

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Nov 18, 2020
1:00-3:00 p.m.
Zoom Online Meeting

Members Present: L. Rutkowski; S. Eckes; Q. Wheeler-Bell; A. Leftwich; A. Maltese; V. Dimitrieska; A. Hackenberg

Alternate Members Present: A. Cuenca; G. Ozogul; D. Svetina; S. Daley

Student Members Present: K. Helstrom; D. Miller

Staff Member Present: M. Boots

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

Guests: D. Shriberg; J. Lester; M. Croom; C. Lochmiller; T. Riley; M. Waldron; C. Hmelo-Silver; L. Stachowski; A. McCormick; A. Walton; T. Millican-Krieger; D. Wyatt

Approval of the Minutes from October 21, 2020 Meeting (**21.32M**)

Motion to approve: A. Leftwich

Second: V. Dimitrieska

Motion passed. In Favor: 9; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 1; Recusal: 0

A. Announcements and Discussions

Agenda Committee

Chair, L. Rutkowski reviewed the voting eligibility and procedures for Policy Council Zoom meetings, reminding those present that for any given vote, there should be no more than 16 votes to tally. These guidelines on voting eligibility come from the constitution of the faculty.

Dean's Report

Dean Morrone informed members that L. Rutkowski reached out the chairs of Policy Council committees to share a request from Provost Robel to ease the burden of committee work for faculty during this difficult year with all of the challenges related to the pandemic. While some committee work must go on for the continuing functioning of the school, non-essential work can be paused. L. Rutkowski noted that she has only heard back from a few committee chairs and she encouraged all committee chairs to share thoughts of how they might ease the burden of committee work temporarily. Dean Morrone went on to talk about the search process and job description for the next Executive Associate Dean (EAD). The term and process will be similar to what the School is doing for the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education. The current search is for an individual to take on a two-year EAD term. This will support a smooth transition to a new dean after Dean Morrone's interim term is up, but also give the new dean the flexibility to keep this person in the position for a third year, or find a replacement. Regarding the job description, one member asked why the chief budget officer does not report directly to the EAD. Dean Morrone noted that the fiscal officer reports to the Dean, though there will be frequent communication between the EAD and the fiscal officer. G. Delandshere provided some historical context, explaining that traditionally, the fiscal officer has reported to the EAD, but the prior Dean changed the title of the position and the reporting line so that the fiscal officer currently reports directly to the Dean. She also assured members that she is in close communication with the fiscal officer. Dean Morrone added that when J. Buszkiewicz, the current fiscal officer, retires this year, the position will be part of the IUB central finance office, but assigned exclusively to the School of Education.

Dean Morrone informed members that she has been working with the IU Foundation regarding major gifts for the School that could allow for investment in additional faculty, provide support for new centers, etc. Such major gifts require a strong vision for the future. As such, she encourages faculty, staff and student self-nominations to a task force to help develop a vision statement in conjunction with the IU Foundation, who can provide expertise in this area. To nominate oneself please send a brief paragraph describing why you are

interested in being a part of this work. The charge for this ad-hoc committee would be given in December and we hope that the bulk of the work would occur in January. There are potential donors who are positioned to want to give the SOE sizable gifts and so this is a task whose timing is such that we could see some direct results. In addition to drafting a vision, the proposal would include some financial plan sketching out the monetary needs for bring the vision to fruition. The goal is broad representation, including students.

B. Old Business: None

C. New Business

Change to Counseling and Student Services major (21.36)-

L. Rutkowski introduced the proposal explaining that it removes a course as a requirement for the Counseling Psychology track, which makes the number of required courses in that track match the number required for the HESA track. In addition, PSY 155 will be substituted for PSY 102 as a major course. Jill Shedd was available to answer questions. There was no discussion.

Motion from Undergrad Studies Committee

Second: G. Ozogul

Motion passed. In Favor: 11; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0; Recusal: 0

Change to Ph.D. in School Psychology (21.37)-

L. Rutkowski explained that this proposal removes one three-credit course from the “Psychological Foundations” requirement of this program and adds a 3 credit course to the “Major Requirements”, maintaining the overall required number of credits for this program. David Shriberg was available to answer questions. There was no discussion.

Motion from Grad Studies Committee

Second: G. Ozogul

Motion passed. In Favor: 10; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0; Recusal: 0

Change to MSED in Education Leadership (Online) (21.38)-

L. Rutkowski explained that this proposal aligns this program with accreditation expectations stemming from new National Educational Leadership Program standards. The changes include removing J500 as a requirement, increasing the number of practicum credits and updating course titles to reflect proposed course changes. C. Lochmiller was available to answer questions.

