

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
April 29, 2020
1:00-3:00 p.m.
Zoom Online Meeting

Members Present: J. Lester; E. Boling; A. Brannan; D. Cross Francis; J. Damico; A. Maltese; C. Lubienski; Q. Wheeler-Bell; A. Hackenberg; P. Wakhungu; S. Martinez; L. Rutkowski
Alternate Members Present: K. Engebretson; G. Ozogul;
Student Members Present: K. Helström
Staff Member Present: M. Boots
Dean's Staff Present: G. Delandshere; L. Watson; G. Buck; C. Darnell; J. Shedd; S. Lubienski
Guests: E. Vaughan; L. Gilman

I. Approval of the Minutes from March 25, 2020 Meeting (**20.49M**)

Motion: E. Boling

Second: A. Maltese

Motion Passed with 11 in favor; 0 opposed; 2 abstention; 0 recusals

II. Announcements and Discussions

Agenda Committee

- Changes in traditional Policy Council operating procedures due to current pandemic and quarantine:
 - Committee chairs will not present annual reports at this meeting. Instead, all annual reports are posted on the web in the Governance section of the web site on the page of each committee.
 - Spring faculty meeting is cancelled.
- Agenda Committee reviewed a statement of practice document put forward by the Dean's Office regarding hiring processes. The document outlines current practice and aligns with University policy and the University's guidance document related to faculty hiring. The SOE statement of practice is available in the Policy Council Canvas Site and will be posted to the SOE website on the policies and practices page.
- Agenda Committee reviewed a new program proposal for a MEd in School Psychology. The proposal did not have all of the components required for a new program proposal and was returned with encouragement to resubmit with the required components.

Diversity Topic: Update from the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion- Carl Darnell, Assistant Dean for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

Carl Darnell informed members that he created a video update and posted a link for Policy Council member access. The office is doing well and was on the verge of hiring someone when the hiring freeze was instituted. Students have left due to the pandemic and so C. Darnell is the only staff member currently working in the office. Balfour is gearing up and there are other projects on the horizon with some grant funding including the "I can persist" STEM program and a HOME program for graduate students.

Discussion:

E. Boling asked what the work study students do for the office. C. Darnell explained that seven of these students are mentors and send regular updates (two communications a month) to Balfour high school students in their mentor year to make sure they are making progress towards their post high school goals. Another group of students do outreach to high schools to get the word out about the program and set up high school visits for C. Darnell. Some students have put together reports and have worked on faculty work groups doing building audits. C. Darnell stated that these students do

everything for the office. S. Lubienski asked how students are learning about potential majors and how does C. Darnell balance recruiting for the School of Education versus helping college-bound students of color more generally. C. Darnell explained the various programs and career exploration opportunities that Balfour provides, but clarified that the Balfour program provides students with information about higher education more generally. The program does not actively encourage students to select IU, however the close connection of IU with the program does help to make students feel more comfortable in selecting IU. J. Lester asked what the key goals and needs of the office are for the upcoming year. C. Darnell would like to spend more time with the faculty. The office would like to have a larger event, and then follow that up with smaller groups, TEA talk style. Also, expand and improve communication about the various events that faculty and students are putting on. He would like to get the HOMES program started, which is a retention support program for graduate students. Regarding needs, with work-study students being his primary workforce, and no students on campus, staffing is a need. P. Wakhungu asked what proportion of Balfour students end up coming to IU. Carl explained that roughly 25% come to IU Bloomington. It is likely 30-35% when you consider all IU campuses. D. Svetina asked about this year's new diversity award. Carl explained that an announcement will be made this week or next week. G. Buck added that the Dean will be announcing all of the awards at the same time.

