

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
September 26, 2018
1:00-3:00pm
IUB—Room 2140

Members Present: P. Carspecken; D. DeSawal; Y. Cho; G. Gonzalez; J. Damico; J. Lester; C. Lubienski; P. Wakhungu

Alternate Members Present: E. Boling; D. Estell; A. Maltese; K. Engebretson

Student Members Present: S. Hiller; E. East; C. Peters

Staff Member Present: M. Boots

Dean's Staff Present: L. Watson; G. Delandshere; S. Lubienski; J. Shedd; G. Buck

Guests: C. Darnell; A. Hackenberg; L. Lackey

Approval of the Minutes from April 25, 2018 Meeting **(18.67M)**

Comes as a motion from Agenda Committee

Second: D. DeSawal

Approved Unanimously

Approval of the Minutes from April 25, 2018 Organizational meeting **(19.04M)**

Comes as a motion from Agenda Committee

Second: D. DeSawal

Approved Unanimously

I. Announcements and Discussions

IUB SOE Faculty Meeting is November 9, 2018

Policy 72.13 contained no core campus changes thus will remain as is until further review. Also, an additional Core Campus reference was discovered in the amended Constitution and removed.

Diversity Topic: Balfour Scholars Program

Carl Darnell provided Policy Council Members with information about the Balfour Scholars Program, which began in 2013 and targets high school juniors in schools with large minority student populations and high numbers of students of low socio-economic status. The program focuses on the state of Indiana, but we do take in out-of-state students. Students need a GPA of at least 2.7. Over 600 students have been a part of the program since its inception and about 140 of these students are now in the IU system. The program includes a residential summer academy here at IU for these students just before their senior year of college so that they have a true college experience, sleeping in the dorms and attending workshops in the School of Education. They tour the campus and learn about the skills necessary to be successful in college. There is also an outreach component designed to inspire students to aim for college and support them through the application process. The goal is to provide a year of mentorship before college, and to provide support as students transition to college. For those who continue here at IU we continuing providing mentorship. The Balfour Scholars Program addresses personal identity, college and career readiness, STEM skills, and overall support and mentoring. We also work with the School of Global and International Studies to encourage more underrepresented students to participate in overseas studies. We are a part of the P-16 Center; Balfour focuses on grades 11-16. Research is also a part of the mission, and so we are learning as we work with these students. We are externally funding through the Laura G. Balfour Foundation, but we are always looking for more support to sustain the program. The program has recently worked to secure scholarships for many of the students currently attending IU and we are grateful for the

School of Education's support through work-study opportunities for 15 students who help with the outreach and for hosting the program. We do not emphasize education as a potential major for students, but with further support, this is something that we could do. Our focus is getting these kids to college, no matter what their area of interest for a major. Funding ends in 2020 and so the program is currently looking for further support.

Discussion: Faculty praised the program and noted the national attention that the program brings to IU. Policy Council members suggested looking into bicentennial funds for sustaining the program, and also to reach out to students or alumni of the School of Education who are living overseas to talk to Balfour scholars about the many doors that an education major can open.

Dean's Report

G. Gonzalez noted that he is filling in today for the Policy Council co-chairs, Dionne Cross-Francis and Sylvia Martinez. He introduced Dean Watson who is attending his first Policy Council Meeting.

Dean Watson began by expressing his value of transparency. To support this he will continue to communicate regularly through emails and other correspondence and hopes the faculty feel informed. He went on to provide information on the upcoming strategic planning initiative. He has contracted an outside consulting firm to help with the process, which will begin with open forums and opportunities for the consultants to learn about our School and the ideas and perspectives of faculty, staff, students and other stakeholders. This will occur throughout the fall. We will also put together a general ad-hoc strategic planning committee and are encouraging people to put forth nominations or volunteer for this committee. This committee will work with the external strategic planning firm. The firm will gather data in phase one, and then in October, November and early December we will host open forums and focus groups to get faculty input, as well as input from other stakeholders. Surveys will also go out and all of the data will be shared at a meeting in January. Faculty will have an opportunity to respond to that data, working in groups at the meeting. The ad-hoc committee will go through that data as well. The Policy Council Strategic Planning committee will also serve as a liaison. We will have an opportunity to provide feedback, participate and respond all along the way. It is important that everyone participate. Most of the information gathering events will be occurring on Fridays, which seems to be the best day for many faculty. Dates of these events will be announced soon. In April we will have the final meeting and should have our strategic plan down.

This coincides with a directive from the University to address a fourth Grand Challenge, reimagining education, that focuses on how we can support K-12 education in the state. We have been asked to submit a strategic plan on how we plan to address supporting K-12 education. A report was sent out with the recommendations of the preliminary task force chaired by Robert Kunzman. Please look at that and provide feedback.

