The meeting was called to order at 2:05 pm

Approval of Minutes of Meeting Held March 23rd, 2021

Diane Henshel moved to approve the minutes. John Walbridge seconded the motion.

The following comments were made:

- The remarks regarding the IU Hospital was regarding the hospital in Indianapolis, not Bloomington.
- The policy regarding off-duty law enforcement officers carrying firearms was PS-03, not PSO-3.
- The universities where concerns regarding concealed carry were raised include the Universities of Michigan and Virginia.

The minutes were approved as amended.

Executive Committee Business

- Approximately 40 faculty members were promoted this year to the new rank of Teaching Professor, of which 20 were from IU Bloomington.
- Walbridge presented a resolution of thanks to President McRobbie, which was approved by acclamation.
- Henshel presented a resolution of thanks to senior academic leadership (the four Executive Vice Presidents). It was noted that the commemorative glass plates are still in production. The motion was moved by Henshel, seconded by Wert, and approved by acclamation.
Walbridge expressed that IU is exceedingly fortunate to have the leadership it had. Henshel added that she was appreciative of the steady hand of the senior leadership at IU and in considering, in its actions, both the mental health of the community as well as financial stability. It was believed that this was unique among peer institutions as well as other universities in the country.

Provost Robel thanked everyone for their work, particularly in the early part of the pandemic where meetings are often called for early or late with little or no notice, yet people met. She believed that this reflected the strong bond of trust that is attributed to the leadership of the different faculty councils.

EVP Applegate stated that this was really about a bond of trust, which takes time and patience to build and is easy to destroy. The bond of trust allows for opportunities to be open and candid, and he was amazed at the support afforded. He appreciated the resolution.

IUPUI Chancellor Paydar stated that the health of everyone was the priority from the beginning; hard work was required to achieve this. Much of this lay with faculty governance, such as with emergency changes in policies regarding grades. While we all work together, McRobbie’s leadership was amazing, including attendance at meetings on Saturdays and Sundays.

President McRobbie was delighted that the University Faculty Council recognized the four members of the executive leadership. The university is blessed to have people of such quality stamina and fortitude and who have worked hard without a break. A commendation of the quality of the four of them is the fact that they can cope with rigorous discussions with different points of view without being acrimonious and always able to come up with a resolution. In addition, the university has been blessed with hundreds and thousands of outstanding people who contributed to how we weather this crisis — to do things that should have been done by the government but which wasn’t done. An example of this is the events staff pivoting to run the testing operations at Bloomington campus, as well as the work of hundreds of scientists. In faculty governance, so many policies had to be adjusted on the fly for the new reality, with strict protocol that cannot be followed. People were understanding and everyone deserved thanks. We’re coming out of this very well and the Academic Leadership Council is optimistic about the fall semester.

The role of the University Faculty Council — and faculty governance in general — is of enormous importance. Shared governance in the university is a fundamental part of what makes the university great; at the end of the day, faculty control curriculum. Old timers may recall that one of the former co-presidents of UFC was asked by a trustee what role the trustees had for curriculum. The answer was: none. The standards of the institution, such as for promotion and tenure, are in our hands — for all campuses which have different missions. We are the guardians of the principles of academic freedom and to ensure that as faculty members we are able to speak out on any issue where we can give an informed, knowledgeable perspective. We should defend these principles and take advantage of it.

Universities are great institutions; we’re the guardians of these traditions and thanked everyone for the hard and serious way that people have done the job in the last 14 years.

Presiding Officer’s Comments

President McRobbie said he’d take what he said above as his comments.

Question/Comment Period
No questions/comments were tendered

**Report on Recommendations for Representing Diversity in DMAI (Cir. U21-2021)**

Becky Torstrick, Chair of the UFC Digital Measures Diversity Task Force, gave a brief summary of the recommendations, and pointed out that this is an opportunity for us to advance our anti-racism agenda. Key changes are as follows:

- The diversity indicator is broadened to a “Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Justice” (DEIJ) indicator, which will have help text that points to a copy of the IU Diversity Statement as well as a glossary of key definitions.
- Instead of just a generic check box, there would now be a dropdown menu of statements for each of the categories. Faculty may check off multiple check boxes as appropriate; there will also be an “other” category with a space for faculty to enter their explanation for why their activity fits the category despite not matching any of the statements.
- A new option for an integrative report on DEIJ can be included as a supplemental document. It will be a campus/unit decision for whether such a statement will be required of faculty. No recommendation on this matter is tendered by the task force.
- It is expected that this can be in place for the 2021 annual review cycle; drop down items on the menus will likely need to be reviewed and revised as needed.

