

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
October 23, 2019
1:00-3:00 p.m.
IUB - Room 2140

Members Present: J. Lester; P. Wakhungu; A. Brannan; J. Damico; Q. Wheeler-Bell; A. Maltese; A. Hackenberg; L. Rutkowski

Alternate Members Present: L. Carspecken; K. Wohlwend

Student Members Present: E. Bloss; K. Helström

Staff Member Present: M. Boots

Dean's Staff Present: G. Buck; S. Lubienski; G. Delandshere; J. Shedd; C. Darnell

Guests: D. Nord; J. Anderson; T. Nelson-Laird; Rod Myers

Approval of the Minutes from September 25, 2019 Meeting (**20.14M**)

Correct spelling error, "Friendly" to "Friendly"

Motion Passed with 12 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstention; 0 recusals

1. Announcements and Discussions

Agenda Committee

IUB SOE Faculty Meeting is November 1, 2019

Graduate Studies Committee proposed form for course, policy and program proposals reviewed by Agenda Committee for feedback

Changes in committee membership:

- Research, Development & External Partnerships: Sam Tirey is a staff replacement
- Long Range Planning Committee: Scott Witzke is a staff replacement
- Learning and Teaching with Technology: Amber Hill is a staff replacement
- Committee on Learning & Teaching with Technology: Anne Leftwich fills a vacancy
- Grievance Hearing Committee: Grace Mayo is an undergraduate student replacement

Diversity Topic: Rod Myers, Instructional Consulting Support for Universal Design for Learning

R. Myers explained that Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is an approach to instruction that ensures that all learners have access to effective learning experiences. UDL was developed by CAST, a nonprofit education research and development organization. UDL is based on neuroscience. The idea is to engage all of the different neuro networks through different teaching strategies. Accessibility is central to UDL. While it began as an approach for accessibility, it has broadened focus on inclusivity, as people realize that many without an identified disability were benefiting. Nearly 20% of undergraduates have an identified disability. SOE Instructional Consulting (IC) can provide support for UDL in course design. Regarding instructional materials, the focus is on providing multiple forms of representation to promote knowledge. A visual syllabus is one example. Closed captioning is automatic through the Kaltura Videos capture tool, but some editing may be needed. IC can help you learn how to do that. Regarding assignments, instructors can consider providing options for learners to express their knowledge in different forms (creating a video or written paper, etc.). Faculty can create different assignment groups in Canvas to facilitate this process. IC has an internship program where student interns work with faculty to

redesign a course. UDOIT is a tool available through Canvas that provides an accessibility check on a course. This tool doesn't provide great guidance on how to fix the reported errors, but IC can help with that. Other resources at IU include several online courses to help faculty improve course accessibility. Canvas also has several additional tools within it, or linked to it, that can help make courses more accessible. Canvas Studio has an accessible syllabus as an example, which faculty can download and edit.

Discussion

J. Anderson added that Teresa Ochoa teaches UDL principals to undergrad students, if anyone would like to talk with her about it as well. Discussion ensued about how to provide this information to faculty and AIs. J. Shedd suggested that this information should be added to the Instructional Resources page on the School of Education website. Others advocated for finding a way to get a web site for Instructional Consulting.

Dean's Report

G. Delandshere shared information on behalf of Dean Watson regarding the role of Education Council in the collaborative program process. According to an email from the Office of University Academic Affairs, Education Council has no formal role in the collaborative program process. G. Delandshere described the history of Education Council, which was designed to bring the campuses together at a time when all campuses were under one School of Education dean. Today, all campuses have their own leadership. The recently revised Education Council Constitution was developed in response to the core campus split. Due to time constraints surrounding the split, larger issues related to the purpose of Education Council were not addressed. Given the current structure, there is a question as to the role of the Education Council today and if it is still needed. This larger issue is not for discussion now, but is likely something we will be examining in the near future.

Discussion

Discussion ensued about how quickly a change might happen. Should programs wait to bring changes to Education Council? Consensus is that programs should not wait. We don't know how long it would take to examine and resolve the issue. There was a brief discussion about the role of Education Council in the course change and development process which led to clarification about the course remonstrance process. Remonstrance goes through Education Council, but does not require a meeting. It is done electronically, though it is still a very lengthy process.