Dean's Report

Dean Watson updated faculty on the work of the COVID task force groups that are taking place now around the campus. The purpose of these groups is to tackle how to scale the return of students and faculty to campus. Various scenarios being discussed include combinations of online, hybrid, face to face, with face to face likely being in the Spring. There are a lot of considerations as we address the needs of students in various programs across the University, including studio programs, etc. These include (1) health and safety; (2) enrollment; (3) course offerings, pricing, and marketing; (4) cost structure. We are also thinking about student safety in larger classrooms, and the needs of international students, and students who rely on Associate Instructor appointments. The Restart Committee has begun to meet, and strives to have recommendations by the 21st of May so that work can begin in June. Enrollment and financial issues are also an important factor. The University will continue to keep faculty informed. Also, the Dean met with C&I and LCLE faculty to examine how to merge the department processes for the next year. Two people have been interviewed for an Associate Chair position to help with this merger and support the departments next year. Regarding the faculty awards, there will be a video to announce the award recipients. Dean Watson and Jill Shedd are working to create a yearend celebration for undergraduate students as well as a virtual graduation. Regarding the budget, we are modeling for a 5% cut and a 10% cut, with the goal of minimizing the impact on faculty and students. Many are wondering when we will return to campus. We don't know yet, but are hoping to have some information in June. It is likely we will be wearing masks and taking social distance precautions when we do return. The Dean closed by thanking all faculty for their diligence and exemplary work in this hard time.

Discussion:

S. Lubienski informed faculty that existing programs that would like to move online at this time can do so with a memo, however, after the pandemic is over, programs will then need to go through the usual process. Exactly what that means is unclear at this time. The Graduate Studies office has a list of programs (not PhD programs) that we want to move online right now. M. Boots asked if this change would apply to incoming students only, or all existing programs. This is unclear, but the sense from S. Lubienski is that all students would be a part of the online program. Dean Watson added that if programs want to move to an online format, they should move to make that happen. If a program is going smoothly in the online format, ICHE will likely pardon programs to be online. Those programs that could do well online should really think about taking this approach. However, those programs that do not lend themselves well to an online format, please think carefully before moving in that direction. We do have clearance from the university, ICHE and accrediting agencies to move programs online in response to the pandemic. As a school, we need to think about the design of our graduate programs with specific attention to a support structure for students and

faculty in a fully online program context. S. Lubienski asked if there is further clarity around the role of the collaborative process, if that will apply. Dean Watson stated that was not addressed. He anticipates some of those issues will come out in the committee work.

Executive Associate Dean – Discussion on how to evaluate teaching for Spring 2020 merit review

G. Delandshere explained that this topic stems from a decision at the Provost level, supported by the executive body of the BFC to not use this Spring's course evaluations as a part of merit review. We are examining the best way to evaluate teaching and would like input from faculty.

Discussion:

G. Ozogul asked if students will be sent the end of semester questionnaire. G. Delandshere explained that they will not be. Rod Myer in Instructional Consulting has developed a questionnaire that faculty can use to facilitate anonymous feedback from students. A. Hackenberg noted that research productivity is being impacted now, as well as teaching, and asked if there have been conversations about thinking more globally about the merit review in the context of this pandemic. Might there be a possibility of extending the timeline of the merit review? Dean Watson stated that extending the timeline has not been discussed, but there are discussions about the impact of the current situation on research. He acknowledged that this is a valid concern and he will raise this question at the University level. G. Delandshere suggested that faculty also contact the executive committee of the BFC with this concern. K. Engerbretson asked if we know what peer institutions are doing about this and S. Martinez noted that the effects on research productivity are not likely to be seen until 2021. No one present was aware of any discussion or actions taken by peer institutions on this topic. G. Ozogul asked if the University has communicated to students that there will not be course evaluations. G. Delandshere stated that it has been communicated to students by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and applies to graduate students in online programs as well as undergraduate students. J. Damico asked if there is a way to get a sense of how we have done as a faculty with online teaching. The informal feedback that he has received from students is that students have had very positive experiences with their School of Education online courses. G. Delandshere noted that capturing this more general feedback is one of the goals of the informal evaluation that R. Myers has created. Dean Watson stated that the School of Education was at the forefront of online teaching early on and is considered among the top in terms of delivery of online instruction at the Bloomington campus. A brief discussion ensued about the use of S/F grading and its impact on students' preparedness for future courses. There have been very few requests for S/F grading at the undergraduate or graduate levels at this time.