**Comments/Questions**

**EVP Applegate:** this started with an inquiry to him from Dean Kessner of the Kelley School of Business to find a way to document diversity activities of faculty in a more substantive manner than the current diversity indicator. This is timely and laudable; it is no mean feat to turn questions like this to something that can be solved.

**Steve Sanders:** Is this applicable to all areas, not just on-campus work? Answer: it was intended this way. Sanders commented that the definitions of terms seemed limited to the campus context and not the community as a whole. What about those advancing diversity/justice beyond the campus? Torstrick commented that the more particular items under each item allay concerns, since those speak to broader contexts. The initial definitions may need to be tweaked, and these are only a starting point. She felt it was important to wait a few years to see where misunderstanding may occur or where “other” is often filled in. Two years might get us more data.

**Steve Sanders:** It appeared that for research, if you click on the dropdowns the definitions would not be seen. Torstrick: Only if you need to see the definition; it gives the eight possibilities for research for example.

**President McRobbie:** What is sought from the UFC? Torstrick: Acceptance of the report and recommendations.

**Selene Carter:** How would these move forward to campuses/schools in the next phase? Torstrick: dropdown options will be centrally programmed in Digital Measures with the goal of these being in place for the next annual report cycle so people can choose from these options. Campuses are not envisaged to need to take specific action unless they desire that all faculty file integrative reports across the board.

Approved by voice vote.
Remarks by President-Elect Whitten

President-Elect Whitten congratulated President McRobbie for his hard work over the last 14 years and stated that she looked forward to stepping on his shoulders.

Commented on Georgia weather today being right at home as people all over the country sent snow. She looks forward to getting to Indiana – July 1 will be a wonderful day. She looks forward to collaborating with everyone in serving students and scholarship as we take the university to new heights.


Selene Carter: the task force worked for the past year, and concluded that more stringent reporting is recommended; if such relationships are not managed, then it is sexual misconduct. It worked to clarify and include “inappropriately intimate relationships”. An outright ban would not protect students and be unmanageable. This is an overdue step to protecting the integrity and safety of students.

Dakota Coates: The initial effort to collect data across all campuses was initially started in March 2020, but was delayed. Last fall/this spring, the survey was reopened to all of the system to get feedback. They spoke to the general assembly of student government. He commended the work of the group particularly with the voice accorded graduate students.

John Walbridge: would like to amend proposal to delete references to “inappropriately intimate relationships”. The concern here was the vague language and the possibility that they are not necessarily consensual. He was concerned that people may not know to report particularly since such relationships are not necessarily sexual in nature.

Carter: underscored conversation in the arts, where intimacy may occur for example in coaching, rehearsing, and/or directing. This is seen in a situation that she became aware of from the New York Times involving the biographer of Philip Roth. An anecdote: she taught with this person in another career 20 years ago. The incident involves grooming behavior and inappropriately intimate relationship among students, and the instructor preyed on the student later when they are of consensual age.

Steve Sanders: He is in sympathy with Walbridge. He understood what Carter said, but didn’t understand why grooming behavior wouldn’t count as sexual misconduct. He is concerned that the footnote that defines it as “amorous, sexual or potentially exploitative” is vague, particularly in the last part. Is anything that might be added not under the sexual misconduct policy?

Carter: Yes, if it constituted sexual harassment (e.g. quid pro quo) or unwanted it would fall under sexual misconduct. The issue is for clarity and a more updated definition of what is proscribed in the code. The concern by the task force is with relationships where people felt like they were in a relationship that seemed consensual at the time but given power differential it didn’t seem like it was consensual later, and wonder why university allowed this retrospectively. The task force wanted the definition to be inclusive of non-sexual intimate relationships.

