

MINUTES  
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
November 13, 2019  
1:00-3:00 p.m.  
IUB - Room 2140

---

**Members Present:** J. Lester, D. Cross Francis; J. Damico; E. Boling; A. Hackenberg; Q. Wheeler-Bell; A. Brannan

**Alternate Members Present:** L. Carspecken; G. Ozogul

**Student Members Present:** K. Helstrom

**Staff Member Present:** M. Boots

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

**Guests:** B. Richwine

I. Approval of the Minutes from October 23, 2019 Meeting (**20.20M**)

**Motion Passed** with 10 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstention; 0 recusals

II. Announcements and Discussions

Agenda Committee

-Long Range Planning Committee: Current Vacancy for an IST representative will not be filled at this time.

-Committee invitations have been revised to request a rationale for declining.

Diversity Topic: Universal Design for Learning: Brian Richwine, UITS Assistive Technology & Accessibility Centers

B. Richwine reviewed the work of the UITS Assistive Technology and Accessibility Centers and the support they provide to students. Neurological disabilities are the most common disability that the center supports. Increasingly students with temporary impairments, such as concussions, are being referred to the center. Universal Design for Learning principles support not only students with permanent and temporary disabilities, but also supports the needs of people experiencing situational disabilities. B. Richwine then reviewed some of the assistive technologies commonly used by students. These can be physical devices such as alternative microphones or keyboards, magnification devices, etc. Students with cognitive impairments also use software technology, particularly with note taking. Sonocent is a popular software. Live scribe pens are also available for students. Many students use text to speech software. This is helpful for students facing a variety of challenges, including visual impairment, dyslexia, ADHD, concussions, etc. Talking calculators are also available. Many students use these during exams when professors do not want students to access a computer. The center can convert textbooks and PDFs into alternate formats that are compatible with the technologies student use. Editors at the center also translate figures and images from readings into descriptions that will make the information accessible to students with visual and other impairments. The demand for these services has increased steadily over time, with a growing demand in the sciences and STEM fields in particular. The center also provides a closed captioning service. Automated closed caption services, like YouTube, often need editing and correcting. A growing concern is the suite of digital learning tools put out by publishers that are increasingly being used in courses. Many of these materials are not designed with accessibility in mind and instructors need to be aware that students with identified disabilities may need to get the information or assignments provided by these resources through a different format. Some publishers are beginning to provide accessible materials. If you have some choices in course materials, consider consulting with our office to get information about which options might provide better accessibility. It is difficult to meet the demands

of a growing population who require accessibility services, particularly when the center learns about a need only weeks before a course is to start. If you have a student progressing through your program sequence, consider being proactive in meeting with the center. Staff there can help faculty make decisions about how best to make the course materials accessible for a particular student's needs.

*Discussion:*

A Brannan asked about the support that might be available for students with disabilities as they navigate their field experiences. B. Richwine explained that the center has worked with field placements and programs, facilitating conversations to come to understandings and agreements about how to meet the needs of all parties. G. Ozogul asked about accessibility tools within Canvas. The center has a Canvas course they offer to students to show students how to use Canvas with their accessibility tools. Also, the center works with faculty to do an accessibility audit of their course on Canvas and provide guidance on how to make the course more accessible for a student with a specific disability.

Dean's Report

L. Watson had no updates since the recent faculty meeting.

III. Old Business

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

**Motion:** Agenda Committee

**Second:** L. Carspecken

J. Lester explained to faculty that the document under consideration reflects the suggestions provided by Policy Council members at the last meeting.

*Discussion*

A. Brannan expressed concerns about the timeline considering the amount of work described. Perhaps completion by next Fall, or Spring 2021 would be better. D. Cross Francis noted that many of the documents the committee would need to gather already exist, it's a matter of collecting and reviewing the material. Discussion ensued about the benefits of stretching out the work versus having a focused timeframe. E. Boling suggested that this work be described as a preliminary assessment, so that the six month time frame becomes a check in. L. Watson added that there are faculty, staff and ex-officios that can help with this work. Concerns were raised about the term "evaluation" and what that means in this context. J. Damico noted that it might be helpful to add language about comparing our structure to other units across campus. Discussion ensued about how specific to be in the charge, and how long it will take to complete the tasks listed. Concerns were raised about how the method of analysis would likely impact the timeline. Discussion evolved to determine what can be done before March 2020.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENTS:

- Add a bullet point that states, "compare the committee structure to other committee structures on campus and at other relevant peer institutions"
- Change the last two bullet points by adding "preliminary" to "findings and recommendations" so that these lines read, "preliminary findings and recommendations"

**Motion:** K. Helstrom

**Second** A. Brannon

**Friendly Amendment passed** with all in favor, 0 opposed; 0 abstention; 0 recusals

Discussion about the proposed ad hoc committee continues relating to what will happen after this report is submitted. There will be a need to bring recommendations to the faculty because any changes to the constitution would require a full faculty vote. Several members agreed that the vast majority of what is being asked of the committee is to review information that has already been gathered. D. Cross Francis noted that much of this work can be done before the end of the academic year. The amended motion was called to a vote.

