Yeah.

WINDSOR: For the proposal... I mean, we want it to be known as student [INAUDIBLE] I think that's what this does.

TANFOR: Sorry, I didn't...

FLY: He's for the proposal.

WATT: He's for it.

MCROBBIE: Yes.

ZINNER: So, can you tell me the date again? What week of class? You're saying it's like the 15th week instead of the 9th week?

FLY: Yes.

ZINNER: So, they can take the whole class and then that week before finals...

MCROBBIE: Withdraw from it.

FLY: Drop it.

WATT: Yeah. So, what...Without any single...

HENSHEL: So, what's wrong with the current mechanisms? I've had a medical this semester. I've also had someone with mental health problems. And the current system...I feel like I can work with them.

ZINNER: One of the issues we've had on our campus is you need the faculty's signature and the Dean's signature. And there is...we have anecdotal evidence that there's variation from dean to dean. So, some deans are known to be sympathetic, other deans are not. Other deans refuse to sign off if it's after the ninth week...refuse to sign off for absolutely any reason unless it's a dire medical emergency that's close to death.

MCROBBIE: Yeah.

HENSHEL: So, what are the options for taking an incomplete? That's what I usually do with students that are losing it towards the end of the semester.

ZINNER: I only speak for my own department. I'm in SPEA. We have a policy in our department you can only get an I if you're passing the course and you only have one assignment left to complete.

HENSHEL: Wow. That's interesting by itself that it's so different between campuses.

SOLINAS-SAUNDERS: But that's because some faculty left, and left the incompletes there and nobody knew what to do with the incomplete. So, there was no documentation left to the department, so it became very difficult for students.

LAFORGE: We have a similar problem because our students tend to take an incomplete and then don't think about it. And then problems pile on, so the incomplete's then transferring over to us and then hurting them in the long run.

MCROBBIE: Yes, Bob?

KRAVCHUK: Anecdotal evidence doesn't make a sample and it's certainly not statistically significant. But I did have a student in my class...he actually started out as a GA for me. He was diagnosed as schizophrenic and he was totally incapable of managing his own life. And it just...it would have been very, very...I think, traumatic for him if he had failed his courses during the semester when he had his breakdown. So, some kind of a provision for people that have these kinds of extreme conditions should be in place.

MCROBBIE: Other comments.

WATT: I'm just speaking for IUPUI. I think that's really very automatic on this campus. And if it comes with some sort of doctor's notice or medical bill that shows they're in treatment, almost always gets the W, even after the semester's over.

MCROBBIE: Yeah, Alex.

TANFORD: Good question. There are a lot of people who have concerns. There are a lot of people who've been sort of supportive. There are a lot of people who've been silent. What the Executive Committee, I think, needs to know is, do we move...is there enough support that we should move forward on this and try to come up with a more concrete proposal to bring back to you, or do you want to kill it today? I mean that's some...we meet again in October. And we'd do a lot of work on this between now and then and bring it back for discussion, unless there's a general sense that you don't like it at all. So, I would like to hear from people who've been silent about whether they think this is something that we should invest our time in to try to draft an actual proposal.

MCROBBIE: Yes.

CLOUSE: I can only speak from the student perspective. But I do know, again anecdotal evidence, of students who, they kind of [INAUDIBLE] in a course, they're not doing so well. They do poorly, and then they have a bit of that learned helplessness where it's like, well, I may as well not come back because I know I'm not going to do well. So, I think that in that...that this could be very helpful, in kind of giving it an opportunity to work through it, rather than just being like, I'm sorry, that's how it is.

MCROBBIE: It would seem that this is enough, and certainly, in this area that it might be able to be worth at least the Executive Committee taking this on and looking into it further. It would seem to be maybe the best way to proceed here. And to see whether there is the need for action

of any kind. I mean, it could be by the POC, it could be on specific campuses, it could be administratively multiple-wise. Would people be happy? And you can obviously assist with that. Would people be happy to leave it in the hands of the Executive Committee with the view to bringing back their findings to the next meeting?

SPEAKERS: Yeah.

MCRORBIE: Executive Committee happy with that? And others? Okay.

TANFORD: So again, some people raised some specific questions about what happens now, what are the actual criteria? Like you mentioned, you got to bring a doctor's note. But when a student doesn't have a doctor's note. If there's information that you want, or anybody's specific concerns you have that you want to address...somebody mentioned what the peer institutions were doing. Don't let those dissipate. Put them in an email and send them to one of us, or to Susan, or you need to send them to somebody. Probably, one of the co-chairs is the best place to send them. And so, let us start to look into it and answer the questions you want answered.

MCRORBIE: Okay, anything more on agenda item eleven from anybody? With that, we're adjourned. Thank you all very much.

SPEAKER: All right.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 3:32 PM