Space evaluation is also an area we are working on. Again we want to be inclusive. We've been looking at the committee structure currently in place to see if there is a committee that is appropriate for addressing space-related issues. This is a topic that should be continually addressed to ensure we have a physical environment that is working for supporting learning and the goals of the School of Education. Please think about this and share your thoughts. It is important that we think holistically and long-term about this.

We are continuing to move forward with regional initiatives through the Center for Rural Engagement and Regional Opportunity Initiatives. Dean Watson asked Rob Kunzman to be Special Assistant to the Dean for Innovation and Undergraduate Initiatives. If there are faculty who are interested in getting involved with initiatives relating to rural initiatives and the regional office of engagement, please communicate this to Rob so that we can coordinate our efforts and put forward a portfolio to strengthen our chances of receiving funding. We will likely have a meeting on this soon.

There is a search underway for the Associate Dean for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. We have a number of candidates as we begin this process. Also, we are working with the Center for Education Evaluation and Policy (CEEP) to do some restructuring and re-tooling so that there is more interaction with schools and districts. I've also asked Rob Kunzman to convene a K-12 type

Council. I've noticed that there isn't a place to learn about all thing K-12 and certification, neither in Indiana nor at Indiana University. I think this is something that is often addressed by Universities in other states and there is a space for IU to get involved in addressing this need.

Discussion: Relating to space, D. Estell asked about a map he noticed at the IMU depicting a plan for an expansion of the School of Education. Is that something that is still on the table? Dean Watson explained that we are limited with the layout of the building and landscaping and so the plan depicted on that map is not likely to happen. We are on the list for maintenance, but additional space will come from internal reorganizing for the time being. G. Gonzalez explained that the map at the IMU came from efforts to incorporate our expansion goals into the master plan when President McRobbie first came onboard. The idea was that it could be a research wing. Y. Cho asked for confirmation that we are keeping the education library. Dean Watson responded that there are no plans to eliminate the library. E. Boling noted that every library needs to maintain a certain level of services. Our librarian is aware of this as we look at space within the library.

II Old Business

Recommended by Faculty Affairs Committee as obsolete: 72.41 Statement re: course enrollments

G. Gonzalez explained that this policy is outdated and the Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the policy be eliminated.

No discussion.

Comes as a motion from Faculty Affairs Committee

Second: E. Boling

Approved Unanimously

III New Business

Education Council Constitution update (19.06)

Education Council Bylaws update (19.07)

G. Gonzales gave a brief history of the Education Council and noted that this body is now undergoing its own revisions. J. Shedd added that the Education Council needed to redefine membership after the core campus separation and with the loss of one regional campus. Also, traditionally, the University Dean was chair of the Council, and this is also recommended for change. Previously the purview of the Council was any certification program that was present on more than one campus, but the proposed change requires every program to go through Education Council. Finally, in the Education Council bylaws, which are also up for revision, there is a change in the frequency of meetings and how the chair rotates, as well as who can be chair.

Discussion: G. Gonzalez asked which programs will now need to go before Education Council? J. Shedd responded that this applies to all programs, including graduate programs. This change stems in part from the large number of online programs at all levels. E. Boling asked about how this integrates with the process from the University's Office for Collaborative Programs. J. Shedd responded that there is now a step in the process where a new program goes to Education Council. Further discussion ensued about the usefulness of Education Council. The role continues to be important, particularly as more programs are online and not restricted to a specific campus. A couple of other units at IU have elements of what we have with Education Council, though none use exactly the same structure. The University has expressed appreciation for the Education Council structure in the new programs creation process. Dean Watson highlighted the value of providing opportunities for participation of other campuses.

D. DeSawal expressed concerns about meetings occurring four times a year. Will this hinder the progress of new programs? J. Shedd noted that Education Council members discussed this extensively. The prior constitution dictated two meetings a year. This change presents a minimum of four meetings, and also the potential for additional virtual meetings. Also, in planning meetings we consider the Policy Council meeting schedule. The new constitution also dictates that the administration of the Ed Council will continue to reside here in Bloomington.

