

MINUTES  
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
February 27, 2019  
1:00-3:00pm  
IUB—Room 2140

**Members Present:** S. Martinez; D. Cross Francis; G. Gonzalez, D. DeSawal; C. Bonk; J. Damico; J. Anderson; P. Wakhungu; J. Lester; P. Carspecken  
**Alternate Members Present:** A. Pickard; A. Brannan  
**Student Members Present:** S. Hiller; E. East  
**Staff Member Present:** M. Boots  
**Dean’s Staff Present:** G. Delandshere, S. Lubienski; J. Shedd  
**Guests:** D. Bauder; J. Wong; A. Elfreich; M. Waldron; V. Akerson; K. Engebretson

Approval of the Minutes from December 12, 2018 Meeting (**19.31M**)

**Motion:** D. Cross Francis

**Second:** G. Gonzalez

**Abstentions:** A. Hackenberg

**Recusals:** none

*Approved unanimously*

**I. Announcements and Discussions**

*Agenda Committee*

Next faculty and staff meeting for strategic planning – April 26, 2019

Faculty Meeting—March 29, 2019

*Diversity Topic:* IU LGBTQ+ focused initiatives at IU—Doug Bauder, Director of the IU LGBTQ+ Culture Center

D. Bauder explained that the LGBTQ+ Culture Center is one of four culture centers under the Office of the Vice President for Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Multicultural Affairs. The center began under the umbrella of the Dean of Students, as a division of Student Affairs. The change speaks to the recognition of the matter of intersectionality and that queer issues relate to all cultures, communities, religions, etc., and has been a good move. This is the center’s twenty-fifth year. When the office opened in 1994 the University was threatened by the withholding of funds from the state legislature but opened nonetheless, with the support of private funds. The center plays a variety of roles supporting students, faculty and staff across the University, including helping students through various award interview processes. Different parts of the campus now a variety of awards and initiatives supporting queer issues which some have done on their own, and others, with our support. The increase of these initiatives across so many different units is exciting. In December, SPEA received a Spirit Award from the Center for the guidelines they put in place for faculty or staff who transition. Students have a lot of options and get a lot of support on this campus, but our faculty and staff haven’t had the same support. These guidelines have proven successful in SPEA and could be a model for other schools. Other things we do include publicizing or, on occasion, co-sponsoring faculty efforts to bring in speakers and artists that highlight or address LGBTQ issues. We also work with the Dean of Students office to support students through the harassment or discrimination reporting process. We do a lot of collaborative work with the other culture centers, such as during Martin Luther King Day. We have also been invited to be a mouthpiece for LGBTQ issues in the city and in other venues beyond the University.

*Discussion:*

D. Cross Francis asked about the guidelines put forth by SPEA. Is that something that only applies to SPEA or can be used by units? D. Bauder replied that it is specific to SPEA but that it could be used as

a model for other units to develop their own guidelines. Executive Associate Dean McGuire at SPEA would be the person to contact. G. Gonzalez asked about changes that the Center has seen over time. D. Bauder replied that across the country more and more institutions of higher education are looking for ways to have something similar to the center on their campuses. Here at IU there is a lot more involvement in advocacy than twenty five years ago. One example of this is the number of student (several hundred every night) who came in to the center to do phone bank calling and provide other advocacy support when the Supreme Court was looking at marriage equality. Most of these students were straight, but wanted to provide support as allies. Another change is the way that students have taken up self-identifying in many different ways, and teaching us all about the value of self-identification. J. Damico asked if the center has a relationship with the high schools. Yes, the center meets periodically with some of the high school guidance counselors and has been involved in helping to organize the community advocacy group Prism, which has an affiliation with area high schools.

#### *Dean's Report*

G. Delandshere communicated concerns expressed by Dean Watson relating to the committees of Policy Council, including their membership, their role, accountability practices and how they fit in with the strategic plan. Committees each run very differently. Some post agendas, take minutes and track attendance, others do some of this or none of this. Dean Watson would like the Policy Council to request that each committee have a Box folder or Canvas site where these items can be posted so that we all know what committees are doing. In a recent meeting with Vice Provost Robel, Dean Watson discussed our committees and Vice Provost Robel expressed surprise at the number of committees that we have, and so the quantity of committees and their purpose are being reviewed. Another issue is the quality of the program review process in committees and how diligently other responsibilities are being carried out. We tend to assume that those reviewing a program before us have done their work, but we recently had a program sent back from Campus Curriculum Committee because it was not properly vetted, despite having passed in multiple School of Education committees, including Policy Council, where these errors should be caught. Selection of committee members is also a concern, with people on committees who don't want to be there, and committees that are lacking needed expertise. In addition, it is important to remember that these committees are Policy Council committees and need to be charged by Policy Council to take on work. Some committees are doing their own thing, and since we rarely have minutes from committees, there are issues.