Sanders: faculty are unlikely to self-report “inappropriate” relationships. Commented on potential vagueness that seemed discretionary and may not give adequate notice to people. While he
appreciated the task force wrestling with the issues he does think Walbridge’s point is valid, and is concerned about mistaken non-reporting.

Yu Kay Law: some faculty concerned about the lack of expertise for someone else to evaluate coursework in this case.

Paul Coats: Removal of the current, outright ban that is in place creates a lot more to manage plus the language on “inappropriately intimate relationship”. He’d rather see a ban with management language to deal with situations. He was curious why this was recommended despite having reviewed the survey feedback. In a survey of provosts across the country, 75% agree/strongly agree with banning faculty-student consensual relationships.

Marc Mendonca: As a member of the task forces, it has taken it all very seriously. After conducting extensive surveys and data analyses it was clear that neither faculty nor students want a complete ban. (3/4 of data suggested that way) We are not an outlier; there are schools that ban this but it should be clarified that we don’t have a ban currently.

The wording was discussed multiple times and legal did look at this. We are trying to show that we are responding in a respectful way to the issue to all stakeholders. The wording of this is tricky. From a Title IX perspective, if you have a ban it would be virtually impossible to enforce. He understands the concerns but the reality is that these things are important. This should act as guidance and this is the goodwill effort to provide this guidance.

Dakota Coates: Will address the points. Evaluation oversight has already been found in previous policy; it is not new. As for Paul Coats’ point, on p. 3 of the report it states that the recommended policy includes a presumption that the relationship requires disclosure, so non-disclosure due to misunderstanding is not permissible. He was originally in favor of an absolute ban; however, when it was brought up with students, students pointed out that an absolute ban would simply lead to those engaging in such relationships to hide them – this would not protect students or faculty ultimately.

Jenny Kincaid and her office (the Office of Institutional Equity) were involved in these discussions and have faith that the administration will develop appropriate management components to manage these relationships. To Walbridge’s point – the term “inappropriately intimate” was designed to distinguish e.g. faculty and students having a beer at a bar, versus having wine in a private apartment. The focus is on whether there could be an exploitative bridge. The footnote may be worth clarifying.

Carter: Felt strongly that consent is taught clearly e.g. in bathrooms. This is the other side of the coin – to educate faculty over what is appropriate vs inappropriate. Having seen chairs spend hours managing sexual misconduct cases, we need to make this move to protect students and be clear to faculty regarding what is ethical.

Jennifer Kincaid: we have a model for reporting and managing relationships for nepotism. This is done centrally and requires annual disclosure, and is managed by her office. Not sure if this can be done by her office, but could be done e.g. by compliance office.

John Applegate: Rules have a significant effect. He was not among the provosts who were surveyed, but part of the reason for their view is the huge amount of time required for cases like this. The other is to send a really strong signal. He is not sure that we can find a formulation of words that would be perfect, but we can send a strong signal.
John Walbridge moved his amendment to the motion. Steve Sanders seconded the motion.

_Debate of Amendment_

Coats: Would it work if the word “inappropriately” is removed?

Walbridge: Would make it more problematic.

Peggy Stockdale: suggest that there can be inappropriate relationships that are not sexual but could be something you would be managed. If “inappropriate” is not included, then a close, friendly relationship as may be found in mentoring might hbe considered intimate, which is not intended.

Sanders: If a member of the committee could not give an example of what would qualify, then the terminology should give us pause – to remove this language or more thought should be given to delineating exactly what is in mind. He doesn’t want to weaken what is generally a good policy, but felt Walbridge has a point here. Does not want to expose faculty to sanctions based on something that they can’t anticipate what it includes.

Carter: Disagrees. Does not want to name names due to confidentiality concerns, but a faculty situation was resolved this year which was reported in the IDS. It was a mentoring relationship that was inappropriate and predatory. The situation shifted to sexual misconduct even though there was never any sexual activity in any digital or personal way; however, the student-victim felt that they were a victim of sexual abuse.

Diane Henshel: An example would be Biden being too “handy” making some people uncomfortable. If a student tells a professor or staff member to stop, and it stops, great. But the person may not stop and in this case the student needs recourse of some sort – something that allows for and can catch “slippage”. She therefore supports the original language.

