

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
December 15, 2021
10:00 a.m. -12:00 p.m.
Zoom Online Meeting

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

Alternate Members Present: L. Carspecken

Student Members Present: D. Miller; 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: M. Johnson

A. Approval of the Minutes from November 17, 2021, Meeting (22.23M)

Motion: D. Rutkowski

Second: R. Kunzman

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

B. Announcements and Discussions

1. Agenda Committee

a. Welcome and Introductions (C. Medina)

Policy Council Chair J. Danish was not in attendance for the Policy Council meeting. Agenda Committee member C. Medina led the Policy Council meeting. The agenda committee had no announcements.

2. Dean's Report (S. Morrone)

Graduate Student Mental Health Presentation

Dean Morrone shared they recently attended the Deans and Vice Provost meeting with Provost Applegate, where a presentation on graduate student mental health occurred. The content was presented by Clinical Psychologist Brian D'Onofrio. Dean Morrone shared that B. D'Onofrio presented recommendations that Dean Morrone plans to share with the executive leadership team. Dean Morrone stressed that mental health is a significant issue as it has not been prioritized to the extent that it should.

Dean Morrone stated that Dr. Aaron Carroll, the Chief Health Officer for IU, takes this initiative and topic very seriously. In the past year, a Graduate Student Mental Health Task Force ran from 2020 to 2021. There is hope that recommendations from the Task Force will be shared in coordination with the Dean of Students Office, The Graduate School, and across IU schools so the campus community can think about the coordination of activities to serve students better.

Education Library Project

The library renovation project is continuing. Dean Morrone briefed the Learning and Teaching with Technology Committee, and the committee was satisfied with the presented concepts. Progress is being made, along with good coordination across the committee and colleagues in the library.

School of Education Café Project

The Café project is at a stalled point. Dean Morrone is meeting with Vice President Morrison to discuss the project and specific design details. Dean Morrone expressed their sentiment with this project as they find it important for graduate students to have a space to come together.

Discussion:

A Pickard inquired if the Task Force with A. Carroll and the presentation on graduate student mental health discussed online graduate students and what resources can be provided to support them better. Dean Morrone responded that they, along with many of the other Deans, were not aware of the work being done by the Task Force, nor do they have the Task Force report to refer to, so they do not have an answer to their question. However, the Deans are determined not to allow this work to sit on a shelf and not be acted on.

3. Diversity Reflection

D. Danns introduced Monica Johnson, the Assistant Vice President for Diversity Education and Cross-Cultural Engagement.

M. Johnson thanked D. Danns for the introduction and Policy Council members for inviting them to present on their office's work. M. Johnson began their presentation by providing an overview of their position and its development. Their position runs across all of IU, so they are front and center for individuals across the State of Indiana.

They shared that their current position derived from the work and efforts of Eric Love. E. Love was responsible for significantly helping the Bloomington campus craft conversations around diversity, and education, specifically for students. However, when E. Love transitioned to a different institution, the task of continuing these conversations was not picked up on the Bloomington campus. M. Johnson noted that while they worked at the Neal-Marshall Black Cultural Center, Student Life reached out to them to begin working on engagement pieces but soon realized that they were doing to work and labor of two positions.

M. Johnson then outlined how their position came to be and their continued work on the IUB campus. One of the goals of their role is to assist in the reframing process, reframing how people see themselves or see their problems. They assist in the process by working collaboratively with departments and divisions working towards strategic goals that deliberately have areas of diversity and inclusion.

M. Johnson transitioned the conversation and presented the idea of "doing the work" within diversity and inclusion conversations. M. Johnson stated that the work must occur in three stages, personal, interpersonal, and systemic. To make systemic change, individuals must first work on themselves and work collaboratively with others, leading to addressing systems. M. Johnson further explained each of the three stages.

M. Johnson ended their presentation and stated that Policy Council members could gain access to past workshops, present if they are interested, and provide graduate students an opportunity to present quality work. C. Medina thanked M. Johnson for their presentation and continued work.