Discussion: S. Eckes informed members that she found a small typo on document 21.38. On this document a few proposed course title changes are noted via track changes. A608 on this document also should have a tracked change to read: Legal and Ethical Perspectives in Education It currently reads: Legal Perspectives in Education. We need to add ‘and Ethical’. There was a brief discussion about when course name changes can appear in the bulletin. M. Boots explained that he checks the course approvals to make sure they’ve come through before he posts any changes to the bulletin.

Further discussion ensued regarding the removal of a course from outside the program area. G. Delandshere expressed concerns that this seems to be a recent trend in the School of Education. M. Boots explained that this concern also came up during the Graduate Studies Committee discussion on this program change, though the committee understood the rationale in the case of this change request. C. Lochmiller explained that nine credits of this program can come from anywhere in the School, so students are not bound to taking courses within the department. The challenge is that the new standards require the program restructure the internship experience, and so this is motivating the change. Not making the change would put the program’s accreditation at risk. G. Delandshere acknowledged the need to find additional credits in the case of this program, but reiterated that this is a concern about recent program changes in general. S. Lubinski agreed that the trend of limiting students to courses within a single program is a trend that has negative implications for the breadth of knowledge developed among students and is something she encourages faculty to be aware of and consider as they discuss program changes.

Motion from Grad Studies Committee

Second: G. Ozogul

Motion passed. In Favor: 11; Opposed: 1; Abstain: 0; Recusals 0

Discussion: Temporary changes to 2020 faculty annual merit review-

G. Delandshere explained that she recently had a meeting with the EADs from across the campus and was surprised to learn that many units on campus have separated the DMAI from the merit review. At these units the merit review is based on a CV and a brief statement from each faculty member. At the School of Education, we use the DMAI information as a part of our faculty annual review process, and reviewing all of this documentation is very time consuming for all of those involved at the department level and for the EAD. The issues on the table are that while it is tedious to complete the DMAI, the data it provides is important for the University level review of the productivity of each unit on campus. There is no systematic way to harvest information from the CV to populate the DMAI, nor is it feasible for staff to fill out this information for faculty. We would like to streamline the SOE merit review process for this year, but because of its impact on the University level review of the School, as a faculty we cannot neglect to fill out the DMAI. With the goal of reducing the workload of those who review documentation for merit review, G. Delandshere would like to hear from the faculty ideas about how to address merit reviews this year.

Discussion: L. Rutkowski asked what types of productivity are most important to include in the DMAI? Is there guidance on what is an appropriate level of detail needed in the DMAI to put the School in the best light and share faculty productivity? For example, is it necessary to include every ad-hoc review a faculty has engaged in over the course of a year? S. Morrone stated that research productivity, such as publications and grants is important and indicated that she should be able to get more clear guidance on what is most important to include. G. Ozogul noted that the Faculty Development Committee discussed this and are concerned that writing a paragraph will just create more work for faculty. If this is just for a satisfactory/unsatisfactory rating, is it worth the extra time? G. Delandshere noted that updating the CV is required for the DMAI anyway, and highlighting activity from 2020 is not a lot of extra work. If we disassociate the DMAI from the merit review and only ask for a highlighted CV and paragraph, that eases the burden for the January deadline. While the Office of Research and Development could generate grant funding reports for the unit review, faculty publication information is more difficult to generate and so the DMAI is important for gathering this information.

L. Rutkowski summarized concerns expressed by faculty in this meeting's chat box as well as feedback from some not in attendance who have shared their thoughts. Faculty are concerned about adding more work to an already tedious process. If we are able to get more guidance on what is important for the DMAI, and if we divorce the merit review from the DMAI, there is the potential for gaining efficiency without doing harm to how we are viewed by the University and external stake holders. A. Hackenberg noted that changing the due date of the DMAI would also be helpful. G. Delandshere emphasized that the DMAI is a dynamic document which can and should be updated regularly. There is no due date if it is separated from the merit review. G. Buck asked how we will get people to complete the DMAI if it isn't linked to the merit review. G. Delandshere stated that faculty often do things for the good of the School, this is one of those things. G. Ozogul asked if there is any possibility in looking at productivity over a multi-year cycle, understanding that the impact of COVID is likely to be evident in multiple years of productivity. G. Delandshere cautioned that by doing anything other than an annual merit review (e.g. rolling averages), it is difficult to determine pay increases annually. A. Leftwich noted that by reviewing two years of data, those who were productive in 2020 won't have lost the credit for this productivity during this year where the evaluation is satisfactory/unsatisfactory. L. Rutkowski explained that many faculty have expressed concerns that those who have been productive in 2020 won't have that work acknowledged, and if 2021 is less productive for these people, they are disadvantaged. G. Buck noted that a lack of productivity in one year will hinder the rolling average of multiple years and so it will not address the issue of differential impact for people. We still need a way to capture those who were unfairly disadvantaged. A. Hackenberg noted that there are multiple ways that productivity data could be evaluated, it does not need to be an average. G. Delandshere noted that when we go back to regular ratings we could ask people which year they would like to use for their rating. L. Rutkowski stated that perhaps we could weight one year more than another. G. Delandshere also noted that people could submit a COVID impact statement to