2. Old Business- None

3. New Business

Policy on Centers and Institutes (20.16)

Motion from: Research, Development and External Partnerships Committee

Second: M. Boots

D. Nord explained that this policy aligns with the University policy related to centers and institutes. This policy did receive feedback from centers.

Discussion

There was a brief discussion about a five-year time line and seven-year review period, which appear to be incongruent. The goal is to have a regular timeline for reporting. Some of the efforts to align with University policy includes having a senior faculty member as a director. The term faculty is interpreted broadly, this means it could be senior research scientists as well as tenure-track faculty. A. Brannan asked if this policy needs to be reviewed at the University level. It does not. We just need it to be aligned with the University policy. Further discussion ensued around the review and renewal time period. T. Nelson Laird noted that this policy addresses how centers are created and then only one way (lack of renewal) that a center may be dismantled or eliminated, but there are likely multiple ways that a center may come to an end, and these should be spelled out in this document. G. Buck noted that in the process of reviewing this policy, the committee wanted to ensure there is as a process that looks at the viability of a center to continue, rather than assuming the continuation of an established center. The University does not

have a formal process/criteria for making the decision to eliminate a center. The decision is made at the school level and then the University is informed. Further discussion ensued around the importance of external dollars as criteria for the continuation of a center. The committee felt that some centers may be important to the field without having external funding. The Dean should have some latitude in making these decisions. Returning to the topic of timeline for review, because this policy states that the school will set up the procedures, it make sense to eliminate any reference to the number of years. A friendly amendment was proposed.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT:

In the first bullet, remove reference to number of years: “a center or institute shall be established for a limited period of time. It may be renewed after this period, but each renewal should be for a limited period of time.”

Motion: P. Wakhungu

Second: M. Boots

Friendly Amendment passed: All in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions, 0 recusals

No further discussion on the policy with the friendly amendment.

Motion passed: All in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions, 0 recusals

Elimination of Basic Skills (CASA) exam requirement for Initial Teacher Education Programs (20.17)

Motion from: Committee on Teacher Education

Second: A. Brannan

J. Shedd explained that State legislation was passed last April that eliminated this requirement. The committee discussed this over two meetings and after a lengthy discussion the committee put forward these recommendations, to be effective immediately, despite being in the middle of the academic year. It is best for students to stop this immediately. If we wait until spring, we will lose students who struggle with this exam.

Discussion

Discussion ensued about the statement in the document that there is not a correlation between passing this exam and being an effective teacher. Many students are hired on emergency permits, even though they haven't passed the basic skills exam. A. Hackenberg noted that this will impact the teaching loads for two different students who have been assigned to tutor for this course. Jill Shedd noted that many students struggle with standardized testing in general, and so there may be a way to build testing skills among students through a short course. Most peer institutions, as well as our other IU campuses are going to start requiring Praxis I as a new criteria. CAEP accreditation requirements are also a concern. This will likely be viewed negatively by CAEP, but we are okay with that. There is a national trend across campuses to de-emphasize standardized tests, and so the committee anticipates that CAEP will need to reexamine their stance. Further discussion ensued about the type of advising faculty should be providing to licensure students relating to exams. To clarify, the committee is not recommending Praxis I as a basic requirement. Only Praxis II in the content area. G. Delandshere asked about the potential impact on public school students. J. Shedd confirmed that we are confident that our students demonstrate basic skill competency simply due to the nature of the requirements to be accepted into IU and the program. Further discussion ensued about the quality checks in admissions and throughout our program and the value of the basic skills test. A. Brannan noted that not all students have to take this exam currently. It is only students who do not meet minimum SAT scores. Other skills checks currently in place are a minimum GPA of 2.5 and minimum grades for specific courses. Discussion ensued about the role of IU in preparing students for a Bachelor of Science degree in education, and the role of the state in licensing teachers. This distinction has informed Teacher Education's decisions about what to emphasize and what tests to require.

Motion passed: All in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions, 0 recusals

Revisions to Graduate Certification Admissions Criteria (20.18)

Motion: Committee on Teacher Education

Second: L. Rutkowski

J. Shedd noted that the review of the basic skills criteria led to a review of admissions criteria for our three graduate level initial teacher licensure programs. The committee felt that alignment of admissions criteria among all of the programs is important. They included the content test as criteria because the student's work experience and/or undergraduate degree may not be in perfect alignment with the curriculum at a secondary level. Rather than having the program administrators do a review of transcripts and make judgements, it would be better to have the content exam determine whether the individual had the necessary content knowledge.

