

MINUTES  
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
November 14, 2018  
1:00-3:00pm  
IUB—Room 2140

---

**Members Present:** C. Lubienski; D. Cross-Francis; T. Brush; J. Damico; J. Lester; Y. Cho

**Alternate Members Present:** S. Daley; F. Pawan

**Student Members Present:** C. Peters

**Staff Member Present:** M. Boots

**Dean's Staff Present:** G. Delandshere; J. Shedd; L. Watson

**Guests:** Dr. David Halloran; Dr. Hitesh Kathuria; Lynn Gilman

*The Approval Process for New Online Degree Programs and/or Collaborative Programs*

Hitesh Kathuria, Assistant Vice President for University Academic Affairs

Director, Office of Collaborative Academic Programs

Dr. David Halloran, Assistant Director, Office of Collaborative Programs

Dr. Kathuria introduced himself and explained his role as the director of the Office of Collaborative Academic Programs, which coordinates fully online degree programs across all units in the University. He then proceeded to talk faculty members through a slide presentation, which explained the process of building an online degree program that is collaborative across multiple campus units. To begin the process, faculty work with their Dean and Executive Vice Chancellor to fill out an initial request form detailing a program idea. The online office reviews the program to determine if it is appropriate for it to be a collaborative program. To do this they look at all campus units and determine whether there is expertise and capacity on other campuses to be involved in the program, and most importantly, if there is interest in participating. Next, campus units are invited to participate and the MOA process begins. If no other campus is interested, the program skips the collaboration phase and goes directly through the approval process.

The first step in the collaborative process is the MOA1 phase, which documents the program purpose, key goals, and statements of responsibilities for each campus as well as basic agreements. This phase involves the Vice Chancellors and Deans. We have a template we use to document this information. MOA2 includes one all-day meeting at IUPUI for all interested campus representatives. Faculty develop learning outcomes, program requirements, etc. to develop a tentative degree map. This is the first draft of the program. This draft goes to all participating campuses where all department faculty have an opportunity to provide feedback within a 30 day window. It is through this feedback that the program evolves and matures. When all faculty of participating units agree to the program, the MOA2 is signed and we move to the MOA3 phase. This is done at an administrative level. Campuses can individually cap enrollment. The online office has a maximum cap of 40 students, but campuses can have a lower cap. A typical collaborative agreement is four years long, however, campuses can join or leave a collaborative program on a yearly basis, after it is initially developed.

When the MOA3 is done, if the degree already exists but is new online, it goes to through regular campus approval using the MOA2. If it is a new degree to the campus, the Office of Collaborative Academic Programs will create a form called the Indiana Commission for Higher Education Form, which goes through the regular new program approval process for your campus. It also goes through the IU Board of Trustees and the Higher Education Learning Commission. This is likely to be an 8-9 month process. There is a team at the Office of Online Education that supports implementation and ensures consistency in implementation across campuses. The office also meets with academic advisors to ensure they are aware of all new programs. Note that faculty have support from the Office of Online Education to build online courses.

### *Discussion*

Question: Is it possible for a unit to request that a program not be collaborative? Dr. Kathuria responded that this is mandated by Indiana University. If a program is going to be an online program, it has to go through our office. The decision to be a collaborative program has to be made at a system level. If a program has certain requirements that can only be met on one campus, the office will determine that it is not a collaborative program.

Question: How developed does a program have to be before it is submitted? Response: We want people to spend as little time and energy on this idea state as possible. We will help you, so give us a call. We will do a market analysis of an idea to determine if it is viable.

Question: Can a unit pull out of a program, even at the last step? Yes, a unit can pull out of a collaboration, but no campus can keep another campus from moving forward and offering the program, if they have the capacity to carry it out.

Question: During the collaborative process, are concerns raised earlier treated differently than when raised later? Response: The MOA2 phase is the best time to raise concerns. This is the time when we are most able to address concerns. At this point we can still gather additional data as the process continues to move forward. MOA1 asks to explore a process—to start the discussion. MOA2 are the faculty meetings where a wide variety of concerns are often discussed including potential competition to face-to-face programs. When the faculty are in the room at this meeting, they actually tend to move towards consensus and help us to resolve concerns that may be threatening in the abstract.

