

MINUTES  
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
January 29, 2020  
1:00-3:00 p.m.  
IUB - Room 2140

**Members Present:** J. Lester; E. Boling; P. Wakhungu; L. Rutkowski; A. Brannan; J. Damico; A. Hackenberg; C. Lubienski; A. Maltese; Q. Wheeler-Bell; D. Cross-Francis

**Alternate Members Present:** G. Ozogul

**Student Members Present:** K. Helstrom; E. Bloss

**Staff Member Present:** M. Boots

**Dean's Staff Present:** G. Delandshere; G. Buck; S. Lubienski

**Guests:** S. Bellini; H. Schertz

- I. Approval of the Minutes from December 11, 2019 Meeting (**20.30M**)  
**Motion Passed** with all in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstention; 0 recusals

II. Announcements and Discussions

**Agenda Committee**

The Faculty Retreat will be March 27, 2020. Save the date.

This year's committees and their work are not impacted by the current ad-hoc committees on committee structure and international engagement, and should continue with business as usual.

Long Range Planning Committee has had a change in membership. Stephanie Power Carter resigned and will be replaced by Martha Nyikos.

The February, March & April Policy Council meetings will be in ED 2277 rather than ED 2140.

**Diversity Topic:** Monica Johnson, Director of the Neal-Marshall Black Culture Center, was scheduled to present but was not able to attend.

**Dean's Report**

G. Delandshere delivered the Dean's report on behalf of Dean Watson. She informed members that the dean of IU South Bend has decided to pull out of the Education Council. G. Delandshere proceeded to give a brief history of the origin of the Education Council and reminded members of an email from the office of John Applegate, the Executive Vice President of University Academic Affairs (OEVPUAA), read to Policy Council members at the October 2019 meeting that clarified that the Education Council does not have authority to approve or deny any courses or programs, either online or face to face. It is likely that there will be some action to dissolve the Education Council. The Dean's Office will keep the Policy Council informed.

*Discussion:*

E. Boling asked if the Education Council provided a mechanism for the dissolution of the Council. G. Delandshere did not think such a mechanism was included and that dissolution would likely require action from Applegate's office. A. Brannan asked how this change might impact the process for developing new courses—will the practice of keeping consistent course numbers across all campuses remain in the event that Education Council dissolves? G. Delandshere stated

that this consistency is important and the course remonstrance process should help maintain this. S. Lubienski noted that the major concern is how to make sure that course content across campuses is consistent. M. Boots noted that we currently have issues with courses having the same number but being of varying levels of rigor and content. Graduate Studies becomes aware of this when issues arise and so it appears that the Education Council is not functioning to prevent these inconsistencies. G. Delandshere emphasized the importance of carefully attending to the course remonstrance lists. Discussion ensued about the level and nature of communication needed across the various IU schools of education. E. Boling noted that what is lacking is a campus process for ensuring consistency of course content across campuses.

III. Old Business- None

IV. New Business

*Ed.S.in School Psychology admission requirement change regarding GRE (20.32)*

S. Bellini noted that the GRE scores have not been an accurate reflection of student success, and as a result the GRE score has not been an important factor in admissions to the program for many years now. This, combined with the trend of GRE scores being dropped as an admissions requirement in programs across the country, led the program to determine it was time to officially drop this as a requirement.

*Discussion*

L. Rutkowski asked if students with GRE scores below the minimum have been admitted frequently? S. Bellini explained that it is rare that a student with a GRE score below the minimum is admitted, but waivers have been given in the past. It will continue to be important that students seeking fellowships submit a GRE score for fellowship consideration. This requirement change would not apply to the PhD program. L. Rutkowski cautioned against using the predictive ability of the GRE score as a rationale for dropping the requirement considering that in the program the pool of students typically being considered have met the program's stated threshold of GRE score. S. Bellini noted that this change will likely impact two groups of students most—those who are known to the program through courses or other involvement, and those who are coming back to school after teaching or other professional work. Discussion ensued about the fact that dropping standardized test scores as an admissions requirement is a current trend in higher education and that removing the GRE removes a barrier for many students. E. Boling asked if this is an accreditation issue for the EdS. S. Bellini noted that it is not an issue for NASP accreditation.

**Motion:** Graduate Studies Committee

**Second:** M. Boots

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

*Six credit transfer policy for Inquiry Methodology (20.33)*

L. Rutkowski noted that this proposal is motivated by frequent requests the inquiry methodology program receives from students who wish to transfer in all of the required credits for an inquiry minor. This makes it difficult when faculty receive requests to serve on committees from these students because it is difficult to assess if a faculty member is a good match if the faculty member has never had that student in class.