Marietta Simpson: Supports original language. The examples cited by Carter are really good and such behavior is often seen in the performing arts. Anytime we can reinforce a safeguard we should do so, and redundancy is not a problem. We need to send a message and support students. If it gives pause to people, that’s a good thing.

Mendonca: Wants to mention from the chat about where there were ~200 text messages which, while it doesn’t have to be sexual, is nevertheless creepy. If it doesn’t say “inappropriate” it’s too wide, and we do have mentoring relationships with postdocs and students – but those are not inappropriate. On the side of caution, he thinks that “inappropriate” is still necessary to give us all pause and think about what we’re doing when developing these relationships.

Voted by Zoom poll. 19 Ayes, 17 Nays, and the amendment is carried – the amendment is made to those recommendations.

Steve Sanders proposed an amendment to the language to add “where the faculty member has or foreseeably could have a professional responsibility regarding the student” to qualify the range of relationships that need to be declared. He stated that he has discussed this with Carter, and it was his understanding that she was supportive of the clarifying language. He thought it was ambiguous at first because the initial recommendation didn’t seem to incorporate the idea that the faculty member has a professional relationship with the student; it suggested that all faculty relationships must be reported.
He could, for example, have a relationship with a student in musicology who could never conceivably come under his disciplinary or grading responsibility, and the language of the recommendation could be interpreted to cover this. Carter stated that it was not the committee’s intention to cover this type of situation. Believes that this just clarifies the committee’s intent to head off possibilities of misunderstanding.

Law seconded the motion.

Debate:

- James Marrs – still concerned about inappropriate relationships. In the next evolution of this policy, things like grooming behavior and the ilk, which may not be addressed sufficiently by “inappropriate intimate relationships”. In favor of current amendment.
- Carter: One of the charges to the task force is to recommend that the university adopt a standalone policy separate from the academic code of ethics. It was resoundingly the recommendation that there should be such a policy. Suggests that such a policy could really delve into these concerns and issues, and where grooming and predatory mentoring can be fleshed out.
- Simpson: Thanks Sanders for adding this clause which she sees as clarifying. Wanted to support what Marrs and Carter said – it is vitally important that we have something like this in there. Believes that to have a consensual relationship policy without a statement about grooming behaviors is a serious misstep.
- Mark Baer: Finds it troubling that we’re considering an issue that concerns diversity on our campuses, and that after hearing the voices of unrepresented faculty and students, we voted to overturn their voices and chose to amend this proposal and take out something that proscribes inappropriate behavior.

Voted by poll on Steve Sanders’ amendment: carried with a 83% majority.

Final discussion on the doubly amended recommendation of the committee:

- John Watson: it is a bit of a shame that the recommendation to include “inappropriately intimate behaviors” was overturned with such a weak vote; believes that this is something that would have easily carried on a different day.
- President McRobbie: it was a close vote that went one way; sees no alternative but to proceed as voted on. UFC can reconsider this at its first meeting next year. However, we have to move on.

Overall recommendation: approved with 94% aye

The appendix was discussed. It was supporting data and does not need to be voted on by the Council.

**Proposed charge for the University Faculty Council Climate Action Plan Task Force (Cir. U24-2021)**

Henshel: This is the “next step” after the sustainability resolutions were passed by the UFC and the various related resolutions.
Laverne Nishihara: This originated at IU East and was discussed by RFC. Similar resolutions were approved by the regional campuses, then by the IUPUI Faculty Council and by the Bloomington Faculty Council.

The next step is what is now before the UFC. The UFC is asked to approve charges to a Climate Action Task Force to come up with an IU wide climate action plan by 2025. IUPUI and IU Bloomington have agreed to complete their climate action plans by 2023; the other campuses will need to complete their action plans prior to the completion of the university-wide climate action plan by the end of 2025.

There are a set of numbered charges. The most important one is number 5, which reads “examine, assist, and advise with developing an Indiana University wide climate action plan, including a definition of carbon neutrality to be drafted by the IU and IUPUI Offices of Sustainability”. Professional staff at these offices of sustainability had a lot of input in the wording of these charges, and support all of this. What precedes number 5 is largely statements about cooperation and collaboration and leveraging the expertise of all constituencies across IU. What follows number 5 is about implementation and reporting. The task force is asking for approval of these charges.