provide context. She also reminded members that this discussion is for a change that would impact this January, and possibly next January only. We could use this year to develop a better understanding of the challenges of basing a merit rating on a CV and a few paragraphs, which could inform future merit rating processes. Discussion turned to charging the Faculty Affairs Committee with developing a proposal to bring to the next Policy Council meeting. L. Rutkowski asked for any additional perspectives to bring into the discussion. G. Ozogul asked what the criteria would be for satisfactory or unsatisfactory. G. Delandshere noted that the criteria for unsatisfactory would remain unchanged. Anything above would be satisfactory.

Discussion: Procedures supporting consistency of committee work-

L. Rutkowski explained that one issue to discuss is whether faculty would like to instigate a regular review process for policies to ensure that they are up to day and that they have been viewed through a Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) lens. Another question is whether we want to have a template for the development of policies, to ensure there is consistency and that all policies are developed in accordance with our values, particularly as related to DEI, and also have some training for committee chairs around this. Finally, do we want to have a formal description of the policy proposal process?

Discussion: G. Delandshere reminded members that the Faculty Affairs committee is reviewing all faculty-related policies through a DEI lens, as are other committees. C. Darnell added that his office is available to provide support for this process. He encouraged the review process to move forward quickly. G. Delandshere noted that committees have very little minority representation, and she is concerned about the capacity of our committees to be sensitive enough to catch potential problems with current policy. It would be helpful to have an “expert” review process, particularly for those “high-stakes” policies. C. Darnell informed faculty that his office can point faculty in the direction of tools on our web site: <https://diversity.iu.edu/anti-racist/resources.html>. L. Rutkowski agreed that additional expertise would be helpful for an effective review. Q. Wheeler-Bell asked what more expertise would look like. A. Maltese proposed that there is the language of the policy and then how it is applied and knowledge of both issues—DEI and implementation of the particular policy—is needed. Q. Wheeler-Bell noted that such a process may come with the expectation that faculty of color provide such expertise, requiring the most vulnerable faculty to question some the most problematic policies and therefore place pressures for institutional change on those vulnerable faculty. C. Darnell stressed the importance of all faculty educating themselves with the tools provided so that everyone can be involved in diversity work. Q. Wheeler-Bell argued that there is going to be a learning curve for any faculty involved, and that creates a long timeline for change. For this reason, some external support could be helpful. We also need to be thinking about the institutional mechanisms that can be put in place to correct these things.

S. Lubienski shared the process that the GSC is going through with student policies. This included going to the SOE website and downloading all student policies, then identifying those that are outdated or otherwise should be sunsetted. They then created a spreadsheet and prioritized those policies that were in greatest need for change. They reviewed policies for content and also for language used. M. Croom suggested we think about this process differently. It should not be framed as a herculean task. As these policies were created over the past 200 years by people who did this as a part of their day to day work of envisioning a future. This is the same work, with a more inclusive future vision. Framing it as a herculean task will hinder our efforts to make the change we want to see. We can all engage in this work just as was done by others before us, but with a more inclusive vision. C. Darnell reiterated the importance of everyone getting involved by using the tools available to faculty on our web site. He will also reach out to John Nieto Philips to see if there is additional support his office can provide. C. Darnell added that across the campus, the SOE is often cited as the example for how to do this. We can get it done.

Discussion: Holistic/systems-thinking approach to curriculum development and changes with considerations for budgetary, enrollment, and interdisciplinary perspectives-