Question: How are current online programs being addressed? Response: Current online programs are not moving towards a collaborative process, unless you are interested in doing so. However, there may be cases where a campus unit is interested in offering a degree in the same area that another campus unit has an existing online program. Here we would look into ways we could potentially develop a complementary degree. The Trustees have established a “no duplication without distinction” policy for the online realm.

Question: Can you go over what defines a completely online vs hybrid program? Response: We look at the total number of credit hours that will be online. At IU we say if it is 80% or more online it will come to us as an online program. If it is 79% or less it stays with the campus.

Question: If there is a current face-to-face program that we want to put online, does it go to collaboration? Yes, and it will become collaborative if other campus units are interested in participating.

Question: Any information on the Curriculum and Instruction Masters program that is in process?

Response: Right now it is in a holding process because the arrangement with the Schools of Education deans was that they wanted to wait to see how the MAT comes out and how the MS EdTech degrees came online before we move onto this one. Those are up now and the C&I program is in the pipeline. We will look at it in January. Regarding the pipeline of programs waiting for approval, we have also noticed some duplication, specifically with certificates and masters degrees. We are discussing whether these should be merged more closely so that the certificate becomes a step towards the masters, or whether they should be made more distinct. We also need to determine where the greatest priority is—at the certificate or masters level.

Question: Do you provide recruitment, advertising and marketing for existing programs that are not collaborative? Response: Yes, Chris Foley’s office is responsible for providing marketing for all online programs whether collaborative or not. They have a very good success rate at increasing enrollment.

Question from Dr. Halloran to Policy Council Members: Regarding the role of Education Council, we would like to know how you see its role in relation to the collaborative process and ask that you keep us informed as to where you end up inserting Ed Council so that we know where and when we should reach out to Education Council in the process. If the Education Council would like to send a liaison to the faculty committee meetings, as the former Dean did, we would welcome that. We just need to figure out how the two bodies will mesh.

J. Shedd informed the guests that this was worked out among the Education deans. At the point of MOA1 the Education deans and the Education Council need to be advised that a program idea has come forward. Then at the end of MOA2, as the program is approved by individual campuses, the program should go to the Education Council for final approval. Dr. Kathuria asked that Dean Watson

have a conversation with John Applegate to verify this is a shared understanding of the process.

Approval of the Minutes from September 26, 2018 Meeting (19.22M)

**Comes as a motion from Agenda Committee**

**Second:** T. Brush

**Abstention:** F. Pawan

***Approved unanimously***

I. Announcements and Discussions

*Agenda Committee*

Diversity Topic: Vision for Diversity in the School of Education

Dean Watson began by reviewing the diversity plan developed by the Diversity Committee and approved by the faculty in 2016. He recommends the goals outlined in the plan be sent to the Long Range Planning Committee to ensure that progress is being made in these areas. We continue to move forward with the hiring of an Associate Dean of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. Dean Watson views diversity broadly, recognizing that as an academic institution, diverse perspectives enrich us all. However, diversity is not an answer to racism. We need to hold ourselves accountable and be mindful of how our emotions impact our interactions with students in the classroom. Diversity doesn't address systemic discrimination. We have the documents to support diversity, and it's a great document, but what does that look like in practice? Understanding the perspectives of others is important and is something we need to employ in interactions with others on a daily basis. Dean Watson pointed out that the document does not include religion, and this is important. In regards to teaching, we have a responsibility to be mindful of all of our students that we teach. Hiring someone to monitor the teaching or curriculum of others is not as effective as monitoring and being accountable ourselves. Dean Watson is a policy person who believes we have to think short term about our actions and viewpoints, but also how they affect us long term. We also have to be mindful of career stages. Institutional partnerships and community service are important ways to address issues of diversity. During Dean Watson's time at USC he was able to greatly increase the number of staff from underrepresented groups. Recognizing that the context of where we are is different, this is still important, as staff are the first people students interact with. They make a big difference in the lives of students and are an important element of any diversity initiative. Race or ethnicity does not make a person diverse nor does it exclude them from having diverse cultural understanding. Getting to know people individually is critical for bridging likeness and connectivity. Dean Watson emphasized that he believes in this work and lives this work without needing to be radical about it. Sometimes the best way to get to people and make sure it sticks is through the heart, not through the head. We need to do this differently. It is important to hold people accountable in a way that brings people to us and opens their hearts, not feel guilty and shut down.