There are some additional recommendations in the document from the task force planning committee; these are in keeping with the UFC Constitution that trustees and administrators should consult the faculty concerning planning and decisions regarding physical resources. Of these, the first bullet is most important: “IU and IUPUI Offices of Sustainability staff be authorized and supported to develop the Climate Action Plan. Administrators should charge staff members with working on the climate action plan and conducting related activities with various campus constituencies as part of the staff’s professional responsibilities. Furthermore, the planning committee advocates additional staff support for the regional campus resilience committee”. There are suggested membership guidelines for the task force to include faculty, staff, administrators, and students as specified. Finally the planning committee membership is included.

No Comments/Questions

Voted and passed.

Henshel: This will take input from all campuses – be on the lookout if you want to volunteer for any subcommittees that arise.

**Proposed amendment to the UFC bylaws to create a Technology Policy Committee (Cir. U25-2021)**

Angie Raymond: UFC requested that her and Sameer Patel to consider how a Technology Policy Committee can be formed. The request is now before the UFC to create this committee. The language used here is adapted from similar bylaws for other committees. They requested that UITS be a liaison to this and created a structure where all campuses are involved in this.

This arises because technology in general has become much more regulated and organized across the system as opposed to being organized on a campus-by-campus basis. A committee at the university level is therefore appropriate.

Yu Kay Law: Thanks for the hard work; asks about that the member “should” have experience on the campus Technology Policy Committee, since some campuses do not have such a committee.
Raymond: Language amended at Law’s request; it now says “where feasible”.

Henshel: Appreciate Raymond and Patel’s work. Only way we can work hand in hand with UITS is at the UFC level. Individual campuses do not have sufficient authority to do so. The development of this committee gives faculty a voice when things affect us.

Sameer Patel: Any changes UITS does would affect all campuses; therefore, it is appropriate for this committee to be at the university level.

President McRobbie: The days are long gone where changes in technology are campus specific; technology is technology no matter where you are.

The resolution was approved by unanimous vote.

**Proposed Consolidated Grading Policy ACA-66, Grades and Grading (Cir. U26-2021, U27-2021, and U28-2021)**

Alex Tanford: Policy Review Committee moves the adoption of the revised ACA-66 and concomitant rescission of ACA-64, ACA-67, ACA-68, ACA-69, ACA-70, and ACA-71.

Some technical changes since the draft posted with the agenda:

- In the extended X/grade replacement policy, it kept referring to students who retake the course. It was pointed out that in some units, in some situations students may retake the course without replacing the grade. Therefore, the phrase “retake the course” was replaced with “replace the grade” or “grade replacement policy”, which reflects the intent.
- In some semester abroad programs, no letter grades will be awarded. Therefore, NY grades will not always be replaced by a letter grade, and the corresponding statement was removed.
- The definition of “A through D grades” are now defined as including plus and minus grades.

Other changes were made since the last discussion draft are found in red on the document. Most pertain to how authority is apportioned between units and their administrators, and its applicability to hybrid and master’s programs. Deadline for completion of incompletes changed to by discretion of instructor, and what happens if no final grade is submitted after a year. Other wording changes were walked through as well.

There was some controversy over how departmental rules from a student’s program may restrict students’ abilities to restrict the applicability of grade replacement for courses required for a major, minor, or certificate. It was clarified because the replacement rules depends on the student’s major rather than the instructor. The grade replacement must therefore be approved by the principal administrator of the student’s unit which is almost always delegated down to academic advisors – we’re not actually talking about discussing the matter directly with the Dean. However, the academic advisors in the student’s unit may need to know about grade replacements to the extent that it determines students’ satisfactory progress towards a degree and things like that – so the approval rests with the student’s unit. There was also concern about language that may imply requiring students to replace at least three courses, which was edited. It was also made clear that to the extent that campus policies are different, if a student is taking courses on multiple campuses the student’s ability to replace grades are determined by the student’s degree granting unit.
Made it clear that campus procedures that determine whether courses are pre-approved to be offered on a S/F basis.