#### *Discussion:*

D. Cross Francis noted that from her perspective, we shouldn't focus on the number of committees, and instead consider the purpose or responsibilities of committees and if there is redundancy. G. Delandshere noted that committees are supposed to deal with curriculum issues and/or make policy recommendations. We have some committees that don't do either. In that case, do these need to be standing committees of Policy Council? D. DeSawal noted that some issues of redundancy are becoming more noticeable now since we uncovered them last year when we reviewed policies to address the core campus structure change, but didn't have the time to address them. Last year Dean Mason noted that addressing the redundancy issues may be more appropriately done by the new Dean as a part of a new vision for the SOE. G. Delandshere noted that one of the challenges of addressing committee redundancy is that the committees are described in the Constitution of the Faculty, and so any change to committees will likely require going through the long process of amending the Constitution. G. Delandshere also commented on recent issues with the P&T committee in that we were not following University guidelines when it was decided that people on the P&T committee at the school level would not vote in the department but would vote in the P&T committee. This caused problems last year because we did not have enough full professors to have at least five people in each committee to vote in a department, so we had some people from one department making decisions for another. This was discussed by faculty affairs and the chairs and we agreed it would make sense to go back to following the University guidelines. So we will have people vote at the department level and then recuse themselves from the committee vote when a case is coming from their department. It will be important to pay attention to how we constitute the P&T committee so that departments are adequately represented. Returning to the discussion around the work of committees, C. Bonk noted that it might be useful to find out from the

chair of each committee which are the things that are standard for committees to address each year, and what are the things that come up. G. Delandshere noted that the lack of transparency of what committees are doing—the things that “come up”—are part of the reason that Dean Watson is looking for committees to provide agendas and minutes.

## II Old Business

### *Revision to policy 07.22 Guidelines for Involvement of Emeritus Faculty (19.33)*

S. Lubienski and M. Boots explained that this policy came before Policy Council last year but then was withdrawn before consideration. Here we changed some of the language of the older policy, replacing “retired” with “emeritus” and also removed reference to the title of “director” and instead using the title “co-chair” as a research committee role. This change aligns our language with the language used by the University Graduate School.

#### *Discussion:*

D. Cross-Francis asked for the definition of “emeritus”. D. DeSawal read from the IU web site that emeriti faculty are recommended by their unit and appropriate administrators for emeriti status and they are approved by the Trustees. G. Delandshere added that emeriti faculty retain some of the privileges of faculty, while retired faculty without emeriti status do not. C. Bonk asked how this policy proposal impacts emeriti faculty chairing dissertations. M. Boots explained that this policy made no changes in that regard. A University Graduate School endorsed emeriti faculty member can co-chair a research committee. S. Lubienski added that, like the previous policy, this policy allows people who are chairing a committee at retirement to continue to be chair, but after retirement, the individual is limited to co-chairing only. M. Boots explained that limiting emeriti faculty to co-chairing is a long-standing policy of the School of Education, but the University Graduate School does not impose this limitation. C. Bonk noted that with the explosion of EdDs in some programs, this limitation could become problematic. M. Boots informed members that a separate policy pertaining to EdD students is in discussion now at the Graduate Studies Committee level.

**Motion:** Graduate Studies Committee

**Second:** M. Boots

**Abstentions:** none

**Recusals:** none

*Approved unanimously*

## III New Business

### *Program revision: PhD in Curriculum & Instruction- Specialization in Science Education (19.36)*

V. Akerson explained to Policy Council members that in the past the minor for this program was limited to a science content area. The department still wants to retain the content courses, and so they have moved these courses to the major. A lot of the students come to the program with a Masters in Science, and so they would benefit from having a minor in Education rather than in Science. With the science-focused requirements moved to the major, students still have room to bring in credits, but this revision will better address student needs. Students can still have a science minor if they would like.

#### *Discussion:*

A. Brannan asked what type of education minor would be recommended? V. Akerson explained that this would be decided by the student, with the help of their advisor. There would not be restrictions. D. Cross-Francis asked if students come without a degree in science, will they be advised to take a science minor? V. Akerson explained that students will be required to take the same amount of science courses as they would have in a minor, but those with a science background will be able to take more education classes.

