

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
February 24, 2021
1:00-3:00 p.m.
Zoom Online Meeting

Members Present: A. Brannan; J. Danish; E. Boling; V. Dimitrieska; S. Eckes; A. Maltese; A. Leftwich; A. Hackenberg; Q. Wheeler-Bell
Alternate Members Present: S. Daley
Student Members Present: K. Helstrom; G. Rennie; D. Miller
Staff Member Present: M. Boots
Dean's Staff Present: G. Buck; C. Darnell; J. Anderson; S. Morrone; J. Shedd; S. Lubienski; G. Delandshere
Guests: D. Shriberg; B. Samuelson

Approval of the Minutes from December 16, 2020 Meeting **(21.48M)**

Motion: E. Boling

Second: A. Hackenberg

Motion passed. In Favor: 12; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 1; Recusal: 0

A. Announcements and Discussions

1. Agenda Committee

- a. Results of email vote for revised Annual Merit Review and Trustees Teaching Award Processes during COVID -19 Pandemic (21.41R): 9 in favor; 0 opposed, 1 abstain, 2 eligible voting members who attended the December meeting did not respond. The motion passed and the new policy was distributed to faculty via email on December 21, 2020.

Discussion: G. Delandshere asked if the policy was sent back to the FABA committee for further revisions to detail the process for 2022. A brief review of the minutes revealed that this document will be revised in Spring 2021. E. Boling noted that this will be on the agenda for FABA's next meeting.

- b. Items brought to Agenda Committee which are not on the meeting agenda:
- i. Diversity Committee provided recommendations regarding SOE anti-bias incident and diversity initiative data monitoring and reporting. The agenda committee fully supports this initiative, they determined that as written, these items described projects/initiatives of the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion and therefore were not policies but rather a description of roles and responsibilities which fall under the purview of the Dean's Office.
 - ii. Nominating committee developed a slate of candidates for the upcoming Policy Council election. The electronic vote will occur in March.
- c. Committee membership updates:
- i. Joshua Danish is replacing Curt Bonk on the Committee on Learning and Teaching with Technology
 - ii. Jesse Oakes will replace James Russell as an ex-officio on the Committee on Learning and Teaching with Technology
 - iii. Jeff Anderson will serve as ex-officio of the Committee on Teacher Education and Amy Hackenberg will replace him as a member of the committee.

2. Dean's Report

Dean Morrone discussed the need for a policy on the review of center directors and noted that we currently lack of any language around the appointment and dismissal of a center director. Dean Morrone suggested that the Policy Council revise the current review of centers or alternatively, create a new policy specific to the review of center directors that addresses these issues. Furthermore, the way we appoint chairs differs across all departments and we have no language that defines the process for appointing center directors. There may be value in developing a policy to add consistency and transparency to these processes.

Discussion: A. Leftwich suggested that whatever review process is developed take into consideration the service load of faculty in terms of participation in review committees and streamline the processes as much as possible. G. Buck noted that there is an unofficial annual review process for center directors that includes goal setting, reflection and an evaluative letter written by G. Buck in her capacity as Associate Dean of Research and Development that is passed on to the department chair to be included in the faculty review process. G. Delandshere noted that this process does not consider input from center staff, and there is no term limit for center directors. J. Danish asked how the review cycles are managed at the College to avoid the issue of a center director needing to prepare for one review or another every 18 months. G. Delandshere stated she was unsure of how the cycles are managed, but she is noted that in her experience, little attention is paid to center directors in the center review process. E. Boling noted that an annual review process would not take the amount of time that a three-year review would take. G. Buck expressed reservations about the quality of a process that includes an external review committee sending out surveys broadly. She noted that there is a lot to the work of a center director that others are not aware of. A. Leftwich suggested we consider the basic information necessary to evaluate whether or not someone needs to be removed and focus on this. E. Boling agreed that thinking about a way to do an annual review using a process that is different from our current 3 year review processes has a lot of value—a center director who is not effective can do a lot of damage in 3 years. A. Leftwich reiterated the value of a simple survey similar to a course evaluation, sent to staff and affiliated faculty that would give basic feedback on the effectiveness of the center director in key areas. This type of simple process may add value to evaluations of chairs as well. E. Boling noted that this is probably something that would fall under the purview of FABAs. G. Delandshere added that the lack of job descriptions for center directors is also problematic. This is a task that would fall to the EAD, since directors serve at the pleasure of the Dean. The EAD could work with the FABAs committee.

Dean Morrone also noted that the School is in need of guidelines for authorship as it relates to research with students. This issue was discussed with the department chairs who were supportive, though this would likely not be a policy, but rather guidelines to be posted to our website.

Discussion: A. Leftwich noted that she follows APA guidelines. J. Danish pointed out the contradiction in messaging between department indications that faculty going up for promotion must be first author, no exceptions, while ethics and APA dictate different guidelines. A policy about this could help faculty navigate this contradiction. G. Delandshere stated that first authorship is not in the P&T criteria and should not be communicated as such. However taking leadership roles is important, and this may be confounding the messaging. A. Maltese noted that while a policy on this issue would be difficult to enforce, clear and visible guidelines could be valuable. Further discussion ensued about current practice of faculty.

3. Diversity Topic: Fall 2021 Undergraduate Admissions Update, Dean Morrone
Dean Morrone informed members that our undergraduate enrollment numbers are up substantially, which may be due to the new test-optional policies and the efforts we are making regarding scholarships. We looked at funding that we could offer to direct admits. In awarding scholarships, we developed 8 category groups. To try to increase the diversity of the school, we gave considerably more to minority and male applicants. Prospective students will now receive a consolidated letter that includes the financial support offer from both the School and the College in one document. The financial support we are providing is greater than what we've ever given before. While we don't know who is going to say yes, we are aiming to give the most attractive

awards to our direct admits. Last we checked, deposits were up 40% over this time last year. We are also going to have a direct admit day. This will include video messages from current students, a panel for Q&A sessions, and we are mailing swag, which is something we have never done before. Ideas for the swag came from the Dean's advisory Council of undergraduate students. Socks were high on the list. A. Leftwich suggested branded cards for ZOOM, or patches for masks. A. Maltese suggested key fobs laser cut in the MILL.

B. Old Business: None

C. New Business

1. Revision to Computer Science License Addition (**21.50**)- A. Leftwich explained that this proposed change is in response to recent licensure changes at the state level which place a greater emphasis on specific computer science concepts and courses. The item comes as a motion from the Committee on Teacher Education,
Discussion: G. Delandshere asked for confirmation that this does not need to be approved by Campus Curriculum Committee because it is a licensure program. She also confirmed the details of the course changes. A. Leftwich noted that we are the only university in the state that offers this program. A. Brannan asked if these changes will impact the content on technology that support students with disabilities. A. Leftwich explained that the increased content requirements has eliminated this as week-long topic, and rather it will be sprinkled in. A. Brannan expressed concern that when things are sprinkled in, they often get lost. A. Leftwich and A. Brannan agreed to collaborate on a plan to ensure this content is covered.

Second: J. Danish

Motion passed. In Favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0; Recusal: 0

2. New: Computer Science Area of Concentration (**21.51**)- Given the new Indiana standards in computer science and associated interest in STEM education, the Committee on Teacher Education proposes a new area of concentration based on the computer science license addition. The item comes as a motion from the Committee on Teacher Education.

No discussion.

Second: V. Dimitrieska

Motion passed. In Favor: 13; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0 ; Recusal: 0

3. MOA2 for Collaborative Program: EdS School Psychology (**21.52**)- This is a proposed online collaborative program that is in the MOA2 phase of development. The program is for individuals who hold a bachelor's degree and are interested in working in a school setting as a school psychologist. The item comes as a motion from the Graduate Studies Committee. David Shriberg answered questions.

Questions from Qualtrics: Where is this program actually administered? Who sponsors the program maintenance/revisions/reviews? What is Policy Council's role in future revisions of the program?

Discussion: D. Shriberg explained that this program was developed by IUB IU Kokomo, IU South Bend and IU East. Students will pick a host campus and will be considered students of that campus, but any program changes would need to be approved by all participating campuses. D. Shriberg noted that we are the only school with a School Psychology program, plus we are the flagship campus, and so we anticipate most students will list our campus as their home campus. As program chair he has received many requests for a program like this. G. Delandshere asked why this is a collaborative program, when we are the only campus with such a program. S. Lubienski explained that when this program was initiated in the Kokomo campus, the OCAP requirements for initiation/participation in a collaborative program were that a campus had the expertise to teach a class. Since then, OCAP is looking more closely at campus capacity. D. Shriberg added that the

unique expertise in Bloomington has come through in discussions with faculty at the other campuses. Further discussion ensued about OCAP's more current thinking about capacity and why this program is moving forward as a collaborative program when the contributions of other campuses are less than what current guidelines recommend. In sum, this is due to how capacity was interpreted at the time this program was initiated. Regarding future changes, S. Lubienski reiterated that all campuses would need to approve changes. A. Leftwich noted that in her experience, while other campuses want to be a part of these collaborative programs, these courses are sometimes taught by adjuncts, and not campus faculty. This is a concern. S. Lubienski explained that the way the courses are distributed will reflect the capacity of each campus, and so IUB will teach most of the courses for this program. E. Boling noted that these processes are often designed for things going well, with little attention to what happens if things go badly. Is accepting the risk of future issues worth being a part of this program now? S. Lubienski acknowledged that this process is murky, but noted that this process is much improved from where we were a year ago. Dean Morrone agreed that progress is being made and encouraged trust in the process. She acknowledge the tension between wanting to protect our programs and also be good university citizens. E. Boling noted that we are bringing in students as we open access through online programs, and she is concerned that if a program unravels, what happens to the students? Is there a plan for that? A. Leftwich asked D. Shriberg how he feels about the program and what will happen if it is not approved by Policy Council? D. Shriberg stated that this program does fill a need and is a good idea. He expressed initial concerns about it competing with our residential program, but that is now less of a concern. Kokomo has a strong desire for this program, but not the capacity. Our program almost has the capacity to run this alone, but not quite. In this respect, it is beneficial for IUB and Kokomo. Accreditation is another issue. It is highly likely that accreditation will fall on us. The online format likely requires a separate accreditation. Right now there are no hybrid programs accredited by NASP, though D. Shriberg is confident that within the next five years there will be. It would be difficult to successfully engage in the accreditation process with the resources that we have now. G. Delandshere acknowledge the appeal of the program. J. Shedd noted that the MOA should explicitly state who will be responsible for the accreditation. OCAP doesn't have experience with or understand accreditation and licensing programs, so it is on us to ensure this is addressed. A. Leftwich pointed out that there is a cost associated with the workload for accreditation, and this should be considered. E. Boling asked if we could vote contingent on addressing the accreditation piece. S. Lubienski explained that MOA2 focuses on approving the curriculum. MOA3 is more the financial piece, and would likely be a more appropriate place to bring this up. M. Boots added that the Graduate Studies office has put forward amendments for other collaborative programs, so there is precedent. A. Leftwich suggested we put forward a motion with a friendly amendment to approve the MOA2 contingent the fact that they discuss IUB as being responsible for accreditation and receiving funding and that this will be a part of the 3rd MOA.

Motion for Friendly Amendment: E. Boling

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: To vote on the motion for this collaborative program Ed.S. in School Psychology contingent on MOA3 include a resolution to the issue of accreditation and financial support for accreditation.

Second: J. Anderson

Motion with Friendly amendment passed. In Favor: 13; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 1; Recusal: 0

4. Revision to Graduate Certificate Policy (21.53)- This bulletin update follows from the approval of the nine-credit Dyslexia certificate and new guidance from University Academic Affairs, and indicates that nine credits is the minimum for a certificate. The item comes as a motion from the Graduate Studies Committee. Sarah Lubienski answered questions.

Second: V. Dimitrieska

Discussion: A brief discussion ensued about where input on these guidelines came from—it was

OCAP and Provost office.

Motion passed. In Favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0; Recusal: 0

5. Revision to C&I Chair Selection process (**21.54**)- The department of Curriculum and Instruction is initiating a search for a new chair, and chair selection processes must be approved by Policy Council before each new search. The item comes from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, and will need a motion for discussion. Beth Samuelson answered questions.

Question from Qualtrics: Are there back-up procedures to follow in the event that sufficient nominations are not made to fulfill the required numbers?

Motion for discussion: A. Leftwich

Discussion: B. Samuelson explained that a back-up procedure was not discussed. In developing the process, the initial nomination cannot be declined. In a department of 40 plus faculty, it is unlikely that 3 nominees would not be found. G. Delandshere noted that the language regarding the development of the job description should be removed, though she acknowledged this language was in the prior version of the policy. B. Samuelson noted that earlier in this meeting there was discussion of a uniform policy and it sounds like this concern could be address through that process. She explained that the charge of the committee that developed this policy revision was to merge the LCLE and C&I chair selection policies, and because that piece of the policy was not something the committee planned to change, it was not part of the discussion. There is some urgency in passing this policy to address the need for a new chair. J. Danish suggested a friendly amendment to strike the language in bullet item number 2. G. Delandshere asked for clarification as to whether every faculty in the department will participate in the ranking, not just the search committee. B. Samuelson confirmed that everyone in the department has an opportunity to participate. G. Delandshere reiterated the importance of having a clear job description that is uniform across departments. What we have is very outdated. M. Boots referred members to a Policy Council discussion on this topic from 2018. E. Boling asked for confirmation about what FABA needs to address.

Motion for Friendly Amendment: A. Leftwich

Second: A. Brennan

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Vote to approve the Chair Selection process with the removal of bullet #2 (position description and statement of qualifications).

Motion passed. In Favor: 13; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0; Recusal: 0

Motion to adjourn: A. Leftwich

Second: A. Hackenberg