For credit by examination, work experiences, or required performances, an S grade can be awarded for passing the assessment. There was some discussion about whether an A would count towards your GPA if it was awarded in this case; the Policy Review Committee was pretty unanimously agreed that it doesn’t count towards one’s GPA – it is just an honorific. Concern is that if the A did count towards the GPA then it would increase grade inflation pressures on those units.

There were some language problems with the withdrawal. There are three periods of time:

- First week (drop/add) - not a W
- Auto-W period (automatically get W)
- Some campuses/units allow students to withdraw later in the semester. The language present now clarifies units can do that – and they can set a time limit and there’s a consent requirement to this.

Changing grades made consistent with the section on incompletes. In addition, faculty may choose to change grades with extraordinary cause – for example if a faculty member awards everyone a D and leaves the university. Registrars however indicated that the workflow for eGrade changes did not provide for principal administrators of the student’s unit of enrollment – the concern would be about units with restrictive requirements on how many courses a student had to be enrolled in and so on.

The definition of “A through D” was now added in, to include plusses and minuses. Other definitions were added as well.

The big one: grading deadline. Discussion has fallen largely based on four groups:

- Faculty: want longest possible deadline.
- Registrar: wanted shortest possible deadline; there were concerns about unanticipated consequences of a longer period. However, it turns out that the main articulated concerns are not really problems.
- Those who need to report grades outside of the university. Of these the most important is athletics compliance, where it turns out to not be a problem. For students who are eligible, they are eligible to play until they become ineligible. The real potential problem is the reverse: an athlete who is ineligible and raises their grades become eligible once grades are turned in. The athletics compliance office stated that a few days won’t actually make a difference. Similar reports were heard from financial aid offices and elsewhere.
- Students: mostly didn’t care. They reported that the existing deadline is so widely ignored that they all had grades not turned in for a week or even ten days; they have never experienced negative consequences.

The Policy Review Committee looked at other universities, particularly other universities in the Big Ten and other comparables. Several observations were made:

- Most universities set their deadlines to the end of term rather than the final exam date/time; our policy was a relic of the days when handwritten records needed to be recorded by hand.
- Most recommended somewhere in between the different times advocated.
- Some institutions – those with long windows for turning in grades – have a different deadline for graduating seniors.
The final choice was four days – right in the middle of what other universities do. This policy has been vetted through the most people and constituencies of any over a two year period, and we hope you don’t send it back – we don’t want to look at it again.

Discussion:

- Yu Kay Law: When does this policy take effect? It would impact the grade deadline for Spring.
- Tanford: Not sure. It is assumed that with the grading deadline the policy will take effect next academic year – not sure about summer. In part this is because the actual process for submitting grades under this policy are to be worked out by campus governance organizations in consultation with the Chief Academic Affairs Officer and the registrar – it anticipates a campus by campus discussion about how best to implement and when to start.
- Diane Henshel: What is “end of term”?
- Tanford: Last day of exams.
- Henshel: Where is this defined?
- Tanford: In the common calendar – can’t remember where it is; he went through this two years ago. The word “semester” is inconsistent; “term” is the only word commonly used in calendar. Will take what she says as an amendment – which he believes is a good one – to make sure that “term” is defined in the definition section.
- Crystal Walcott: Approached by several folks from the School of Education. At the beginning of student teaching semester, some students are required to pass certain courses in order to begin student teaching. They need to know students’ grades in sufficient time so they can pull students from student teaching if they aren’t qualified to do so. The problem is that they need to start their placement at the time schools start their second semester after winter break – often a week or more before IU Bloomington finishes their winter break. There is not enough time to make the determination whether or not student teachers are eligible for their placements. This is combined with Cate Reck’s message about staff who will take on extra burden to get the information to the right people. The School of Education struggle as it is with the current deadline – with faculty who haven’t submitted grades on time to make those decisions as it is; they expect problems to increase with an extended deadline.
- Tanford: Not sure whether extending deadlines would increase the problems – if it’s already taking three or four days to grade exams, it’d take that. However, in any case, this situation is contemplated for in the professional school exception to the general rules in A1. However it requires one consult with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Registrar to ensure everyone’s on the same page.
- Marietta Simpson: Similar comment from the School of Music; extending the deadline from 48 hours to four days after the end of term would put undue stress on the limited staff (2) who need to handle the grading system for 1500 students. They wish to speak very strongly against this clause.
- Tanford: How does extending the deadline make their job harder?
- Simpson: Reads statement from relevant staff, stating that it would decrease time allowed to process probation and graduation, which is already limited with only one person in the undergraduate records office and one in the graduate records office – placing additional stress on staff members at a time when there are already many additional responsibilities. Also, it would affect undergraduate and graduate advisors responsible for 1500+ students in the Jacobs School of Music who will have less time to prepare materials for probation hearings. Also, from the financial aid, who need to update and remove financial aid for those on probation. There are already existing impediments to timely and efficient graduation reviews; delaying the grade submission deadline would exacerbate existing challenges. This will force ever-increasing
processing work to be completed in a shorter timeframe, as deadlines are defined by outside constituencies such as transfer work, overseas study, foreign language proficiency, and English composition exemptions.