**Motion:** Graduate Studies Committee

**Second:** P. Wakhungu

**Abstentions:** none

**Recusals:** none

*Approved unanimously*

*New Track for MS Ed in Learning and Developmental Sciences: Human Development Track (19.34)*

M. Waldron explained that the Human Development program is trying to grow. One obstacle to growth is some overlap with programs in the School of Public Health. This overlap is acceptable to both schools because we focus on research while public health focuses on application. This proposal is to add a Human Development track to the Masters that is separate from the Education Psychology track.

*Discussion:*

Discussion ensued about the purpose of adding a new track. M. Waldron explained that another part of the motivation is for this to be a recruitment tool for identifying bright students for the doctoral program.

**Motion:** Graduate Studies Committee

**Second:** M. Boots

**Abstentions:** none

**Recusals:** none

*Approved unanimously*

*Program revision: PhD in Counseling Psychology (19.35)*

J. Wong explained that this program is returning to Policy Council because of some issues that SOE Graduate Studies Office pointed out. We previously stated the degree requirement to be 108 hours. However, some students can graduate with 101 credits, if they double count two courses with a minor in human development. We have many students who choose this minor. Also, this proposal clarifies what has been a practice for many years- that students take 6 hours of practicum. The program officially lists that only one credit is required. M. Boots added that the elective section was removed because the elective requirements are met in other areas of the program of studies.

*Discussion:*

D. Cross Francis asked if students always meet the elective requirements with courses in other areas of their program of studies. J. Wong said they do and reiterated that this program is very hours intensive, and so there are several opportunities for students to double-count classes. This particular PhD program and its requirements are complex. We continue to tweak the description of this program to increase clarity and transparency.

**Motion:** Graduate Studies Committee

**Second:** M. Boots

**Abstentions:** none

**Recusals:** none

*Approved unanimously*

*New online program: Graduate Certificate in Academic Advising (19.39)*

D. DeSawal explained that she was approached by the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education to work with them collaboratively to establish a certificate program in academic advising that could be used by all of the campuses of the university. In addition to growing enrollment, this certificate also serves as an opportunity for those in the adult education online degree and the HESA online degree to use this as a part of their master's program. This is a collaborative program across the School of Education. The courses in the certificate draw heavily from existing courses not only in Higher Education, but also from Adult Education and Counseling, reflecting the foundational role that these disciplines have in the new area of Academic Advising. The only new course being added is a new course on academic advising. This new course has previously been taught as a topical seminar and was developed in conjunction with colleagues in OVPUE as well as a past president of NACADA, the National Council for Academic Advising. Beginning in Spring 2020 CEP will be offering two of the courses online. There is also a practicum/field experience component.

*Discussion:*

G Delandshere confirmed that this is a program that will have to go through the collaborative programs process. D. DeSawal acknowledged this, noting that if other campuses do not have the expertise, then we will be able to do this on our own. S. Lubienski acknowledged concerns about the new collaborative process mandate, adding that she was recently informed that a program she thought was already in the collaborative process will actually not appear on the agenda for collaborative programs

until the Fall. Further discussion ensued about the challenges of the collaborative online program process. D. DeSawal noted that NSSE, which is housed on this campus, has very good data relating to academic advising and that could help push this through. C. Bonk asked for clarification around the numbers used to establish a trend. D. DeSawal noted that the 13,000 number comes from what the NACADA website publishes as their membership while the 10,000 number comes from the professional development committee of the Council for Higher Education Standards. G. Gonzalez noted that this academic advising certificate only has one course in academic advising. D. DeSawal explained that this is because academic advising as a field grew out of higher education and student affairs, adult education and counseling. These areas represent the foundational literature basis for academic advising. Academic advisors need a knowledge base in these three areas in addition to a course in academic advising specifically. These courses will help students to learn how to work with individuals of this age. C. Bonk asked if research has been done to uncover competing programs. Yes, competing programs have been identified. G. Gonzalez asked if technological/web-based models will be a part of this, and if so, should they be mentioned? D. DeSawal explained that the systems used by higher ed institutions are constantly shifting, and are very external and prescriptive, so she would not advise listing specific programs in this certificate. What students do need is to understand the implications of the nature of the information they enter information into these systems, how they enter it, and how to share it.

**Motion:** Graduate Studies Committee

**Second:** M. Boots

**Abstentions:** none

**Recusals:** none

***Approved unanimously***

*Hybrid program proposal: Secondary Transition to Teach (19.37)*

A. Elfreich explained that the T2T program has been exploring options for growth. They would like to improve access and equity, increase enrollment, and increase diversity in the licensed teacher population. We get a lot of inquiries about online options for potential students, and students who are already working in schools, but would like to obtain licensure. Many of these come from students who cannot attend the classes required for our face to face program. By moving to a hybrid program we can address these needs. This move does require some minor changes to the program. Two courses would move to an online format, and one would have a short, intensive face to face component, following our executive learning model, rather than a weekly meeting over the course of a semester.

