

School of Education Spring 2016 Faculty Meeting

April 15, 2016

IUB School of Education Auditorium

IUPUI 3138E

IUPUC CC156H

10:00am - 11:30am

****What follows is a summary of speaker contributions****

1. Welcome & Announcements

T. Mason welcomed faculty and stated that we have a full agenda but want to save some time at the end of the meeting to have a discussion about the core campus issue. In the past we have spent time going over data slides at the faculty meeting. This year we are doing things differently. The data documents are all available for view in a Box folder and you should have received an email about this. Please take the time to look at these documents.

2. Dean's Report – Terry Mason

T. Mason highlighted key points from the data available to view in Box. Enrollment declines have slowed down a bit. We have some ideas for increasing enrollment. Funding seems to be consistent with what it has been in previous years. In fact, we are getting grants and contracts at a higher indirect cost rates, which is a good thing. We have had a reduction in credit hours this year which has created a shortfall, but our financial manager has been able to use funds in a way that has us in good shape for this year. We do need to think about this shortfall as we plan for future spending. Fiscally responsibility is important. We are about half way through our capital campaign, half way to our goal. If you have ideas about sources of funding or donors who might be interested in supporting the school please contact Joe Kantor in the Development Office.

Another document in the Box folder is information on diversity at the School of Education. Our diversity committee asked for this report. The data reinforces what we know, we need to increase faculty and staff of color. But this gives us a good base line. US news and World Report ranking has us a little down, but doing well. It is not highly scientific data. A lot of this ranking is based on perceptions, as Deans and faculty are polled. We are now sending emails right before voting time to these people with a little blurb of information about what we are doing. A. McCormick added that it is interesting to note that while our overall school is down, Individual programs are either the same or up.

T. Mason continued the report informing faculty that several colleagues are being funded with internal grant awards, with a nice distribution across the campuses. Our five research centers are the engine that support our faculty in obtaining external funding. The Center for Postsecondary Research (CPR) has been doing work with many surveys of student engagement. The Culturally Engaging Campus environment has a new survey being run by Sam Museus. SNAP is also doing some good work there. CEEP has been very active with the Appalachia Regional Lab and the What Works Clearing House. CIEDR has been very active with

projects in Kosovo and South Sudan, bringing students in teacher education to our program. CRLT has been busy with a workplace simulation with Crane, the Direct Employers Foundation and they are hosting a third cohort of the Effective Leaders Academy that they do in partnership with the Kelly School of Business. The global initiatives arm in the P16 Center has been active in internationalizing the curriculum here in the School of Education as well as other projects.

Other highlights- the INSPIRE Living and Learning Center has been growing. It is focused on undergrads in teacher education. They provide an opportunity for education majors and other undergraduate students to get together and focus on issues of democracy and equity and how that relates to teachers. The Make Innovate and Learn Lab (MILL) opened officially this year and has been working with school kids in the maker space and as a result, we are strengthening our connections with schools. We had a USAID sponsored event to develop reading materials for children in developing countries. We have established a partnership with Middle East Technical University (METU) for faculty to join together to engage in collaborative research projects with faculty in Turkey. The deadline for that is the end of this month.

T. Mason and Gary Crow have started an advancement team to coordinate the efforts of marketing, recruitment and development. We are developing strategies for doing a better job of recruiting and retaining underrepresented groups of students, communicating and marketing ourselves better to attract those groups. A new Undergraduate Major is under development, a collaboration between Counseling and Education Psychology, HESA and IST. There is the potential for a lot of transferability of the skills developed in the program for people in a variety of professions. Your input on this is welcome. Finally, many of our faculty have recently been awarded and recognized by various professional organizations which speaks to the quality and work of our faculty.

3. IUPUI campus report - Robin Hughes

R. Hughes stated that we have a healthy fund balance. Matt Saba, Director of Fiscal Affairs, recently conducted a presentation on transparency to the Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee and will continue to be in close communication with the Chair of that committee. We are hopeful that this will lead to greater transparency in regards to the budget. M. Saba and R. Hughes both presented the budget to the Chancellor, N. Paydar, and his cabinet. We have a healthy relationship with the cabinet and plan to go back in a few months to ask for a few things. You can see figures from the IU Foundation in the Box folder. Admissions data is interesting. Our enrollment is looking about the same, we are seeing a healthy increase of about 12-14 percent, which has stayed constant. Most important to me is our students and faculty of color percentages. We have seen a significant increase in our faculty of color, but with our Black and Latino and Asian students, we need to do some work. We have hired someone to work on this, but it's only a part time hire.