M. Johnson also made Policy Council members aware of the Social Justice Conference and the keynote speakers.

4. New Business

C. Medina transitioned the meeting to focus on the new Policy Council business. Based on questionnaire comments, presenters will be invited to talk about the proposal on the floor, but if no Policy Council members expressed questions or concerns in the questionnaire, we will go right to a

vote. Again, at any time, members can ask for a discussion.

1. Graduate Studies Bulletin Update, Maintaining Active Student Status (22.25)

This proposal sought to update the Graduate Studies Bulletin to include additional language for Maintaining Active Student Status.

Motion from Graduate Studies Committee

Discussion:

M. Boots stated that the item was more of a clarity issue and served as an update to the old bulletin language to include what it means to have a passing grade. The Graduate Studies Committee (GSC) wanted to clarify that a passing grade is a C, which is the minimum that can be used in a program. The goal was to spell out the minimum requirement students had to obtain in a course during two years to maintain active student status.

Second: A. Pickard

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

2. Graduate Certificate on Disability Rights, Policy, and Services (22.26)

This proposal sought to create a new stand-alone certificate, the Graduate Certificate on Disability Rights, Policy, and Services. Two disciplines leading in the disability support field are education and social work, both of which are joining to create this certificate. The purpose of the certificate was to:

- Provide a pathway for professionals within and outside of these disciplines to obtain graduate education about disability-related services, policies, and practices to prepare them for leadership roles in the field.
- Using an interdisciplinary approach, learners will be able to stretch, cross, and connect disciplinary boundaries while learning about the disability field in a more holistic manner than any single discipline can achieve.
- Learners will also obtain a strong grounding in the values and approaches that are intimately related to inclusion, equity, and human rights, which are critical to the development of our future leaders.

Motion from Grad Studies Committee

Discussion:

M. Jensen noted that the invited presenter for the item, D. Nord was not in attendance. Due to this, they asked M. Boots if they were willing to provide additional insight into the item's details.

M. Boots agreed but also called upon S. Lubienski to add additional information. M. Boots informed Policy Council members that this item is in conjunction with the School of Social Work, and overall a straightforward certificate. M. Boots encouraged Policy Council members to refer to the documentation to understand the certificate better.

C. Medina opened the floor for questions.

D. Danns stated that when the Agenda Committee reviewed this item, it seemed like this certificate was a hybrid program because there are courses taught in-person and online. Therefore, they sought additional clarification on why this is considered an in-person course when there are online options. M. Boots responded that an email with D. Nord clarified this

inquiry.

S. Lubienski stated that from their memory, D. Nord thought of this certificate as an in-person/primarily on-campus program rather than a program that would draw students from online audiences. M. Boots added that D. Nord thought of the certificate being 50% in-person and 50% online, which is why it was kept as a residential program. D. Danns clarified that 50% is the minimum to making the certificate an in-person program. M. Boots responded that 50% is the maximum amount of coursework a student could take online while still being in a residential program. M. Boots expressed the difficulty of these courses due to the modality and scheduling not being inherent to the course.

D. Danns asked what the difference between this program and a hybrid program. M. Boots stated that students could take up to half of their coursework online for residential programs. Hybrid students can take up to 79% of their course online, online students can take 80% and above of their course online, and 100% of online students enroll in all online coursework. S. Lubienski added that D. Nord stated that half of the coursework would automatically be face to face and the other things on the education side would be as well, which would take students over the 50% residential requirement.

D. Danns thanked S. Lubienski and M. Boots for their clarification.

Second: D. Rutkowski

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

3. Fast-Track Special Education License in Exceptional Needs: Mild Intervention (P-12) Transition to Teaching Initial Licensure Program (Online) (22.27)

This proposal came as a program change to the Graduate Initial License in Secondary Special Education Exceptional Needs - Mild Intervention (Fast Track). This program change has been made in response to significant changes generated by the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) with respect to a new requirement of schools that teachers in special education classes are required to have a special education license, rather than a license in another area and/or on an emergency permit. Given the significant shortage of special education teachers in the State of Indiana. The faculty decided to modify the existing graduate special education initial license in two ways -- to make it a P-12 license and to modify it into a transition to teaching (T2T) program.