- Tanford: To the extent that these are driven by the nature of the music school program, A1 allows the unit to make modifications. We have heard variations on this concern expressed from the beginning by staff – and we appreciate it. But grading policy is first and foremost driven by academics. It must be consistent with what makes good sense from an academic perspective on the part of instructors figuring out how best to teach and assess. These considerations take priority over staff pressures. Perhaps the staff should be talking to the Dean about adding another person in the office – one person processing 1500 peoples’ records seems outrageous regardless of the deadlines. They talked to as many people as possible about possible adverse impacts on graduation, honors, etc – the administrators in charge of those areas (versus lower level staff and registrars) stated that a few days won’t make a difference. Staff are concerned; however those who actually make those decisions stated that two days won’t make a difference. A one week deadline – that would actually make a difference that could cause problems that can be articulated.

- Harold Olivey: The new language on grade replacements addressed most of their concerns. For core courses, students can only take it twice. If a student took the course three times, and the previous two grades are X’ed out, is there any recourse for the college to get access to the second X grade to determine their ability or eligibility to matriculate? Or can this not be accessed unless the student chose to reveal it – and hence the college would have to disqualify the student from matriculating.

- Tanford: Under Section E, for the X grade it does say that the previous grade can be retained as an internal grade and used for that purpose.

- Olivey: While units can modify the grade replacement policy such that required courses for the major (say) cannot be repeated more than twice, they can’t reject grade replacement completely – they can’t say that you can’t ever replace any grade or any grade more than once. Is this correct? For example, a nursing student could retake their philosophy (general education) course and have the grade replaced – twice if they want to – and the nursing school couldn’t prevent this; however, the nursing school can say that a student can only take (say) anatomy and physiology up to twice. Is this correct?

- Tanford: Yes, but stated that Olivey identified a potential gray area that would have to be worked out by the unit. It talks about courses required for a program by the unit; it doesn’t specifically say that these courses must be limited to those offered by the unit. For example, a unit can say that to join our program you must have received a B or better in 2-3 courses outside of the unit beforehand. These then become requirements – particular things required by the units to move on with that unit. This will need to be worked out with the Registrar and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. What we’re trying to prevent is a catch-22 where a student is originally in one unit – that allowed the student to retake the course – and was allowed to retake that course. It could even be a unit that made an entry level course extremely difficult to weed people out, where lots of people would retake the course – there are a couple of units like that at IUB. After that, the student gets discouraged and switches to another unit, which then says that in that unit students aren’t allowed any retakes. This is the sort of competing sets of rules that a student might be caught that they wanted to eliminate. However, didn’t want to narrow it so much that a unit could not have its own sensible policies on retakes and grades and retaining the grade information.