R. Hughes highlighted the work of L. Patton-Davis as one of a handful of scholars who uses contemporary language to convey academic ideas. At AERA she participated in a presidential address where she breathed life into a presentation on the issues of how black female scholars work is not valued. We need to acknowledge the work that is done to make an impact in communities of color. J. Mutegi received the Chancellors' Diversity Scholar Award. This award has been given for six years and the recipients have been from our school for five of the

six years. B. Maxcy and TS Nguyen as well as the Burmese Community Center received the 2016 Chancellors' Community Award for richness in community engagement and is doing great work supporting communities of color. We had our first student graduates from our Urban Education Studies program. These graduates will continue to do great things and are committed to giving back to communities of color and making an impact on the world.

4. Honoring Retiring Faculty (Chairs, IUPUI and BL)

Curriculum & Instruction retiring faculty presented by Lara Lackey

- Carol-Anne Hossler
- Pete Kloosterman
- Leana McClain

Education Leadership and Policy Studies retiring faculty presented by Peg Sutton

- Luise McCarty

5. Constitutional Amendments – Barbara Dennis

B. Dennis, Chair of Policy Council, led a discussion on the constitutional amendments and process. It is required in our constitution that we present these amendments at a meeting of the faculty and allow opportunities for a discussion. It is not a forum for making additional changes, but to review the changes presented. The amendment process began with a proposal for a new standing committee on Undergraduate Education through K. Barton. This then went to the Long Range Planning committee and the Agenda Committee who reviewed the Constitution for additional needed changes. Regarding the new committee proposal, presently we do not have an Undergraduate Studies Committee at IUB. This came from the Committee on Teacher Education which is primarily focused on licensure. There has been an increase in business outside of the teacher education purview with new majors and programs for undergrads that are not related to teacher licensure. We thought about other approaches to deal with these challenges, but decided that the best course of action was the creation of this committee, which will parallel the Graduate Studies committee, but focusing on undergraduates, taking up work on issues that are not teacher education related. The second change is on voting membership. We would like to change the wording regarding voting members to full time and probationary academic appointments and research rank appointments to make the voting more inclusive. The other changes that you find are largely related to catching typos and updating procedures. We initiated the amendment process at the Policy Council. A discussion was held at the March 23 Policy Council Meeting and through an email vote which ended March 30 we issued this call. A faculty meeting needed to be called within 3 weeks. This is that faculty meeting. Now, within 30 days of this meeting, by May 15, the Policy council chair will circulate these changes and an electronic ballot. There is no voting time frame outlined in the constitution, so we will set a time frame for the voting. Amendments are adopted with 2/3 majority of votes cast.

B. Dennis opened the floor to questions. P. Sutton asked about the voting process. B. Dennis clarified that 2/3 of the votes returned via the email vote must be positive for this to pass. There is no quorum requirement. P. Sutton noted that this may be a change to make for the future. B. Arnove asked about the voting membership change, other programs list "faculties

of practice". B. Dennis replied that instead of trying to list all the individual faculty appointment names, we used the term "full time probationary faculty" and so new faculty positions should be covered under these provisions. The goal was to be as inclusive as possible. E. Boling asked to which office would the new undergraduate studies committee be attached? K. Barton replied the Office of Teacher Education. A. McCormick called attention to a possible ambiguity in article 1 section 2. The wording implies that research rank appointments aren't academic but they are. Also, we have an appointment called research associate, and it is unclear where they are in this wording. B. Dennis replied that this was discussed and the intention of the change as written is to be inclusive of all positions and acknowledged that this wording could imply that research associates are not included. A. McCormick will forward other language to consider. A.M. Brennan asked about the academic standards committee. Is it being removed? K. Barton replied that academic standards is not being removed from the responsibilities of the Committee on Teacher Education, but there is a whole sentence here that refers to the professional standards committee which no longer exists. The wording of academic standards has been added to the list of responsibilities of the Committee on Teacher Education and the outdated sentence is being replaced. R. Skiba noted that under the Committee on Diversity, there is a sentence struck out regarding a commission to collaborate with other standing committees. Why? B. Dennis replied that this charge is not specifically named in any standing committee, so to keep the standing committee descriptions consistent, it was removed. M. Nikos noted that at the inception of the committee it was noted that that committee needed representation in other committees for the importance of this topic being addressed in all committees. R. Skiba added that while this hasn't happened in practice recently, distributed leadership is key to this committee and so the committee may want to discuss this further. B. Dennis acknowledged this request for review by the Diversity Committee. T. Mason closed by asking faculty to look for the ballot which will be distributed via email shortly.

6. Memorial for Heidi Ross

T. Mason asked that we take a moment to acknowledge important members of the faculty community who we have lost this year. P. Sutton and L. McCarty shared memorial statements articulating the depth of the loss of H. Ross for the faculty, professionally as well as personally. She will continue to be an inspiration. L. McCarty noted that, with the help of student contributions, we would like to plant a tree outside the school of education that will include a rock with a plaque on it as a memorial to Heidi. We are also planning a celebration of her life in September.