*Discussion:*

Regarding the initiative to hire faculty of color, is that a school initiative or a campus initiative? Dean Watson replied that it is important to both the school and the campus. As we bring people in to our academic family we need to be intentional about making people feel welcome. C. Lubienski asked if there are other programs looking after issues of bringing in faculty or staff of different family SES, class or educational backgrounds? Dean Watson encouraged faculty to do whatever they can to help students and faculty feel welcome and comfortable. The boxes we have created for ourselves in this country do us a disservice, and rather we need to look again at our uniqueness and individuality as we look at our common experiences. S. Lubienski reiterated that the Diversity Committee is grappling with a lot of these issues and all faculty should be aware of this committee and feel comfortable reaching out to the committee chairs—S. Martinez and E. Tillema. D. Cross-Francis added that the wording in initial job postings should be looked at carefully to ensure it is welcoming to a diverse pool of applicants. This is an important first impression. Dean Watson noted that he doesn't think that the IU story is being told in a way that highlights the impact that our alumni of color are making on the world, and this should change. F. Pawan asked about Dean Watson's positioning on international faculty—does diversity include us? Dean Watson reiterated that he thinks broad and wide in terms of diversity. New hires from another country are likely to benefit from support services as well. We need to be intentional about how to serve all of our faculty so they can be successful. F. Pawan noted that the definition of what is a faculty of

color is a question she grapples with.

*Dean's Report*

Dean Watson highlighted the faculty meeting last week and noted that we are moving forward with strategic planning. The budget is showing a lower deficit than we had projected. We will also be getting a slightly larger allocation from the state. The current state allocation for the School of Education is \$8.8 million.

II Old Business

*Policies Recommended by Graduate Studies Committee as obsolete (19.24)*

Most of the policies here have been replaced by either bulletins or the CARmin system.

**Comes as a motion from Graduate Studies Committee**

**Second:** C. Lubieneski

***Approved Unanimously***

III New Business

*MS Ed in Mental Health Counseling & Counselor Education: Mental Health Track (19.25)*

*MS Ed in Mental Health Counseling & Counselor Education: Addictions Track (19.26)*

L. Gilman explained to faculty that there is an existing Masters degree in Counseling and Counseling Education to which they are adding on the track specifier, Mental Health Track. In addition, the Addictions Track is a new track that will also be an option for this Masters. The Mental Health Track stems from the courses that are a part of the addictions initiative at IU. All of the courses are already approved.

**Both items come as a motion from Graduate Studies Committee**

**Second:** T. Brush

***Approved Unanimously***

D. Cross Francis asked Dean Watson about the strategic planning process and the role of the consultants. Dean Watson explained that the consultants have all of the reports on the School of Education that have been completed over the past five years. The consultants will also gather information from the focus groups, campus visit and other discussions. With this information, they will present a report which faculty will have an opportunity to review and provide feedback on. Everything in the process will be shared with faculty. D. Cross Francis asked if the consultants will be making recommendations for next steps. Dean Watson clarified that the consultants will not be making recommendations. This will be the role of the Ad Hoc strategic planning committee. The consulting group is doing the work of gathering and sharing information with the committee, but they are not making recommendations. That is our work, to be done at the retreat and at the February meeting with all faculty. After the ad hoc committee finishes we can take the map and the six priorities and give that to the Long Range Planning committee, or we can continue to use the consultants to help the LRP with this work. The goal with using the consultants is to make this process as easy on the faculty as possible.

Meeting adjourned at 2:39.