Discussion

Discussion ensued about whether language should be included in the policy that specifies that this is for secondary education only. Members decided the current language provides important flexibility to accommodate future programs in other areas. The committee consulted with program faculty related to these changes. The major differences between this and current criteria are a higher GPA requirement and the Praxis II requirement. K. Wohlwend asked if the language related to professional experience is broad enough to include elementary degrees down the road. Members agreed that providing greater flexibility to accommodate future programs is important. A friendly amendment was proposed. A. Brannan asked for clarification as to whether someone with a high GPA still needs to take the content exam. They do need to take the exam.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENTS:

In the third bullet of the document add "(for content area teachers)" after the word "degree" and before the semi-colon.

Move the final bullet point, "Passing state approved content area examinations..." to the top of the bulleted list. Insert the work "And one of the following:" between the first bullet item and the following three.

Motion: A. Brannan

Second: A. Hackenberg

Friendly amendment passed: All in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions, 0 recusals

Further discussion ensued to clarify that this language is clear and broad enough to be inclusive of future programs, particularly at the elementary level. Consensus is yes.

Motion passed: All in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions, 0 recusals

Ad Hoc Committee to evaluate functions of Policy Council committees (20.19)

Motion: Agenda Committee

Second: L. Carspecken

J. Lester noted that the large number of committees we have as a part of Policy Council was a point of discussion among the Policy Council last year and came up again in our last meeting. The Agenda Committee proposes a committee be formed to evaluate the role/work of these committees. Are they effective and holding true to being policy committees or have they become work committees? J. Lester informed members that in the discussion among agenda committee members, Elizabeth Boling, who has a long history of service and involvement in various capacities, noted that the number of committees we have and their usefulness/effectiveness has not been visited in living memory.

Discussion

Discussion ensued as to whether it is just the number of Policy Council committees that would be evaluated, or the faculty governance structure. This proposed ad-hoc committee would evaluate the

overall structure of committees. G. Delandshere noted that with so many committees, it is difficult to get faculty representation from all departments. Some departments are just too small and it would overburden faculty. Another concern is that some committees are not focused on policy. Also, it would be beneficial to have greater alignment between the strategic plan and the Policy Council committees. With our current committee structure, these links aren't always clear. J. Damico asked what the criteria would be to determine the effectiveness of a committee. Would Policy Council come up with the criteria or would the ad hoc committee develop the criteria? Collaboration or communication that happens across the committees should be directed towards some larger purpose. K. Wohlwend noted that not long ago she was involved in a Leadership Inquiry committee, which focused on service and issues of equity around service. The intent of the Leadership Inquiry was to identify people who might be in a good position to be mentored towards leadership positions, but the primary finding was that it is very difficult to get any real data on what people are doing in committees and the types of leadership actions and experiences people are engaging in. Some committees are viewed as "leadership" while others are seen as "management". The data and insights gathered in that inquiry could be useful. Discussion ensued about the experiences and knowledge gained from the work of this inquiry. Members feel that issues of service and the effectiveness of committees are linked, and there is consensus that faculty governance is important. A. Brannan noted that a part of the mission of the ad hoc committee should be to include all perspectives and to hear all faculty voices. A. Maltese asked if there is another structure that could take on this work, rather than creating a new committee. G. Delandshere noted that all annual reports are on the web site and can be reviewed by anyone. Perhaps we could begin with committee members doing an internal review of their committee. It may be of value to pull from past Policy Council minutes to determine the policies that have come from these committees. Discussion ensued about the role/charge of Policy Council committees. Members recognized that the charge of committees is not limited to policy development. J. Damico asked if there is a way to frame the work of this committee to push thinking towards alternative structures. We need a better understanding of what committees produce and how much time is put into it. J. Lester summarized key points to include in a charge to this ad hoc committee. Concerns about the length of the charge were voiced. The **item was tabled** so that a written charge could be presented for members to review and vote at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned 2:56 PM