- Angie Raymond: Want to go back to grade deadlines. Is this something we can pass right now and move forward on because Tanford has done a great deal of work, and then we can look at
what reasonable timeframes are. One concern is that the four days includes the weekend for most people – and for many people, if one is assigned a Thursday or Friday exam, one would be grading for the entire weekend. For some people this means working 12-15 hours over the weekend to make these deadlines. Also pointed out that this year various campuses have adjusted policies, such as the religious observance policy as it relates to students. But we ask colleagues to administer exams during Hanukkah and grade as well, including on the weekend. These historic ties to the way in which the calendar works might need to be examined a bit and the work life balance factors into this for everyone. Rejects the idea of one person trying to do a job for four – this is a different problem to be fixed. It can’t be pedagogically okay for probably a lot of colleagues grading all weekend for 15-17 hours. As a major university, we have to allow faculty to examine the way they feel appropriate for their topic and subject area, and to read the submissions and grade them. This is not possible as student numbers increase and so on – something has to give. Unfortunately this came as one massive vote, and don’t want to stop all the hard work Tanford has done. But doesn’t want to spend two years producing a white paper. During the next semester, can get the right people (faculty, staff, students) in the room, and look at timeframes and see if these can be adjusted.

• President McRobbie: the committee has worked for two years; some comments are there but mostly minor. Could we pass this with understanding that timing and other things might need to be reviewed next year so that we can make progress? Many of these changes – which seem uncontroversial – can get done and it can be tuned again.

• Tanford: Every relevant person has been in the room and we’re hearing the same voices repeat themselves. Our job was to do what was best for the university – everyone. There are grade appeal processes that have to go on – there is no ideal day. Four days is the average of what others do – it doubles the amount of time even if your exam is on Friday. If your exam is on Monday, you’ve now got nine days to grade. Faculty with individual issues e.g. with childcare or religious observances may be able to negotiate with their unit to try and get their exams on Mondays or Tuesdays to have plenty of time. There doesn’t appear to be a good way to resolve this within the terms of this policy. Having now been involved with massive renovations of policies, he would say that we’re not going to get everything right. It’s time for individual campuses to look at this, survey its faculty, and come back with proposals for change – possibly with the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee looking at this. One can also propose an amendment to do one of two things: either the grade deadlines are set by the campus, or seven days, or four days with extensions for religious observances. However, he urges body not to amend this policy and give it a chance to see if it works.

• Henshel: As Raymond said in chat, need to exclude weekend from the time for grading; this is contradictory to the effort being made for work-life balance. She also supported the suggestion that Cate Reck made, whereby faculty with large classes – particularly multiple large classes – may request earlier exams during the exam period. The rules were set when everyone used scantrons, which is not a good way to assess learning. This time schedule is anathema to good assessment. Have spent over a decade emphasizing teaching and assessment. The crazy time schedule is contradictory to allowing faculty to create and give time for reasonable assessments. We need to first pass this – thanks Tanford and Kip Drew and the rest of the committee for their incredible work on this policy and outreach. But the issue of timing at the end of semester needs to be considered holistically – and it can’t be just faculty working on it. Suggests that President McRobbie or EVP Applegate suggests to the new president that this needs to be done in the fall. We need to pay attention also from an equity perspective – the people getting most screwed among the faculty are the non-tenure track faculty, who are the least paid.
• President McRobbie asks Dakota Coates if there is something that needs to be said. There appears to be a consensus that the timing issue needs to be revisited next year, and EVP Applegate can take care of making sure it is transmitted to the new administration.
• Dakota Coates: wants to put explicit focus on work days versus regular days. He didn’t know since Tanford was defining term as part of this per the earlier conversation if that can be worked in but that would be tacked on to the future stuff.
• Tanford: A day is defined as a calendar day, not business day. It was debated whether it should be three business days or four calendar days. Most people said that if one got the exam on Friday one would be grading over the weekend anyway. All constituencies have been involved in discussion this year – this was the compromise that we came up with. There are two things: how this policy has to be implemented at the campus level – different campuses schedule exams differently. University policy is silent on how large class exams are scheduled; it is also not possible to schedule all large class exams for the beginning of the week as this harms students – particularly freshmen who may need their exams spread out. Campuses or units may develop its own policies regarding how early week exams are reserved for faculty with the most students; but this was not thought as something to be put in a university wide policy.
• President McRobbie: can either put this amendment to a vote per Raymond and Henshel, or voted up with the understanding that further work is still needed on this particular matter.

Voted by poll – approved 91% ayes, 9% nays

Minutes should reflect that the timing of grade deadlines will be revised in the fall through EVP Applegate with the new administration.

President McRobbie thanks everyone for their work.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:38 pm.