Motion from Committee on Teacher Education

Discussion:

J. Shedd provided insight into the item, stating that there is and has been a need for special education teachers, and there is quite a shortage. In addition, there is a mandate from the Indiana Department of Education that schools must have licensed special education teachers in respective classrooms. Due to this mandate, the faculty have responded in reviewing the offered programs. The proposed program is a Transition to Teaching program and all grade. This is the first all-grade special education program that is being offered and affords both the candidate and public schools more flexibility. J. Shedd stated that the proposal for the program reflects the mandates from the State and the standards for an all-grade Transition to Teaching program, which included meeting the standards for exceptional needs as well as six credit hours in reading. Once this proposal receives approval from the Policy Council, it will then be passed to the Department of Education for approval. Assuming that all channels will approve it, the program will be available for Fall 2022. Additionally, J. Shedd shared that the Department of Education is offering scholarships to candidates who are completing a special

education transition to teaching program.

C. Medina asked if this proposal is being presented as a new program. J. Shedd responded that it is new in terms of being a Transition to Teaching program. The special education faculty have had a graduate initial licensure program for a while. J. Shedd mentioned that the special education faculty have seriously reviewed the coursework, worked through outdated language, updated course titles, and reviewed content.

D. Danns asked how the content would be replaced upon the removal of the course Diversity in the Community of all Learners. J. Shedd stated that they could not answer the question and called upon J. Anderson to reply or provide further insight.

J. Anderson stated that the content would be placed in other classes; however, they have not fully been involved in the decision-making regarding that process. J. Anderson then indicated that they were constrained by the State for the program to become a transition to teaching program, which meant a reduction in credits. J. Anderson added that they would be happy to confirm where the information will be dispersed, but they cannot specifically answer the question as they were not involved in the planning.

D. Danns clarified that they did not want the question and action of finding how the content would be replaced to hold up the process, but they asked the question because they assumed that the content was probably already taught in other classes.

J. Anderson responded that they do recognize the importance of course titles, and for students to be eligible for state funding, it must be a Transition to Teaching program. A meeting with the state representative took place, and they can assure that the content from the Diversity in the Community of all Learners is provided in the coursework.

M. Boots asked if the discussion was referring to the Fast Track program that was approved last year and if so, they raised a question regarding the coding. The EDUC-G tends to be COT, and all the Transition to Teaching programs tend to be coded at the T-level. They hoped that the coding would have been updated to be classified with the Transition to Teaching courses. They stated that in the SIS description, which is how it appears on the transcript on the application, it is categorized as a Special Education Secondary Certificate program. This means that two programs are different with the same name, one being classified as a fast track but being coded as COT. With the secondary language and the program coding, they inquired if the coding would be updated to EDUC-T and remove the secondary language from the description. J. Shedd stated that M. Boots was correct. Once the program is approved, the language will be updated.

M. Boots inquired if the admission should be closed pending approval or should students still be admitted during the transition. J. Shedd responded that they would ask the faculty, but they are aware that the faculty do not want to be running what could be perceived as three different programs, but they will double-check and provide an update. J. Anderson mentioned that the State was clear about the program not being advertised until State approval was given. M. Boots asked if the current version should be pulled. J. Anderson responded that confirmation is needed from the program faculty.

V. Torres asked a clarifying question regarding the use of the word State. They asked when individuals were referring to the State and State approval if they were referring to IDOE. J. Shedd confirmed that the Indiana Department of Education is being referenced in relation to State language use. V. Torres asked if their approval is based on making the program eligible for funding and scholarships or is it based on a degree program. J. Shedd stated that it is not a degree. However, the Indiana Department of Education does review the curricula and programs for state teacher licensing and administrator licensing. Under that responsibility, this program is being submitted to the Indiana Department of Education for approval.

S. Lubienski mentioned that as a member of the C&I faculty, they received a ballot for the program. They inquired why voting was happening simultaneously between the department and Policy Council. J. Anderson stated that the process is slightly out of order but believes they are within policy constraints. D. Rutkowski asked if voting out of order was within Policy Council constraints and if there was opposition amongst C&I faculty.

S. Lubienski stated that discussion has not occurred. They proposed that it would be best for Policy Council to make their vote pending approval from C&I. M. Jensen agreed and noted that a friendly amendment is applicable.