7. Memorial for Myrtle Scott

T. Mason acknowledged the passing of M. Scott in January and spoke of the contributions she made to the school of education, particularly in the area of faculty governance. A video clip of Ken Gross Louis talking about Dr. Scott at her memorial was shown.

8. Update by Committee to Evaluate Core Campus Structure & Discussion

T. Mason thanked the members of this committee for their work on evaluating some of the issues that have been identified in the Core Campus structure. If faculty can stay beyond the allotted time, that would be appreciated. The committee was charged with the task of reviewing the Core Campus structure and making recommendations. We conducted a survey on both

campuses to gauge sentiment of the faculty regarding the core campus structure. In general, IUB is either in favor of separation or are indifferent on the matter. IUPUI faculty and staff are not willing to commit until more details about the terms are made clear. The committee created a prototype to see what the elements of separation might look like and what alternative structures might be. (An example was presented visually in the PowerPoint). We looked at what would be needed in terms of resources, governance, etc. Challenges identified included differentiated contributions to the overall mission of the school, separate budgets and accreditations, persistent operational difficulties for core campus programs. This has resulted in perceptions of inequity and lingering resentments particularly in IUPUI regarding resource allocations. There have been barriers to shared awareness of challenges that each campus faces, resulting in a lack of empathy.

Recommendations include developing a mission that is differentiated for each campus but with shared values. In terms of operations, Higher Education and Student Affairs (HESA) developed a transition plan that will facilitate maintaining that program and Educational Leadership is working on a plan that would enable IUPUI to grow in strategic areas, notably in the area of graduate programs related to the urban mission. We also need explicit and recognized university processes for collaborative programs. Adjustments required include a Dean position at IUPUI, administrative staff positions to be established at IUPUI and faculty lines transitioning to IUB for HESA to maintain that program. The committee has drafted a document that it is deliberating. We are trying to articulate what a separation might look like.

T. Mason opened the floor for discussion. B. Dennis added that the Provost communicated that we cannot keep things as they are. Whether we choose to separate or stay together, something has to change. L. Gilman asked about the Blue Ribbon Committee report. T. Mason replied that this has been a source of concern for many. In the process of its review, the committee came to a point where they indicated to the Provost that the panel could not move forward with a formal review until the issues of the core campus structure are resolved, and so the process did not culminate in a final report. J. Scheurich asked about the voting process. IUB has a larger number of voters. What does that mean for the process? T. Mason replied that the committee has only an advisory role and the decision will be made at the level of the Provost. The vote would be disaggregated by campus and proportions would be noted. This committee is an ad hoc committee and the vote does not have the authority that it would if it were a different kind of committee, in fact, we could put forth a recommendation without a vote. L. McCarty asked about the faculty lines. Faculty should have a say in where their lines would be. What does the moving of lines mean? T. Mason replied that the lines indicated are now affiliated with the budget of the IUPUI campus. The move would mean that the line would be on the budget of the IUB campus. It is likely that these lines would have a presence on the IUPUI campus, but would be funded out of the Bloomington Campus. C. Buzzelli asked if the committee has communicated with other Schools that have a core campus structure, i.e. Kelley and SPEA? T. Mason noted that all schools have different contexts and so they don't necessarily serve as a strong model to follow. E. Boling added that, after speaking to folks at the other schools, they have less overlap in programs, and so their relationship is different. L. McCarty asked if a split would mean the University Dean position would be eliminated. T. Mason replied that the title is no longer used, but yes, a split would require two separate deans. J. Scheurich noted that in this process we are not acknowledging past wrongs. T. Mason replied that

meetings with individuals at IUPUI have revealed that there are lingering resentments. It is difficult to address these things directly as an Interim Dean. This needs to be acknowledged and structures need to be put into place to ensure that those types of things do not happen again. We have an opportunity to create more equitable structures for the future. The call for separation has come from the IUPUI faculty in the past. S. Powers-Carter noted that it is important to find the time and place to address past wrongs, even if we do decide to split, so that we can move forward.

T. Mason noted that the timeline from the Provost requires a recommendation by the end of the semester. The recommendations will also go to the Chancellor. A separation will require an investment and the administration needs to be on board with that investment. T. Mason reiterated that decisions are not being made today, but it is an opportunity to raise awareness of the faculty and give an update on the process. If you have questions, contact members of the committee as soon as possible. Faculty input is critical. Committee members include: E. Boling, V. Borden, M. Boots, G. Buck, B. Chung, B. Dennis, D. DeSawal, N. Flowers, C. Hmelo-Silver, R. Kunzman, M. Lewison, M. Lynn, T. Mason, C. Medina, L. Patton Davis, G. Pike, J. Scheurich, S. Scribner, K. Shaw and J. Sturgeon.

9. Closing Remarks & invitation to attend the Emerging Research Town Hall Meeting at Noon

Meeting adjourned at 12:00