L. Rutkowski explained that this topic came up in discussions around uneven enrollments and how to balance enrollments when thinking about budgetary and faculty load issues. Dean Morrone added that this topic has come up many times in the past few months. For this discussion it would be good to think about how we can take some decisive action and come up with some recommendations. A. Leftwich shared that other institutions identify a specific number of credit hours that each faculty is required to fulfil in a given year. So if

one were to teach a 3 credit undergraduate course with 18 students that would be 54 credits you would get for that course to count toward your annual requirement. If we could think about how we attribute credit hours differently, we could make it more equitable for those that do a lot of advising, or who take on those really large courses. G. Delandshere asked what happens in that system when faculty don't meet their quota. A. Leftwich said it may mean teaching a summer course, or something else. She also acknowledged the potential for unintended consequences with such a system, but noted that it is a different way to count and give credit for the many different teaching, supervising and advising activities of faculty. S. Morrone asked how other units at IUB do this. G. Delandshere explained that different units have different teaching load expectations and it is difficult to compare across units. She noted that from a budgetary perspective, we are barely making it with the current minimums that we have. We need to consider credit revenue and expenditure. The idea of hiring more adjuncts is thwarted by policies that govern the percentage of courses taught by non-tenure track faculty. Discussion turned to the possibility of hire more clinical and lecturer faculty. J. Shedd stated that we think about all credit hours in the same way—a credit hour of field experience is the same as a credit hour of coursework, even though field experience requires travel, developing partnerships, etc. By equating all hours the same, we are hindering creativity. We also need to recognize that it will take a few years to ramp up enrollment for creative programmatic ideas. If we could have conversations about these issues, that would help the quality of our undergraduate programs and enrollment. G. Delandshere reminded members of a past experience of developing signature programs that were determined to be too expensive, and so they were dropped. We get the same revenue per credit. J. Shedd acknowledged this, but advocated for being more innovative and creative, so that we could get more within the standard 120 credit hours. This could increase our enrollment. She closed by stating that the limitations of working within a 3 credit framework is hindering creativity.

Further discussion ensued about convening a task force for this issue. Dean Morrone noted that we need to be mindful of the goal to reduce people's committee work and added that examining options could be an appropriate task for the new Associate Dean for Undergrad Education who will begin in January. A. Leftwich noted that it would be helpful to have a better understanding of what it costs to offer a course. G. Delandshere explained that there are so many factors that go into course cost, and taking an average is relatively meaningless. While adjuncts could be hired for low-enrollment courses, finding adjuncts willing to teach a low enrollment course is challenging. G. Buck noted that AIs who are SOE students can be cost-effective instructors because we get the fee remission. There is also a difference in the cost of AIs between in-state and out-of-state students if they take classes outside of the SOE. G. Delandshere cautioned against pushing RCM down to the department level. Programs may be important irrelevant of what they may bring in.

Discussion: Increasing efficiencies in course scheduling

L. Rutkowski explained that while faculty often become concerned about scheduling errors, we are often unaware of all that goes into the process of course scheduling. To inform faculty of the process and gain an understanding of how to mitigate future errors T. Millican-Krieger and D. Wyatt have been invited to share their experiences and insights into the scheduling process.

D. Wyatt explained to members that the course schedule is developed a year in advance of each semester. It is very important that faculty input and carefully review their data during this initial schedule-building phase rather than attending to these details only when the schedule enters the "maintenance" phase prior to going live. Changes requested during this latter phase have to go through the registrars' office, complicating the process for fixing errors and creating multiple places for additional errors. D. Wyatt then gave a brief overview of the schedule building process beginning with the spreadsheet her office receives from departments, then explaining the transition to the registrar's office and ending with the posting of the schedule online for student access. The 2021 spring schedule was created last spring, but this fall, her office received a large amount of requests for changes. This late in the process, changes are much more difficult to make. D. Wyatt added that once the schedule is published, there should be very few changes, other than changing enrollment caps or perhaps adding an instructor. Things like changing the instruction mode, among other things, has a real impact on student choices in class selection. She further explained that for a period of time between the building and the maintenance phases the registrar shuts down access to the schedule and so all changes are put on hold. Creating the schedule is a team effort. It is important that faculty take the time to

understand the differences in the different course format options (online synchronous, online asynchronous and hybrid). Also information needs to move from the departments to T. Millican-Krieger in a timely manner. L. Rutkowski asked if there is a way to prioritize needed changes. D. Wyatt noted that T. Millican-Krieger typically processes requests the day she gets them, so prioritizing isn't really the issue. She also highlighted that room change requests typically cannot be accommodated. T. Millican-Krieger agreed that she processes changes shortly after receiving them, the challenge is the timing of when she receives these requests. If it is during the block of time when the schedule is closed, she cannot move the request forward. D. Wyatt explained that her team is looking at ways to improve the template departments use to list courses for the schedule, but with competing priorities at ETS, this may take some time. G. Delandshere asked if all changes should come through department admins/chairs, or if faculty can make change requests directly. T. Millican-Krieger stated that the office typically directs individual faculty back to the department to initiate a change request. Requests typically come through department admins and chairs are copied on these emails. L. Rutkowski thanked D. Wyatt and T. Millican-Krieger for their time in illuminating this process for faculty.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:02 PM