V. Torres asked S. Lubienski if there was a deadline on the departmental vote. S. Lubienski stated that there is a deadline of December 16, 2021. C. Medina added that they are not aware if discussion amongst C&I faculty was allotted before the voting process. V. Torres stated that if the Council does not want to hold up the proposal, then the friendly amendment of "pending departmental vote" would be an essential element of the motion.

J. Shedd asked if the friendly amendment would come from them, as the motion came from the Committee on Teacher Education. M. Jensen reminded council members that a second is needed to discuss the friendly amendment.

Second: A. Cuenca

M. Jensen noted that the Council needs someone to request the friendly amendment, and the request must come from a committee member. D. Rutkowski asked if there is a policy or procedure that individuals are supposed to follow for program proposals, and if so, did the council plan to follow the policy for this specific program. Additionally, they asked if a friendly amendment would be included for the concerns that D. Danna brought forth at the beginning of the discussion. M. Jensen stated that there is no policy or procedure on how programs should be done, but informally, a vote should occur on the departmental level, then it goes to the curriculum group, either the Committee on Teacher Education or Grad Studies. Lastly, it would be presented for a vote to the Policy Council. D. Rutkowski sought clarification from the Agenda committee regarding the item being placed on the agenda.

D. Danna stated that the Agenda committee was unaware that the proposal had not gone through the departmental vote.

R. Kunzman stated that procedurally at the committee level, proposals had been approved pending program or departmental approval in the past.

D. Danna asked if there was a deadline for the program proposal. J. Shedd stated that it must be submitted to the Indiana Department of Education not later than February 1, 2022.

C. Medina asked Policy Council members if they should begin exploring the possibilities of friendly amendments. V. Torres noted that J. Shedd could not make the friendly amendment as they are not a voting member of the Council. V. Torres asked who made the original motion.

M. Jensen stated that the original motion came from the Committee on Teacher Education and was seconded by A. Cuenca. M. Jensen noted that a motion for a friendly amendment by a committee member and second is needed.

Friendly Amendment - Motion to approve pending departmental vote: R. Kunzman

Second: D. Rutkowski

Friendly Amendment passed. In Favor: 9; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 2; Recusals: 0

Discussion:

D Rutkowski asked if the policy provided via the Zoom chat by S. Lubienski was applicable to the current discussion. V. Torres clarified that S. Lubienski provided the practice, which M. Jensen provided previously in the discussion. V. Torres stated that the practice could not be altered without good reason. C. Medina asked if a friendly amendment was needed for the previous discussion point by D. Danns regarding the content in the Diversity in the Community of all Learners being dispersed amongst the program.

J. Kinzie asked if the Council would want the department to respond to the potential friendly amendment to assure that the diversity course or the elements of the course are being picked up throughout the program. D. Danns stated a simple response to the Agenda Committee would suffice.

Friendly Amendment – Motion to approve pending clarification of where the Diversity Course that was removed is represented in the curriculum, and that clarification be responded to by the department to the Agenda committee: J. Kinzie

Second: D. Danns

Friendly Amendment passed. In Favor: 10; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 2; Recusals: 0

Discussion:

M. Boots requested a friendly amendment for updating the proposal to the correct transition to teaching coding. M. Jensen stated that a friendly amendment is not needed since that is a procedural process.

5. New Course/Course Changes

The following new course or course change proposals have been reviewed and approved by the Graduate Studies Committee, the Committee on Teacher Education, or the Undergraduate Studies Committee. These course proposals will be forwarded to the next level of approval unless a remonstrance is received within 30 days.

New Courses

BL EDUC-O 625	CRITICAL RACE THEORY IN EDUCATION	3 Credits	BL Document 89482141
BL EDUC-K 643	DISABILITY RIGHTS, POLICY, AND SERVICES	3 Credits	BL Document 89512080

Course Changes

BL EDUC-K 515 FOUNDATIONS OF DYSLEXIA: IDENTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT
3 Credits BL Document 89621027

BL EDUC-K 570 INTENSIVE READING INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS FOR STUDENTS WITH DYSLEXIA
3 Credits BL Document 89637907

Motion: D. Danns

Second: A. Cuenca

Adjournment: 11:14 am