**Motion Passed** with all in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions; 0 recusals

Dean Watson emphasized to Policy Council members the importance of the work this committee is being asked to do. He commended Policy Council for taking this on, noting that addressing the issue of how our committee structure serves us will help to maximize faculty time by either changing our structure or by working better with the structure that we have.

#### IV. New Business

##### Revisions to Doctoral Minors in Sport and Performance Psychology (20.22)

**Motion:** Grad Studies Committee

**Second:** M. Boots

In the absence of a representative from the program, M. Boots introduced the item and provided a brief overview of the changes.

##### *Discussion*

E. Boling noted that the documentation indicates that these courses are already being taught as 600 level courses, so there will not be a change in the course syllabus. The program had been awaiting the approval of the 600 level version. G. Delandshere noted that the sequencing of the courses does not look fully aligned. E. Boling noted that it appears that the course is being shifted from a “special topics” listing to its own course title and number. Discussion ensued about the difference between a 500 level and 600 level course, and whether this difference is consistent across schools. E. Boling asked for clarification as to whether or not the School of Public Health is continuing to offer the special topics course, or not. M. Boots found information online that confirmed that the special topics course will still be offered at the School of Public Health. J. Lester asked for clarification as to whether we are voting on all of the changes, or only on the changes to the School of Education courses. M. Boots clarified that while we are voting on the changes as listed in this document, we are making the assumption that the School of Public Health will pass the proposed changes under their purview. G. Delandshere brought up the issue of students not being able to take course from the major in their minor. These students would need to enroll in the Public Health course option.

**Motion Passed** with all in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions; 0 recusals

##### Update to bulletin language for courses counted in graduate programs (20.23)

**Motion:** Graduate Studies Committee

**Second:** A. Hackenberg

M. Boots explained that this change addresses issues that result from students making assumptions in the absence of specific guidelines in print. This proposal documents existing practice.

##### *Discussion:*

G. Delandshere asked about exceptions for double majors. M. Boots acknowledge that this is one of several common exceptions. E. Boling commented that this is a good policy to have in writing because many students make assumptions about what they can do based on their experience at the masters level or with certificates. E. Boling asked if the course has to come from a previously conferred degree, or if prior coursework that was not part of a degree can be counted. M. Boots explained that if a degree was not conferred, then it would be a course credit transfer. Discussion ensued about the difference between coursework that is part of a degree or certificate and course work that never was part of a conferred degree or certificate.

**Motion Passed** with all in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions; 0 recusals

##### Policy Revision: Graduate student dismissal for failure to maintain adequate progress (20.24)

**Motion:** Graduate Studies Committee

**Second:** E. Boling

S. Lubienski noted that the School of Education (SOE) Bulletin says very little about the reasons a student may be dismissed from a program. The University Graduate School (UGS) Bulletin lists a variety of reasons for dismissal, including a lack of progress. This proposal aligns the SOE bulletin language with the UGS Bulletin.

##### *Discussion:*

A. Brannan asked if this language allows for the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies to override the discretion of the advisor and dismiss a student. S. Lubienski noted that there is language included that identifies the faculty as setting the standard. E. Boling asked about potential conflicts between student actual GPA and the written standard, particularly in situations where the advisor is reluctant to recommend dismissal. S. Lubienski emphasized our ethical obligation to the student. If the student is not going to be successful in the program, utilizing the dismissal mechanism is in the student's best interest. She also noted that the new language proposed here is meant to address the post-course work stage of the program. Discussion ensued about the need for departments to define or outline adequate progress in their programs. Many programs have had that conversation and do annual check-ins with students, which is helpful. G. Delandshere noted that this protects faculty from having to scramble to meet the demands of students who suddenly find themselves hitting the end of the timeline for completing the dissertation. J. Damico asked if automated emails can be sent to these students and faculty to remind them of timeframes. M. Boots informed members that the office is in the process of doing this. J. Lester clarified that we are not voting in a new policy, but are mirroring a policy that already exists at the University Graduate School.

**Motion Passed** with all in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions; 0 recusals

Meeting adjourned at 2:28