*Discussion*

Discussion ensued regarding who this policy would impact. This policy is written broadly so that it will be the general rule. Exceptions will be given on a case by case basis, and such exemptions would likely include students who completed a masters here in the School of Education. J. Lester noted that HESA has the same policy for their minors as well.

**Motion:** Graduate Studies Committee

**Second:** A. Hackenberg

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

*Program change: Preparing Educators for Students with Autism (PESA) Certificate (20.34)*

H. Schertz explained that this change removes one course requirement from the certificate program. This is in part because the faculty instructor of the course being removed will no longer be able to teach the course, and also because, to a certain extent the content included is already a part of the other required courses. The program also feels that making the certificate 12 instead of 15 credits will make the certificate more attractive to more students.

*Discussion:*

E. Boling asked if the other courses can absorb all of the content of the course being eliminated.

H. Schertz explained that when the certificate was devised, the understanding was that 15 credits was required. There is now an understanding that 12 credits is sufficient. The remaining courses already had a heavy social communication component, and social interactions was a primary focus of the course being eliminated, and so the program faculty feel the content is covered sufficiently.

Discussion ensued about course enrollments. Most students enrolled in the courses are not pursuing the certificate. Enrollment comes from all over campus. A few certificates have been granted over the 3 years it has been offered.

J. Lester asked about the prerequisites being removed.

M. Boots explained that these prerequisites were in the bulletin but were not part of the program's practice, and so they are being removed from the bulletin.

J. Lester asked, if the motivation for dropping the course is due to a faculty member no longer teaching it, would it be possible for an adjunct to teach the course?

H. Schertz explained that was a possibility, but the program faculty preference is to eliminate the course. J. Damico asked if students have complained about redundancy in course content. H. Schertz explained that the course being removed had a behavioral approach to the content, and was based on the faculty member's work. The other courses have a different approach and focus in regards to social communication.

**Motion:** Graduate Studies Committee

**Second:** G. Ozogul

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

*New policy proposal: Graduate Student Misconduct (20.35)*

S. Lubienski explained that this would require students who had been suspended from a program for misconduct reapply to the program, rather than automatically being readmitted after the term of their suspension, as is the case currently due to the fact that we don't have a policy in place. Faculty could request waivers for a student whom they felt the offense did not warrant re-applying.

*Discussion:*

E. Boling noted that other units on campus have a similar policy. Discussion ensued about the difference between suspension from a program and expulsion from IU, as well as the potential for exemptions, and the nature of offenses that might result in a suspension where this policy might be waived. E. Boling explained that the Dean of Students manages suspensions, meaning they are responsible for verifying that a student has complied with the terms of suspension. If the terms have been satisfied, students automatically return to the program, unless the unit has a policy that requires readmission. Further discussion ensued about how programs might learn if a student has been suspended or expelled from another program or university. M. Boots explained that there is a behavioral question on the applications, but this relies on self-reporting. He also noted that within our own system we could create a mechanism for flagging students. E. Boling highlighted the

importance of looking at applicants holistically and taking the initiative to inquire more deeply about elements of the application that may not line up, such as having a transcript from IU, but no degree.

**Motion:** Graduate Studies Committee

**Second:** E. Boling

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

*Policy Revision: Mentoring Program (20.36)*

G. Ozogul explained that this came from a request to include full-time non-tenure track faculty who also go through a promotion process and are not currently included in the policy. The committee saw this as an equity issue in regards to support provided to pre-tenure and pre-promotion faculty. In addition to adding wording to be inclusive of full-time non-tenure track faculty, the committee is also striking language regarding financial incentives or financial support for the program.

*Discussion:*

A. Brannan noted that in her experience, non-tenure track faculty have been included in her department's mentoring program. G. Delandshere noted that it has not been the practice to include research scientists. Discussion ensued about center directors serving in the role of department chairs in the mentoring of research scientists and that such language should be included in the policy revision. G. Ozogul noted that this policy applies only to full time assistant level faculty.

**FRIENDLY AMENDMENT:** add "department chairs or center directors" in each instance where department chairs are mentioned (a total of 4 times)

**Motion:** A. Hackenberg

**Second:** A. Brannan

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

No further discussion of proposal with friendly amendment.

**Motion:** Faculty Development Committee

**Second:** A. Brannan

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

Meeting adjourned at 1:52 PM