III. Old Business- None

IV. New Business

Proposed Updates to Practicum & Internship Experiences for Masters in Counseling Programs (20.51)

Motion: Graduate Studies Committee

Second: K. Engerbretson

E. Vaughan explained that this change to the practicum and internship experiences in the counseling program is to be consistent with a curriculum that is logical, sequential and graded. These courses come after the foundational courses. In these new, more advanced courses students take the skills learned and apply them in the field.

Discussion: None

Motion Passed with 11 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstention; 0 recusals

Proposed Update to PhD in Counseling Psychology (20.52)

Motion: Graduate Studies Committee

Second: A. Brannan

Lynn Gilman explained that none of the sports psychology courses that make up the minor are required in the counseling psychology major, and so it constitutes a separate program. This proposed change cleans up the language in the bulletin clarifying that students can use those specific G courses

to constitute a doctoral minor.

Discussion:

J. Lester asked if these G courses are all cross-listed with the School of Public Health. M. Boots explained that as it was before, School of Education students had to either take the public health version of the courses or go through a waiver process to take these courses. This change makes the process easier for students. G. Delandshere asked how this related to the general policy of not taking a minor in the major. M. Boots and L. Gilman explained that the G designation includes counseling and sports psychology, but they are different program areas. G. Delandshere asked if there are two minors, one in the School of Education and one in Public Health. L. Gilman explained that it is the same minor, and the same courses, but the course numbers are different in the School of Public Health and the School of Education. E. Boling asked if these students will now be taking their minor courses in the major department. L. Gilman agreed they would, but clarified it is a different program in the same department. None of these courses are a part of the APA program requirements for the major. J. Lester asked who administers the minor. J. Steinfeldt administers it. E. Boling clarified that all students who take this minor are taking it through the School of Education. Yes, the minor is only administered in the School of Education.

Motion Passed with 12 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstention; 0 recusals

Proposal to remove the GRE requirement for Special Ed (20.53)

Motion: Graduate Studies Committee

Second: G. Ozogul

A. Brannan noted that this is one in a long line of programs making the decision to drop the GRE requirement for admissions. The rationale includes issues of equity and to become more competitive in attracting potential students. Students who want to be considered for a fellowship will still need to take the GRE, as will international students with a degree from a foreign institution.

Discussion: None

Motion Passed with 13 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstention; 0 recusals

Proposal for a policy on prior learning credit- Undergraduate level (20.54)

Motion Committee on Teacher Education

Second: G. Ozogul

J. Shedd explained that this proposal is a response to a request from the higher education commission that universities be explicit in how they address giving credit for prior learning.

Discussion:

J. Lester clarified that this does not apply to transfer credits. L. Rutkowski asked what kinds of experiences might a candidate request be considered for credit. J. Shedd stated that prior work experience is one example. E. Boling added that in the past some students have asked if workshops attended as a part of their job could count. There are many types of things that people might want to bring forward, including active service, volunteer work, etc. A. Brannan noted it is hard to imagine how faculty would select which courses we would exempt students from, if we were to provide credit, and agreed with the proposed policy. J. Lester asked if other institutions are providing credit for prior experience. J. Shedd stated not to her knowledge at the undergraduate level. She noted that we do have the Transition to Teach program to address the needs of those with prior experience. G. Delandshere reminded faculty that the goal of this policy is to provide clarity for incoming students about what they can expect regarding applying work experience to their programs. J. Shedd noted that we do have avenues for dealing with individuals with particularly compelling requests. This proposal represents a faculty commitment to a general rule.

Motion Passed with 13 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstention; 0 recusals

Proposal for a policy on prior learning credit- Graduate level (20.55)

Motion: Graduate Studies Committee

Second: G. Ozogul

S. Lubienski indicated that this policy is the same as the prior proposal except at the graduate level.

This is not a deviation from our current practice.

Discussion:

E. Boling stated that at the graduate level some might have taken exams to get credit for work experience. Some for profit institutions allow this and so there may come a day when we are faced with having a student who wants to transfer in credits they received by taking this sort of a test at a prior institution. G. Delandshere noted that this may also be an issue with MOOCs and badges in the future.