A. Maltese noted the inclusion of courses among the items to be approved by Ed Council. J. Shedd explained that course numbers are shared across campus, and so a new course, or a change, needs to be address on all campuses. Course changes do not require a meeting. Approval occurs on a continuous basis. Going through the Ed Council does not necessarily mean going through a meeting. Continued discussion clarified that there is an Education Council remonstrance list, and then a Chancellor's remonstrance list. As a result, all campuses vote on all courses through Education Council even if they don't have the course on that campus. The process for a new course approved by a department would go to Grad Studies, Policy Council, 15 days with Education Council, then it goes on to a 30 day remonstrance across units on this campus. Regarding the different remonstrance periods, courses currently spend 30 days on remonstrance within the School of Education. If no concerns are raised, the course spends 15 days on remonstrance with Education Council. If there continue to be no concerns raised, then it goes on to a University level remonstrance for 30 days before it can become an approved course. There was also a brief discussion about the value of the internal School of Education 30 day remonstrance period now that we do not have a core campus structure. This may be something to discuss further in the future. The value of providing these 15 days for regional campus Schools of Education reviews is in that it fosters collaborative thinking across the various campuses and allows each campus to learn from one another as new courses are presented. E. Boling highlighted that when courses are put before Education Council, a syllabus is included, which is not a requirement of the University remonstrance process. This has value. Members agreed. J. Shedd explained that the new constitution for Education Council can only be ratified if it is approved by the majority of participating campus' Policy Councils. All other campus bodies have approved the revised constitution. Further discussion ensued around membership composition. IUB has two members, as does IUPUI, though the IUB faculty is much larger. J. Shedd noted that both the membership composition and the definition of a quorum, which is the presence of five campuses, serves to reinforce that this is a University-wide body.

Both the Revised Constitution and Bylaws come as a motion from Education Council

Motion to approve constitution and bylaws: E. Boling

Second: D. DeSawal

Approved Unanimously

PhD Curriculum and Instruction, Math Education program change (19.08)

Amy Hackenberg informed members that this change came about as a result of the doctoral program review. We needed to better support students through the process of becoming a professional. We decided to convert a course we hadn't used much over the past few years into a course that provides that needed support for students. In this course will cover a variety of topics, such as academic writing, conferences and professional organizations, providing common advice, etc. The program change was unanimously approved at the department level and was also was approved by the Graduate Studies Committee.

Discussion: E. Boling asked if there is a syllabus, because there is a guideline that dictates that you can't have a graduate course designed to get students through milestones, or do things that are supposed to occur outside of the course structure. It will be important to make sure that is not an issue. S. Lubienski noted that the course objective goes beyond mentoring for milestones, and gets into things like grant writing and other skills needed for active participation in the field.

Comes as a motion from Graduate Studies Committee

Second: M. Boots

Approved Unanimously

Policy Update: Ed.D. Residency Policy (19.09)

M. Boots explained that this revision highlights that you can't use dissertation work as a course that

counts for residency. Because 795 was omitted in the original policy, we have added it here to clarify. This also clarifies that online students do not have to come on campus. Rather than residency, we view full time enrollment as necessary for the Ed.D.

Discussion: E. Boling noted that engagement in the academic life of the community is an important part of a doctorate. Based on recommendations for the Graduate Office, IST was thoughtful about including a requirement that addressed the importance of engagement in academic life. The policy as written seems to only check off courses enrolled. M. Boots responded that in general, Ed.D. policies likely need to be revisited from an online perspective. E. Boling states that, as written, this seems to shift the focus of the Ed.D. program from engagement to compliance with course credits per semester and noted that her concern is that this proposed revised language may add an additional layer of requirement on top of what IST defines as residency for their EdD students because the IST Ed.D. does not have a requirement for the number of credits taken per semester. M. Boots noted that the intent was just to clarify the courses that count as residency for the Ed. D. and not add requirements about the number of courses students in online programs should take per semester.

Comes as a motion from Graduate Studies Committee

Second: D. Estell

Approved Unanimously

Policy Update: Ph.D. Residency Policy (19.10)

No discussion.

Comes as a motion from Graduate Studies Committee

Second: D. DeSawal

Approved Unanimously

Selection of C&I Department Chair (19.11)

L. Lackey presented the revised policy for the selection of C&I Department Chair.

Motion made by: D. Estell

Second: K. Engerbretson

Discussion:

Dean Watson noted that rank ordering candidates is out of step with customary practice. Noting strengths and weaknesses is more customary. G. Delandshere questioned the step defining the position, considering that there are campus and school definitions of the role. L. Lackey responded that the intent was allowing for a description that is more specific to the department. D. Estell noted that this policy as written does provide a mechanism for having stakeholders review the description and flag potential conflicts with existing policies. C. Lubienski asked for the rationale of not allowing nominated faculty to decline. G. Gonzalez noted that this eliminates the knee-jerk reaction to decline and gives people the opportunity to consider the position more thoroughly.

Friendly Amendment: In bullet number 2, after “chair’s position” state “that does not conflict with established School of Education policy” and also remove the last sentence on bullet number 6.

Motion: D. DeSawal

Second: D. Estell

Approved Unanimously

A discussion ensued about the appropriate venue for raising concerns about existing policies. Members concluded that Faculty Affairs Committee is likely the most appropriate body for hearing these questions and concerns about policies outside of the purview of Faculty Affairs should be brought to Agenda Committee for discussion.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm