

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Special Faculty Meeting

October 15, 2010

1:30-2:30

IUB School of Education Auditorium
IUPUI & Columbus via Videoconference

I. Welcome and Call to Order

Dean Gonzalez welcomed all faculty members present to the special meeting of the faculty, for the purpose of reviewing the amendments to the Constitution proposed by the Long Range Planning Committee and Policy Council.

II. Overview of Constitution History

Ginette Delandshere, Policy Council chair, gave a brief overview of the proposed changes to the Constitution. Changes to the Constitution were first proposed by Policy Council in 2007-08, to amend the Constitution and make it more consistent with current practices.

A more detailed overview of the process that has led up to the proposed changes was given by Gary Crow, Chair of the Long Range Planning Committee. Faculty members with interest, history and/or knowledge of the Constitution were interviewed on the Indianapolis and Bloomington campuses. They were asked about possible modifications that could be made. Based on the interviews, the Long Range Planning Committee generated an initial set of amendments, which were reviewed and further developed by Policy Council and subsequently forwarded to the faculty.

Within 30 days of the special faculty meeting, faculty will vote on the proposed changes via electronic ballot. A two-thirds majority of the votes cast is required for an amendment to be passed.

III. Review of Proposed Changes and Discussion

Gary Crow outlined the following types of amendments proposed:

1. Clarification of procedures
2. Updates resulting from changes in practice
3. Updates reflecting changes in the school since last revision (2002)
4. Updates/modifications to the Standing committees

Included in the proposed amendments were the following:

- a) Changing "mail" to "electronic/email" throughout the document
- b) Changing "IUPUI" to "IUPUI/Columbus"
- c) Changing the minimum number of representatives from IUPUI/Columbus on the Policy Council
- d) Changing the voting membership to include research rank and lecturer
- e) Changes to standing committees of PC

Gary Crow then opened the floor for discussion. Questions and comments were raised with regard to the following proposed amendments:

i. Voting Membership of Faculty

A question was raised about the rationale behind the inclusion of research rank and lecturer-level faculty as members of Policy Council, and the impact of this change on faculty governance.

Result: Gary Crow clarified that lecturer and research rank faculty were added in order to be more inclusive and to provide faculty at these levels a voice on Policy Council. It is important that persons affected by changes in policy are allowed to have input and decision-making power. However, it is still required that the majority of members have tenure or tenure-probationary status. Additionally, the point was raised that there was some concern about the burden placed on tenure-level faculty to serve on Policy Council, and increasing the pool of eligible voting members (to include research-rank and lecturer faculty) would lessen this burden.

ii. Voting Membership of Policy Council

A related proposed change concerns the voting procedures for Policy Council. The proposed amendment states that at least 7 out of 12 voting members of Policy Council must have tenured or tenure-probationary status. However, a concern was raised that the stipulation that 7 out of 12 of only tenure or tenure-track faculty being elected to the Policy Council could inadvertently shift the responsibility for faculty governance to non-tenure track faculty. It was suggested that the number of tenure-affiliated faculty be increased to at least 8 or 9 out of 12. Further discussion ensued.

Result: A motion was put forth to change the language from 7 to at least 8 out of 12 members, and this motion was seconded. As 25% of the voting members of faculty (41 of 160) were present for the faculty meeting, a vote by this quorum approved the initiation of a proposed amendment to change the language from 7 to at least 8 out of 12 members.

iii. Inclusiveness of Ranks Specified in Constitution

Discussion ensued regarding the inclusiveness of the term “research rank,” and whether or not the expanded language in the proposed amendments is inclusive of all faculty ranks.

Result: Gary Crow clarified that although it may be challenging to decide on final terminology to be used during the meeting, faculty will have the opportunity to reject any proposed amendments and provide comments to specify alternate ways of changing the items in question. It was further clarified that research associates and academic specialists are not considered research rank appointments.

iv. Faculty Retreat

A question was raised regarding the rationale for mentioning the faculty retreat in the Constitution.

Result: Gary Crow clarified that this was done in order to specify the committee that would be responsible for organizing the retreat, but does not mean that an annual faculty retreat is mandated by the Constitution.

v. Email vs. Electronic Ballot

A question was raised regarding the difference between the email and electronic ballots mentioned in the Constitution.

Result: Jack Cummings and Gary Crow specified that the ballot will be electronic, but not completed via email. The language will be changed to be consistent throughout the document.

The meeting was adjourned by Ginette Delandshere at 2:15 p.m.