Motion Passed with 12 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstention; 0 recusals

Report of Ad Hoc Committee on International Engagement (20.56)

A. Brannan presented the key contours of the report. The committee considered options for structuring the SOEs international engagement. There is a lot of activity within the SOE in this area through research centers and individual faculty and so we need an organizational structure that can coordinate and support those efforts. The committee recommended that we establish an office of international engagement that would be led by an associate dean and include a small staff. The Committee on international programs would serve in an advisory role to that office. The office would help coordinate international work and attend to fundraising. It would maintain an information source regarding initiatives, track international initiatives within the School of Education and lead evaluation efforts to see the impact of the work. In terms of resources, the committee recommends the funds come from the Dean's Office plus left over funds from the CIEDR, which is currently defunct. The office would be sustained by fundraising, research grants, and an application fee for visiting scholars.

Discussion:

G. Buck noted that this recommendation sounds a lot like the defunct CIEDR, and asked how it is different. A. Brannan noted that CIEDR did not engage in fundraising, which is difficult to do as a center, but easier to do as an administrative office. Staff funded through research funds had restrictions in terms of the activities in which they could engage. Whether or not international research could help sustain the office is a valid question. International work was not coordinated in this way through CIEDR and there is hope that increasing coordination will make it more viable. G. Buck stated that CIEDR was not a research center, though it did have grants, it also had support from the Dean's office. She cautioned against recreating what did not work. A. Brannan noted that highlighting the good work faculty are doing will help to create interest in terms of fundraising. G. Delandshere highlighted some of the differences between what is in this report and what CIEDR was, including Global Gateways, more faculty involvement and a broader scope of work. E. Boling asked if there was thought about how the fundraising might be accomplished. Would there be coordination with the people in the development office? A. Brannan noted that the vision was to work with all of the different offices in the school, and with the IU Foundation. Dean Watson explained that one of the major challenges with CIEDR is that they were not well positioned to successfully coordinate global and international activity broadly, beyond the research portion. This discussion will continue based on this report. The report gets us closer to the kind of organization that we want.

Commit the Long Range Planning Committee to make recommendations for amendments to the Constitution of the Faculty relating to Policy Council Committee Structures (20.57)

Motion: E. Boling

Second: G. Ozogul

J. Lester explained that the Agenda Committee made this proposal in an effort to move the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Committee Structures forward.

Discussion:

E. Boling noted that this request asks the Long Range Planning Committee to not just take the report at face value, but use it as a basis for proposing a committee structure that they think will work based on the information in the report. A. Brannan asked for clarification that there will be a faculty vote before any changes are made. She emphasized the importance of having a faculty discussion. J.

Lester agreed. E. Boling noted that all-faculty meetings aren't a venue where in-depth discussions occurs. She indicated that the Long Range Planning committee would have to be pro-active in creating opportunities for faculty discussion, perhaps in small groups. Further discussion ensued about how to solicit faculty input and how to ensure discussion occurs as a part of this charge.

Friendly Amendment "...faculty, assuring that all processes for changing the SoE's constitutions are followed (e.g., ascertaining feedback from the faculty, etc.)."

Motion to accept friendly amendment: L. Rutkowski

Second: S. Martinez

Motion as amended passed with 11 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstention; 0 recusals

CASS Minor GPA Language Change (20.58)

Motion: Undergraduate Studies Committee

Second: G. Ozogul

J. Shedd explained that the bulletin lists all of the requirements for academic minors. A recent proposal for a new undergraduate major included language requiring a GPA for the minor that was greater than what the college requires. To mitigate this type of conflict the committee proposes a change to the advising sheet and bulletin.

Discussion:

E. Boling asked if this a change to the advising sheet, or to the bulletin? J. Shedd clarified that this is for the advising sheet and bulletin. E. Boling recommended that the language about minor GPA be removed completely from the bulletin. J. Shedd agreed that the only language needed in the bulletin is that the major requires a minor. J. Lester clarified that we are now proposing a friendly amendment to the proposal.

Friendly Amendment: Strike the last sentence about the GPA in the bulletin

Motion to accept friendly amendment: E. Boling

Second: S. Martinez

Motion with Friendly Amendment Passed with 12 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstention; 0 recusals

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM