

MINUTES  
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

November 17, 2021  
10:00 a.m. -12:00 p.m.  
Zoom Online Meeting

**Members Present:** J. Danish; J. Kinzie; D. Rutkowski; C. Medina; D. Danns; A. Cuenca; R. Kunzman; A. Pickard; L. Saleh; D. DeSawal

**Alternate Members Present:**

**Student Members Present:** D. Miller; K. Helstrom; L. Adams

**Staff Member Present:** M. Boots

**Dean's Staff Present:** V. Torres; C. Darnell; J. Shedd; S. Lubienski; G. Buck; S. Morrone; D. Ferguson; J. Anderson

**Guests:** E. Boling; H. Schertz; B. Samuelson; M. McMullen; D. Castner; J. Oakes; E. Jacobson

A. Approval of the Minutes from September 15, 2021, Meeting **(22.09M)**

**Motion:** A. Pickard

**Second:** A. Cuenca

**Motion passed. In Favor: 12; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0; Recusals: 0**

B. Announcements and Discussions

1. Agenda Committee

*a. Welcome and Introductions (J. Danish)*

Policy Council Chair, J. Danish welcomed members and guests. J. Danish indicated that there is a full agenda but reminded Policy Council members of the Pre-Meeting Qualtrics survey. The survey will assist those presenting particular initiatives, giving presenters a chance to think through responses. This will ensue a more streamlined process for discussion. To assist with reminding Policy Council members to complete the Pre-Meeting Qualtrics survey, C. Hawkins will send out the survey out two days prior to Policy Council meetings.

*b. Spring Policy Council meeting location*

Policy Council members voted on the location of Spring Policy Council meetings. Members had the choice between a hybrid model, online only or in-person

**In Favor: Hybrid 9/16; Zoom 6/16; In-Person: 1/16**

*c. Standing committee communication with Policy Council (22.11)*

The Agenda Committee has decided on two new processes that will increase transparency, facilitate communication with the Policy Council, and support all of the committees in their year-to-year activities. Three ideas were outlined for committees to follow.

- A Committee charge and progress spreadsheet (22.11) has been created that lists all of the current committee charges. The goal is to use this spreadsheet as a central point of communication about progress on those charges, it is not meant to be burdensome on committees. M. Jensen clarified that the document was shared with ex-officios and committee chairs.
- Reviewing processes related to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. Committees have been

asked to share a brief memo with the Agenda Committee regarding:

- a) what process the committee used (briefly)
- b) what changes if any the committee has made to language, procedure, or policy.

Once the review process is complete Committees have been asked to share the information with M. Jensen who will then compile and send the information to C. Darnell and their office.

- Requesting that committee document information is housed in two places. First, major ongoing milestones should be placed on the committee charge spreadsheet. The committee charge spreadsheet will be the basis for the new charges in the upcoming years and will keep any perennial tasks on there to help us all keep track. Second the traditional annual reports will be replaced with a new document which will articulate the ongoing tasks for the committee in addition to any tasks that are new for that year. J. Danish stated that the goal is to make the annual report process more useful, and people will be able to glance at it and see what needs to be completed within the committee.

*d. International Programs Committee name change*

The International Programs Committee has proposed to change their name to the International Engagement Committee. The vote for this name change will take place February 25<sup>th</sup> at the Faculty Retreat. J. Danish noted that the vote for the name change will take place at the Faculty Retreat because a constitutional amendment is needed.

*e. The Long-Range Planning Committee has been charged with amending the Constitution*

The Long-Range Planning Committee has been charged with amending the Constitution to assist with easily changing Committee names.

*f. New Guidelines were added to the procedure by topic*

The following guidelines were added to the procedures by topic on the Policy Council website

- Guidelines for Third Year Review Committees
- Guidelines for 1-credit Courses

*g. Agenda Committee administrative referral*

The Agenda Committee referred a discussion item about AI orientation and professional development to the department chairs within the chairs committee

*h. GenEd Taskforce update and upcoming survey (22.12)*

The Bloomington Faculty Council has created a task force to review the GenEd program. A survey has been distributed asking for input on what works or does not work for SoE faculty and students in the current program, and what would be attractive in any future program. J. Danish reminded faculty to participate and complete the survey.

*i. The Faculty Development Committee has been charged with updating policy (14.39)*

After completing the DEI review by the Graduate Studies Committee, it was determined that policy 14.39 aligns with the responsibilities of the Faculty Development Committee.

*j. Reminder about Culturally Engaging Campus Environment (CECE) Survey*

J. Danish reminded Faculty to complete the Culturally Engaging Campus Environments (CECE) Survey.

## 2. Dean's Report (S. Morrone)

Due to the Faculty Meeting taking place recently, Dean Morrone shared two brief updates relating to space projects.

- *Education Library Project*

The Project is awaiting approval by Vice President T. Morrison. To gain approval Vice President Morrison has to walk the space and determine if the project should move forward. President Witten is more closely scrutinizing space projects, especially larger ones, so Vice President Morrison will be doing their due diligence to ensure that the project is needed.

- *SOE Café project has been approved. Currently D. Ferguson is working with RPS on a cost sharing model.*

The project is moving forward but an agreement has not been met with RPS that is mutually beneficial for both RPS and the School of Education.

- *IU Art Collection*

Art has been identified to showcase in the elevator lobbies on the first, second and third floor. The selection process included the input of C&I and C. Darnell.

## 3. Diversity Reflection

J. Danish presented the Diversity Reflection for this month. The agenda committee thought it would be beneficial to discuss if and how the Test-Optional approach, which a number of programs have implemented is working and in particular if these approaches appear to be increasing diversity. J. Danish stated that S. Lubienski would present on the topic.

S. Lubienski stated that they were not aware they were presenting on this topic, as M. Boots did a great job compiling information together on this topic. S. Lubienski asked M. Jensen if the spreadsheet if the compiled data housed somewhere. M. Jensen stated that they recently received the information about program coordinators.

M. Boots stated that they are able to access the admission data. M. Jensen noted that program coordinators were invited to the meeting to discuss their experiences. Prior to the program coordinators sharing their thoughts, J. Danish asked if S. Lubienski had any general impressions that they wanted to share.

S. Lubienski stated that data M. Boots pulled shows a general increase in applications. The data does not break down who the applications are from, it provides a very general sense. There is an overall trend that programs who are grappling with the GRE are seeing more applications. However, this does not necessarily mean that there are more people admitted to the programs or in the enrolling process. S. Lubienski stated that overall, it is a good thing for various reasons to receive more applications. It allows for programs to select a more diverse and stronger applicant pool. Additionally, it is also good for U.S. News and World Report rankings. S. Lubienski noted that the data depicted an increase in the number of underrepresented students who are enrolled this year.

B. Samuelson stated that from their program they have had several requests for GRE waivers. Waiver requests usually come from students that are often living in parts of the world where testing is inaccessible, especially now due to the pandemic. B. Samuelson provided examples of affected areas such as Iran, and parts of North Africa. They also stated that they have identified students that have graduated from their program who have done exceptionally well and looked at their admissions numbers. Based on this review, often times, particularly for international students, they cannot compete with the numbers, when compared to domestic students. However once international students are in the program, they show strengths in other ways. Due to the support of the program, international students are able to do quite well. Students have been asked to send in additional writing samples instead of submitting GRE scores. This process has caused legitimate faculty concerns. If students who are a little subpar particularly in terms of writing ability, it is a lot of extra work on the faculty. B. Samuelson stated that there are ways to provide support

without taxing faculty.

J. Danish asked if Policy Council members had any thoughts or questions to share.

**Discussion:**

D. Rutkowski inquired about equity in admissions. If programs are making exceptions for certain students and not making exceptions for other students, especially when there is a lack of understanding on grades from other countries, it is fair? Or should this exception just be made for everyone?

B Samuelson responded that their program is not requiring the GRE for the online Ed.D admissions process.

D. Rutkowski clarified that certain students in the Ph.D. program are having the GRE requirement waived, so they questioned why is the GRE not waived for all students in the Ph.D. program.

B Samuelson stated that they would be more comfortable with a policy, or data that would point that there is not a strong correlation between GRE scores and grades in the first semester or year of graduate school.

S. Lubienski mentioned that they did run an analysis last year. The analysis showed that there is not clear pattern. However, incoming graduate students do not have really low GRE scores. Students who were accepted and there was an exception made are a very small group. S. Lubienski stated that what was striking in the data was that there was not a lot of difference between being in the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile and the 40<sup>th</sup>. However, the extremes are unknown since there are not a lot of students who are very low on the distribution.

D. Rutkowski asked if the data pulled by S. Lubienski included students who dropped out. S. Lubienski responded that the data did include that information, however the information is a bit foggy. Overall, S. Lubienski stated that they came out of the data analysis process feeling better about programs dropping the GRE course.

S. Lubienski asked M. Boots if the GRE waiver spreadsheet was sent to M. Jensen. M. Boots stated that it was sent. M. Jensen confirmed and mentioned that the spreadsheet would be uploaded onto Canvas.

S. Lubienski noted that they could review the spreadsheet with Policy Council members, however they did not think that would be the best route for the discussion. J. Danish agreed that focusing on the high-level impressions and possible policy implications should be a point of conversation. J. Danish asked if additional program coordinators were present that could speak on the topic.

H. Schertz stated that they are a program coordinator for the Special Education doctoral program. They mentioned that they cannot say they have seen enough data to draw any conclusions. There was an increase in doctoral applications. However, they were unsure if the increase in applications resulted from the GRE being waived or pandemic related issues. Additionally, they cannot say that the increase is related to an increase in diversity. H. Schertz stated that in the Special Education program there is always a lot of diversity when it comes to international representation. Additionally, the program has a doctoral student with autism this year, which highlights a different form of diversity that is sometimes discussed.

D. DeSawal stated that they could speak to the Higher Education and Student Affairs master's program, as they believe the program initiated the trend to remove the GRE requirement. There was an immediate increase, there was a decline in application numbers when the GRE was required. The increase in application numbers as well as diversity representation took place pre-pandemic. However, throughout the pandemic timeframe there has been an uptick in diversity representation. This increase in diversity

representation is due in part because there is a growing narrative around the GRE and its impact in higher education for admissions comes out of higher education and student affairs literature. Students are going into the field a little bit more familiar about that, so it is only natural to build on that connection. Lastly, D. DeSawal shared that the program is very upfront about sharing that the GRE is not required in order to demonstrate that it will not be a barrier for students. It allows for students to know that their entire application gets a holistic review.

R. Kunzman asked if there is data or impressions on test optional practices for undergraduate students. J. Shedd stated that this was the first year of a freshman class that test optional practices were available for undergraduate students. The entire campus saw a larger number of applicants and the Office of Enrollment Management shared that the School of Education saw the largest increase in the number of applicants who chose test optional in comparison to other units on IUB's campus. J. Shedd did infer that test optional did make a difference in the number of applicants. However, in terms of diversifying the freshman class, J. Shedd stated that they have not seen the applicant data with respect to the diversity of the applicant pool. There is no clear way to determine what assisted in diversifying the freshman class or applicant pool, especially because at the same time of test optional practices, there was a radical change in scholarship offerings. Since two initiatives were implemented for the freshman class, one cannot focus on one. However, no one is satisfied with the end result. There is underrepresented freshman, but not nearly enough, so neither of the two initiatives had a significant effect.

C. Darnell mentioned that J. Shedd's interpretation was very well said and professional. C. Darnell Stated that the direct answer is no, there has been no impact on the general diversity and demographics of the School of Education for undergraduate students.

R. Kunzman clarified if the data points would focus on direct admits, rather than students who transfer into the School of Education.

J. Shedd stated that this was correct. The data both test option and scholarship focus on direct admit students. However historically freshman classes have been 50/50 between direct and non-direct admits. This percentage has changed a bit and now reflects a 60/40 relationships. J. Shedd noted that their perception of this change is due to the test optional practices and how the Office of Enrollment Management were reviewing applications, which has been subtly different than previous years.

C Darnell offered to screen share Quick Facts of the School of Education 2021 census data.

J. Danish thanked C. Darnell for the information and asked if program coordinators or Policy Council members had anything to share.

S. Lubienski shared that looking at students who scored in the bottom 15 percentile of two of the three areas verbal, math, reading and writing are either not still in a program or not having graduated. However, the numbers are still very small. Additionally, the timing is not consistent in terms of when those students entered in the program.

J. Danish summarized the discussion, stating that the results of test optional practices are inconclusive and not particularly helpful for diversity at the moment. Due to this there is no need for a call to action at this moment.

S. Lubienski mentioned that the GRE is no longer required for master's programs at the school level. There are Ph.D. programs with different requirements, for instance for the Math Education program, the Math test score is important to review. However, test scores are not used as the end all be all for the application process.

J. Danish asked S. Lubienski if there are still implications for fellowship availability.

S. Lubienski stated that this is the first year that the GRE requirement was softened for the Dean's fellowship, which was the only fellowship that GRE requirements mattered. Faculty and departments set their own requirements for fellowships.

#### 4. Discussion on Committee Work Documentation Storage

*The agenda committee hopes that committees can store documents in a central location and maintain a consistent format. This process will serve as a communal memory aid to help support communities in subsequent years. J. Danish introduced J. Oakes who presented on documentation storage.*

J. Oakes thanked the Policy Council for allowing them to present, as this task is in line with one of the first charges they received from the Dean, which was to help the School of Education understand where to store and find information. J. Oakes stated that their team has worked to figure out how to best implement a solution that will meet majority of needs across the school. The solution that is being proposed is ready for committees to immediately adopt. The proposed solution is based in OneDrive. Although IU currently has three major options, Microsoft storage, Google storage and Box. However, J. Oakes stated that they did not want to reinvest in old technology and expand use of the file server.

J. Oakes goes on to state that they hope to provide an option that is based in one of the modern platforms, either between Google or Microsoft options. They are aware that individuals prefer Google, however there is a big caveat on Google as enterprise storage. There are changes coming in 2022 that will make Google a questionably viable option on a larger scale storage. Through process of elimination, OneDrive is left as the final option.

J. Oakes shared that a Teams serve board for storage and would be the best solution for broad use for the school. However, for storage space for Policy Council committees, Teams will not be involved. For individuals who personally use OneDrive, additional folders will appear in the same space, and follow a consistent naming pattern. For most purposes the folders will function just like any folder in OneDrive. However, the thing that will assist committee members is that individuals will not be responsible for managing access. ETS will audit access and conduct data management oversight. J. Oakes then shared their screen to provide Policy Council members a tour of what their storage platform would look like.

Policy Council committee members would have their own collection folder. Committee members would inform ETS on who needs to have access to the folder. It will be important for committee members to ask why individuals need access. This will assist ETS in tracking membership in groups within the School of Education. This will help the transition process for individuals in new roles.

J. Oakes stated that the folder works like any OneDrive folder. However, the only thing that is different is that it's not going to show up in synced folders on individuals computer. J. Oakes asked if Policy Council members had questions on the presentation.

#### **Discussion:**

J. Danish asked if it is easy to safely share the link to the collections folder. Since certain individuals will be given access, there is potential to place the links to the committee folders on the Policy Council website. J. Oakes confirmed.

J. Danish noted that the goal would be to start a process of moving everything from Canvas to the OneDrive folders. Additionally, the OneDrive folders will be used to bring all archived and older information as well since Canvas is not designed for the same level of collaboration in comparison to OneDrive.

Dean Morrone pointed out the efforts of the ETS team and J. Oakes. They stated that there is no other school that has embarked on this task in the way that J. Oakes has. Dean Morrone stated that J. Oakes has been a leader at IU, and other people in similar roles have gained interest in their processes. J. Danish agreed.

M. Jensen inquired if a committee member created a document and housed the document in the collections folder would the document remain in the folder if the creator no longer has access.

J. Oakes stated that M. Jensen's question aligned perfectly with the definition of institutional storage, which is why this process should be adopted. On a technical level, as soon as the file is stored in the collections folder, owners of the file are ETS administrators. ETS would be responsible for ensuring continuous ownership. Overall, for this solution ETS is taking a data management responsibility.

K. Helstrom inquired about temporary access to individuals (e.g., for external presenters). Who would committees contact to manage temporary access?

J. Oakes shared hesitation on the idea of temporary access. They stated that temporary access would include the entire folder. To alleviate issues surrounding permissions, J. Oakes provided an overall rule that collections will be created for necessary Policy Council committee members and permissions will not change. J. Oakes suggested that the contents for presenters should be shared in a personal shared drive, so temporary access can be given easily.

J. Kinzie asked what the transition timeline was for files to transition to OneDrive and if committees could receive help in the use of teams.

J. Danish responded that if there is no pushback from folks then the Agenda Committee will work with J. Oakes to gain a timeline of when everything is established for committees. J. Oakes added that they would be happy to have ETS members to work directly with Policy Council members to assist in structuring out the folders, navigating OneNote and provide general documentation for specific needs.

J. Danish concluded the conversation and noted that if Policy Council members have questions or concerns then they should email the Agenda Committee or J. Oakes directly. J. Danish thanked J. Oakes for attending.

## 5. Old Business

### *1. Collaborative Academic Program Ed.S. in School Psychology (21.52R)*

J. Danish stated that this item was originally discussed during the February 2021 Policy Council Meeting. The Collaborative Academic Program Ed.S. in School Psychology is intended for individuals who hold a bachelor's degree and are interested in working in a school setting as a school psychologist. This comes as a motion from S. Lubienski & D. Shriberg. S. Lubienski was present answer questions.

**Second:** D. Danns

### **Discussion:**

S. Lubienski provided context on the item, discussing why it was tabled and now on the agenda today. When this item was discussed in the Spring, Policy Council raised the questions related to accreditation. Questions included who was doing the work and how would accreditation work across multiple campuses. Since the Spring Policy Council meeting there has been a lot of discussion amongst the different institutions involved. The discussions have led to the following points:

- One institution will be in charge of accreditation for students regardless of where their home campus is. Presumably, IUB will be the institution charged with the task.

- This method would apply to other programs down the pipeline.
- Normally to compensate the campus, when a program hits 100 people, then the program coordinator is paid, with funding coming from each campus. However in this case, there is no waiting for the 100 people. Once the first student is enrolled, the coordinator is named and compensated, funding provided from other campuses.

S. Lubienski noted that funding is not outstanding and is roughly \$600 per campus per year. D. Shriberg is willing to step into this role however they have shared concerns if there is capacity for this program. D. Shriberg and a counterpart at IU Kokomo have established roles, one focusing on field placements and D. Shriberg leading accreditation.

S. Lubienski stated that internal discussion have taken place regarding accreditation and ways to make the process easier and smoother for involved faculty.

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

## 6. New Business

### *1. Proposal for Early Childhood Education Program TAYL Track (22.13) – Presented by J. Shedd, M. McMullen & D. Castner*

This proposal seeks to make changes to the Early Childhood Education program and create a TAYL track. This dual-track program, including license and non-license options, was created to better meet the needs of future professionals for a variety of key positions in the field of Early Childhood Education (ECE).

#### **Motion from Committee on Teacher Education**

**Second: R. Kunzman**

#### **Discussion:**

L. Saleh asked why there are no learning development courses listed and if this program do not offer learning theory courses to students.

M. McMullen responded that the program has always had as a foundational course, child development for elementary school students, what we do here is have child development for birth through about age 12 instead. The program has never had any of the learning sciences or learning theory courses included in courses, however, the program heavily emphasizes learning theory through what are called the early childhood education foundation courses. Students take three of those courses in which theory is emphasized and those are paired with pedagogical courses. Overall, students have three credits of a foundational theory course essentially paired with a three-credit pedagogical practice course. Essentially, this is how it's always been, and has not a changed. M. McMullen ensured the question was answered. L. Saleh confirmed.

J. Danish asked why there is an exception when most other programs require a learning theory course. M. McMullen clarified that the program does heavily engage in the learning sciences and learning theory courses with master's students. However, with 120 credits, the program is not making an exception, but rather not adding to the program. Essential courses were moved around to include additional courses such as the Diversity Living in a Pluralistic Society Course, and a Mental Health and Wellness course. M. McMullen noted that the Mental Health and Wellness course would be taught by CEP and a critical addition. In addition, the program added Arts and Dramatic & Visual Arts, which has never been included in the Early Childhood Program except when embedded in the pedagogical section. M. McMullen ensured that students are exposed to learning theory. M. McMullen asked if D. Castner had anything to add

to the discussion. D. Castner stated they had nothing additional to note.

M. McMullen expressed that they would be happy to speak to learning theory and learning science colleagues on how to better embed learning theories in foundation courses. J. Danish referred to the spreadsheet created by J. Shedd that provides a list of the learning theory courses. This will allow for individuals to look at how those topics are covered across all of the different programs.

M. McMullen noted that since the proposal was sent, there has been a language change from the use of the word track to concentration. J. Danish verified the proper procedure for the change. M. Jensen stated that a friendly amendment would be needed.

**A friendly amendment was made to update language from tracks to concentrations – M. McMullen**

**Second:** D. Rutkowski & R. Kunzman

**Motion passed. In Favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0; Recusals: 0**

2. *Proposal for Early Childhood Education Program ECCEL Track (22.14) – Presented by J. Shedd, M. McMullen & D. Castner*

This proposal seeks to add the ECCEL track to the Early Childhood Education program.

**Motion from Committee on Teacher Education**

**Second:** A. Pickard

**A friendly amendment was made to update language from tracks to concentrations – M. McMullen**

**Second:** D. Danns

**Motion passed. In Favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0; Recusals: 0**

3. *Changes to policy (18.08R) Students in Online Programs Taking Courses on Campus – Presented by S. Lubienski*

As part of the DEI Policy Review the Graduate Studies Committee has proposed changes to policy 18.08 – Students in Online Programs Taking Courses on Campus.

**Motion from Graduate Studies Committee**

M. Boots indicated that the item should be tabled

**Second: J. Danish**

4. *Changes to policy (18.09R) Students in Residential Programs Taking Online Courses – Presented by S. Lubienski*

As part of the DEI policy review the Graduate Studies Committee has proposed changes to policy 18.09 – Students in Residential Programs Taking Online Courses.

**Motion from Graduate Studies Committee**

**Second:** D. Danns

**Discussion:**

M. Boots noted that the policy itself would not change, but rather cited the source as the Commission of Higher Education to provide further clarity. M. Boots reiterated that there was

no change to the policy.

S. Lubienski supplemented M. Boots thoughts and shared that the change assisted in International students receiving additional direction.

**Motion passed. In Favor: 13; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0; Recusals: 0**

5. *Proposal to drop GRE requirements for the following programs (22.15 & 22.16) – Presented by M. Boots*

The following proposals were submitted to drop the GRE requirements of the following programs:

- a. School of Psychology Ph.D program
- b. Educational Leadership Ed.D.
- c. Educational Leadership Ed.S

**Motion from Graduate Studies Committee**

**Second:** J. Kinzie

**Motion passed. In Favor: 13; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 1; Recusals: 0**

6. *Program change Educational Leadership Ed.D. Program (22.17) – Presented by J. Decker*  
The Educational Leadership Faculty requests three changes to the program requirements for the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership:

- a. To eliminate the Minor requirement for the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership. This will allow students more flexibility to find relevant coursework.
- b. Add 9.0 credits of elective coursework to the requirements for the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership. Students will now complete 15 credits of elective coursework as part of their program of study. The additional 9 credits are available with the elimination of the Minor requirement.
- c. Replace Intermediate Statistics Applied to Education (Y502) with Quantitative Analysis for Educational Leaders (Y501). The new course will be individualized to prepare Educational Leadership students for their dissertations and removes the lab credit. The program faculty propose further revision to the degree requirements to clarify which Inquiry courses Ed.D. students take because students have only been enrolling in the courses listed.

**Motion from Graduate Studies Committee**

**Second:** M. Boots

**Motion passed. In Favor: 13; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0; Recusals: 0**

7. *Graduate bulletin language change on admissions application procedures (22.18) – Presented by M. Boots & S. Lubienski*

Graduate Studies Committee has proposed language changes to the graduate bulletin regarding admissions applications procedures.

**Motion from Graduate Studies Committee**

**Second:** J. Kinzie

**Discussion:**

M. Boots added that this is something the Graduate Studies Office had to do during COVID last year. The process was found to be easier for students to apply. When a DEI lens was used, it was seen as easier for students, like First-Generation college students to apply. Students

were not required to pay for multiple transcripts. This initiative was also seen to contribute in an increase in applications.

J. Kinzie stated that they believe it would be beneficial for departments to track the impact of attempts to fully realize the efforts on social justice initiatives. Hopefully, this will make a difference in a positive direction for DEI efforts. J. Kinzie inquired if there is a collective examination and or policy that might assist in keeping track to determine how well efforts and initiatives work.

J. Danish agreed that the more these efforts are tracked and understand processes the better. They noted that tracking is underway with Graduate Studies as well as Teacher Education.

M. Boots noted that the process has been difficult. Programs made changes by dropping the GRE or changing application processes. Although changes have been made it is hard to track what is making the difference for social justice efforts.

J. Danish proposed the possibility of surveying individuals, asking directly for what initiatives played a role in their decision to apply and attend.

D. Danna asked if it is difficult to collect official scores from students. M. Boots responded that often times official scores come in automatically, but there is a lag in reporting. The timing of collecting transcripts actually lessens the burden on staff as the process takes place later in the summer. S. Lubienski added that there is the possibility to freeze students accounts so they lose the privilege to enroll if official transcripts are not submitted. Additionally, M. Boots stated that the new GEMS system makes the process more accessible for admissions coding.

**Motion passed. In Favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0; Recusals: 0**

*8. Graduate bulletin language change on revalidation (22.19) – Presented by M. Boots and S. Lubienski*

Graduate Studies Committee has proposed language changes to the graduate bulletin regarding the revalidation policy. Currently, there is no limit on the number of courses and the age of courses that may be revalidated. When courses are quite old, it is questionable whether revalidation methods adequately confirm that a student is current in the field.

**Motion from Graduate Studies Committee**

**Second:** L. Saleh

**Discussion:**

D. Miller inquired why seven years was the chosen time frame. S. Lubienski responded that the requirement has always been seven years. M. Boots commented that seven years is actually larger than most other programs. The seven years allows PhD students to get to necessary milestones.

D. Miller noted that non-traditional students take courses, some of which do not change in the course of seven years. D. Miller noted that while they understand the need for certain courses, but they also recognize the power of transferring courses specifically through an equity lens for non-traditional students. M. Boots clarified that students do not have to revalidate to transfer in courses. Students can work with advisors to find the best mechanism to revalidate course by the point of candidacy.

**Motion passed. In Favor: 13; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0; Recusals: 0**

9. *Response to charge for rolling three-year window (22.20) – Presented by E. Boling*

The Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee has the following response to the charge for rolling three year window. The Faculty and Budgetary Affairs committee recommends, that the prior "rolling three year" review plan proposed to Policy Council in 2020 should expire on the basis that a detailed set of implementation guidelines has not been developed by FABA.

**Motion from Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee**

**Second:** R. Kunzman

**Discussion:**

J. Danish asked if E. Boling wanted to share anything regarding the item. E. Boling stated that the committee spent a great deal of time on this effort. It is not a workable plan, nor is it a plan that would be of most people's interest. The recommendation focuses on lessening the burden.

**Motion passed. In Favor: 12; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0; Recusals: 0**

10. *2021 Merit Review Policy (22.21) – Presented by E. Boling*

The Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee proposes the following procedure for the 2021 merit review:

- Faculty complete the DMAI in full on the normal campus schedule
- Each member of faculty supplies an optional addendum to the DMAI indicating which of three years (2019, 2020, or 2021) they are selecting to be considered for this review; this addendum may additionally direct the attention of merit review committees/EAD to particularly significant accomplishments in either of the other two years; these will be taken into account during the review, but the full report of only the selected year will be reviewed in detail
- If an addendum to the DMAI is not filed, merit review committees/EAD will focus on the current year, 2021

**Motion from Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee**

**Second:** J. Kinzie

**Discussion:**

E Boling clarified that the committee developed this proposal because the merit review letters that went out last year indicated that individuals would be able to emphasize which year they wanted to emphasize for the 2021 merit review.

**Motion passed. In Favor: 13; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0; Recusals: 0**

11. *New Annual Performance Review Policy and sunset current policy (22.22) – Presented by E. Boling*

The Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee has proposed a new Annual Performance Review Policy which will sunset policy 14.19R

**Motion from Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee**

M. Boots referred to the use of gendered language in document (22.22). They proposed gender neutral edits to the document.

**A friendly amendment was made to update gendered language to gender neutral language – M. Boots & V. Torres**

**Second:** J. Kinzie

**Discussion:**

E Boling remarked that most of the change relates to two actions. One being to drop the O ranking that's been used for some time, and simultaneously drop the requirement that limits how many people can receive E rankings. There used to be limits on E and O, so FABA is proposing to drop the limit on the E ranking and the actual ranking of O.

D. DeSawal asked for clarification for non-tenure track faculty. They asked if non-tenure track faculty were still eligible for E ranking, as previously non-tenure track faculty were not eligible for O ranking. E. Boling confirmed that non-tenure track faculty would be eligible for E ranking.

A. Pickard asked for further explanation for eliminating the O ranking. E. Boling stated the difference between E and O has never been clear and leaves individuals feeling slighted one way or another. The School of Education as a high performing faculty, and chairs and associate deans are boxed into the position of having to make judgement calls between people who are performing very well. E. Boling called upon R. Kunzman for their thoughts.

R. Kunzman stated that the goal for eliminated the O ranking stemmed from wanted to reduce complexity and levels of gradation.

**Motion passed. In Favor: 13; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 1; Recusals: 0**

**Motion:** J. Kinzie

**Second:** L. Saleh

Adjournment: 11:34 am