Indiana University School of Education

EDUCATION COUNCIL

July 20, 2018

MINUTES

Members in Attendance via Zoom:

Matt Benus, Denise Dallmer, Enrique Galindo, Lisa Hoffman, Linda Houser, Wendy Marencik, Terry Mason, Leah Nellis, Thu Suong Nguyen, Kwadwo Okrah, Beth Samuelson, Jill Shedd, Erik Tillema

Terry began the meeting noting that there was a quorum and thanked everyone for participating in this special meeting. He suggested that the Council discuss each of the suggestions received from members as proposed amendments to the Council constitution.

Section 2. Authority

SUGGESTION 1

Given that this suggestion came from South Bend, Kwadwo offered a brief rationale for the idea -- to limit Education Council authority and to provide more freedom and autonomy to the individual campuses. Several members noted that this move of the Council’s authority from governance to advisory would be a drastic change and would weaken the Council, when the University administration has specified that it would like to see the Council more “robust.” Lisa supported the suggestion, noting that the degree of local authority that it represented was appropriate.

SUGGESTION 2

Since both Suggestions 1 and 2 addressed the Council’s Authority, Thu Suong stated that the authority of the Council should be viewed as a “both/and” versus “either/or” matter, in terms of the Council serving as both advisory and governing. Matt added that in his six years on the Council, he felt that Suggestion 2 did not reflect a loss of autonomy among the campuses but a move to inclusion of a larger, University perspective. Beth agreed and felt that Suggestion 1 would move the Council to being less robust, and in her mind would weaken the Council considerably.

Kwadwo noted that all changes that go before the Council go through many advisory/governing steps on an individual campus first. Lisa added that the Council meeting only once/semester tended to slow down and/or serve as barriers to individual campus innovations. Beth noted that the Council easily could meet more often, and has in its history. Leah also noted that the issue of efficiency is important, and that the Council meeting schedule should be revised to facilitate efficiency.

Erik asked for clarification as to which programs would come before the Education Council. Also, Thu Suong recommended that the work of the Council include addressing policies associated with education programs. Jill noted that the first sentence of Section 2 indicates that the Council “shall review all (italics added) professional education programs at Indiana University.” Matt added that individual campus entities do not understand nor have the professional expertise with respect to teacher education/ licens ing/accreditation; the Education Council does. He added that the Education Council authority is well regarded across the University.
Matt motioned to remove Suggestion 1 from consideration, Enrique seconded. Without additional discussion, Terry called the question. Jill conducted a roll call vote: the results were 8-2, in favor of the motion to remove Suggestion 1 from consideration.

With respect to Suggestion 2, Leah did ask for clarification of “where appropriate” in Suggestion 2. Thu Suong was open to friendly amendments to the language in Suggestion 2 to provide clarity. She also noted that Suggestion 2 deleted reference to “courses.” Matt noted that all education courses continue to go through remonstrance through the Education Council. Terry asked if there were amendments that individuals wanted to recommend to the language of Suggestion 2. There was brief discussion re: adding reference to programs and courses, with the exception of terminal degrees. Enrique proposed that the existing Constitution bullets under “principal functions” were most clear. Leah suggested that perhaps the second statement in the Section 2 re: the scope of the Council could be expanded to include such issues as redundancy of programs across campuses, as well as coherence, alignment and/or exclusion of programs. Members noted that the Council did provide the added value of the collective wisdom of professional educators to program and course discussions.

Erik initially suggested that the first line of the Council Authority be revised to include “programs and courses with the exception of those for terminal degrees.” Further discussion led to consensus that there should be no exceptions as to the education programs and courses to come before Education Council.

Thu Suong was happy to withdraw Suggestion 2 and moved to change the language in the fourth bullet under “principal functions” to state: Discuss and make recommendations of issues and policies affecting education programs throughout the Schools of Education.” She added that the procedures could be delineated in the Bylaws. Beth seconded the motion. Terry called the question, and Jill conducted a roll call vote; 10-0, a unanimous decision to retain the four principal functions of the Council as stated in the Constitution with the approved changes to the fourth bullet noted above.

Section 3. Composition

There was agreement among the members that the Council consist of ten faculty-voting members as listed in the Constitution. Discussion surrounded the inclusion of the campus deans as ex officio members and designation of the Chair and Secretary to the Council. With respect to the campus deans, Thu Suong believed that Suggestion 6 would reflect a shared governance structure, having faculty and deans working together, and would provide leverage within the University. Terry concurred. There was discussion about adding Suggestion 6 as a second sentence to the Composition, and Leah moved to do so, but the motion did not receive a second.

Discussion moved from the inclusion of the campus deans to extended discussion re: the leadership/Chair of the Council. Matt voiced concern that a rotating chair would lead to a loss of stability in the Council. In addition, he noted the importance of the chair being tied to an administrative office, providing staff to keep things moving. He noted grave concerns about the loss of consistency in the work of the Council. Kwadwo agreed that the administration of the Council’s work was important, yet he felt that it would be good and appropriate that there be shared leadership of the Council. Terry raised concerns about an annual rotation of the Chair, given the complexities of the Council’s work and the administrative management/oversight required for the Council’s work. Matt noted that the Council
in recent years has not used the Agenda Committee as stated in the Bylaws, and that issues of shared leadership could be addressed by the membership and work of the Agenda Committee. Further discussion about the length of the chairmanship and eligibility to be Chair ensued with some suggestions that these issues could/should be a part of the Bylaws.

Related discussion continued on whether the Chair should be a voting member or ex officio. Given that the Council has ten faculty-voting members, there was the idea that the Chair should be an ex officio member, voting only in the case of a tie. Erik added concerns re: the centralization of the Council’s work and the ability of all campuses to manage the administrative requirements of the Council.

In addition, there was discussion about the proposal in Suggestion 3 of a chair-elect, a new position in the existing Council structure. Following further discussion, there seemed to be consensus to dropping the notion of a chair-elect. There seemed to be some agreement to the notion of a two-year Chair. Wendy stated that it seemed more practical for the Chair to be ex-officio, able to vote only in the case of a tie. Matt recommended that the Chair should be an administrator. Various ideas were shared about members selecting the Chair from among the deans. Erik moved that the Chair be an ex officio member of the Council selected from among the deans. There was no second. Erik motioned to retain the Chair as the Bloomington dean. Matt seconded the motion, but the question was not called.

Given the hour, Terry recommended that a subcommittee of the Council work to prepare proposals to be considered with respect to the leadership of the Council. Thu Suong, Leah, Lisa and Erik volunteered to serve as such a subcommittee. Jill insisted that the members agree to a time to meet again, for this has to be resolved. There was agreement to another Zoom meeting at 1:00 on Friday, July 27th.

Jill will send out the minutes of this discussion prior to the 27th, and the subcommittee will forward proposals for the leadership of the Council to members prior to the 27th. As a final note, Jill stated that the Council members must address Suggestions 7 (frequency of meetings), 8 (alternate members), and 9 (quorum definition) at the meeting on the 27th.

Submitted by
Jill D. Shedd
Secretary to the Education Council