*Discussion:*

C. Bonk asked how long this has been under development. This has been in the works since August. D. Cross-Francis raised concerns about the value of meeting regularly over a longer period of time for M500, to have questions and challenges addressed as they come up, rather than meeting only once for a long period of time. A. Elfreich explained that the timing of this course was such that students had it before having extensive experiences in the classroom. Feedback from students was that to have it later in the program would be more valuable. In this program proposal, the placement of this course will take advantage of students' experiences in the classroom and provide better opportunities for discussion. K. Engebretson added that the cohort, field-based model will allow students to continually have conversations over the course of the program, and this will better serve the students. Further discussion ensued about the nature of the methods course. Right now these students take their methods course with undergraduates, and they have requested a separate course. While this approach to the methods course is non-traditional in the IU context, it is aligned to what our peer institutions do. M. Boots asked if this will apply to all of the T2T programs. Yes, they will all be updated to hybrid. In response to concerns about the methods course, K. Engebretson explained that we are restricted by state requirements and mandates. The program is limited to 18 credits. This course structure meets the needs of students, provides flexibility and, we hope enrollment will grow such that we can have a content-specific methods course for each area. Until then, we are open to continuing conversations about how to best meet the needs of secondary students by ensuring their teachers are as prepared as possible, given the restrictions of this mandated program. A. Brannan asked if most students in this program have experience in the classroom? No, most students do not have experience in the classroom. Further discussion ensued about the goal of

expanding enrollment by meeting the needs of working professionals. S. Lubienski noted that with the state-mandated literacy requirement, future math teachers will have more training in literacy than in math, and asked at what point would we have a critical mass to offer a program with more robust math methods training? K. Engebretson explained that she had similar concerns and it was her experience continually turning away people across the state, and seeing the potential for this online format to address the critical lack of diversity in teacher candidates, that she changed her mind about the value of the program and now fully supports it. The potential for growth will hopefully enable us to expand and enrich the overall T2T program in the future. The chance to make a positive mark, and the potential for our own academic research with the development of this program are valuable. J. Damico added that he agrees with the potential for added substance as the enrollment grows, and that we can figure out a way to prepare students well. A. Brannan noted that the lack of a classroom management class is also a concern, but that given the state-mandated restrictions on this program, it sounds like this proposal is the best solution for now. K. Engebretson noted that the SOE has strong relationships with excellent educators in strong field placements, and this is a real strength of the program. S. Lubienski asked about the potential for creative scheduling. For example, a summer-fall-spring-summer schedule to allow for an every-other year area-specific methods course when cohorts overlap to create a critical mass to run such a course. D. Cross-Francis noted that another possibility is to make the methods course attractive for in-service teachers to take, to add to the enrollment numbers. Further discussion ensued about the value of offering the methods class at the same time as, or before the field experience.

**Motion:** Committee on Teacher Education

**Second:** M. Boots

**Abstentions:** None

**Recusals:** None

**Approved unanimously**

#### *Early Field Experience Proposal (19.38)*

J. Shedd explained that this proposal comes from ongoing conversations in Teacher Education about field experiences, how they are working effectively and not. Consensus grew that it is important to bring our early field experience coordinators together to identify fundamental skills that all teacher candidates should have and to discuss how we can deepen the experience for our students and help them better understand how to understand their learners well. We are doing this in collaboration with CITL, who have helped us to think about our field experiences in regards to community based learning. We have had conversations with our early field experience coordinators. We had one workshop which was attended by all of our field experience coordinators and we have a second workshop scheduled for March 1 to look at written objectives for all of our field experiences. We want to make sure that these experiences are scaffolded so that we are best preparing our students for their student teaching.

#### *Discussion:*

D. Cross-Francis asked for clarification as to whether the first field experience described in the document is in a classroom. J. Shedd responded that students may work with learners in other contexts, not necessarily in the classroom. D. Cross-Francis asked about the field experiences in other courses. J. Shedd noted that some courses have field experience components, while others do not and went on to describe the various service learning experiences students get in different courses. This approach will provide students with slightly more field experience. Further discussion ensued about whether this item is something that needs to be voted on by Policy Council. The Council concluded that this is an information item only. D. Cross-Francis asked for verification that field experiences will be strategically embedded into the course work of the courses presented here. Several faculty expressed interest in utilizing a credit hour to enhance student experiences in their specific program area. Response from field experience coordinators has been positive.

**Motion:** Committee on Teacher Education

**Second:** M. Boots

**No vote was taken**

Meeting adjourned at 3:07