

MINUTES  
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

April 27, 2022  
1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.  
Zoom Online Meeting

**Members Present:** J. Danish; C. Medina; D. Danns; C. Christensen; A. Cuenca; R. Kunzman; A. Pickard; T. O’Neal

**Alternate Members Present:** C. Bonk; M. Croom; S. Daley

**Student Members Present:** K. Helström, D. Miller

**Staff Member Present:** M. Boots

**Dean’s Staff Present:** V. Torres; G. Buck; D. Ferguson; S. Morrone; J. Anderson; J. Shedd; M. Park Rogers

**Guests:** E. Boling; C. Brinda

A. Approval of the Minutes from March 23, 2022, Meeting (**22.251M**)

J. Danish stated that the Minutes from the April 23, 2022 meeting were distributed to Policy Council members and asked if any corrections were needed. There were no corrections, and the minutes were approved as distributed.

B. Announcements and Discussions

1. J. Danish informed Policy Council members that two discussion items were added to the agenda after circulation.

2. Agenda Committee

a. Committee Annual Reports Due

J. Danish reminded Policy Council members that committee annual reports were due April 6, 2022. They requested for those who serve as ex-officios to remind committee chairs to submit the annual report.

b. Global Gateway e-Notations Proposal

Global Gateway e-Notation proposal was approved by C&I curriculum committee.

c. Creation of Uniform Lesson Plan and Rubric

The Office of Undergraduate and Teacher Education received feedback from students and in response a uniform lesson plan was created.

d. Learning Sciences Moving Update

Effective August 1, 2022 the Learning Sciences program will be moving from Counseling and Educational Psychology (CEP) to Information Systems Technology (IST). J. Danish noted that both departments are supportive of the move.

e. Amendments to the Constitution

J. Danish informed Policy Council members that the amendments to the Constitution relating to making minor amendments were approved April 8, 2022.

3. Dean’s Report (S. Morrone)

Dean Morrone informed Policy Council members that during their meeting with the Provost a request was made for a meeting with faculty to discuss the search for the new Dean of the School of Education as Dean Morrone’s term is ending. Discussion ensued regarding the timing of the search, as Policy

Council members expressed concerned for the proposed timeline if started in the Fall. Dean Morrone stated that they would inform the Provost that the search and proposed meeting should be held earlier.

Dean Morrone concluded their report by recognizing the painful times for both graduate students and faculty. They stated that the requests of graduate students are real and legitimate including higher pay, and the removal of high mandatory fees. The 5% increase enacted by the Provost, where \$18,000 is now the minimum stipend for a 50% FTE is a small step in the direction of meeting graduate student requests. Although this small step has occurred more needs to be done. Dean Morrone discussed that the School of Education student academic appointments differ across campus, as the School of Education is the only school who offers 45% FTE rather than the standard 50% FTE. Dean Morrone stated that they would like a task force of this issue to determine what should be done budgetarily to correct this.

#### 4. Diversity Reflection

##### a. Discussion on Student Academic Appointment and Graduate Student Strike

C. Brinda provided a statement on behalf of graduate students in relation to issues of graduate student pay, community and school climate. Although the statement and efforts of graduate students led to a 5% increase in pay, C. Brinda recognized that the increase and faculty statement of neutrality is not enough. Ultimately both efforts fell short as they retain the status quo. C. Brinda highlighted the actions of faculty members in response to the strike, including threatening and retaliating behavior. C. Brinda concluded their statement by reiterating that the goals of both faculty and graduate students are the same, to make Indiana University Bloomington the best possible.

#### **Discussion:**

Policy Council members asked C. Brinda clarifying questions related to the definition of neutrality, and what processes would align best with graduate student needs. C. Brinda clarified the need for a pledge of neutrality to strictly outline that faculty members will stick to being neutral not retaliate or threaten graduate students. Additionally, M. Park Rogers stated that the Graduate Studies Office is the academic home for graduate students. Due to this, the goal is to keep the office separate from graduate students' academic appointments (SAA) to ensure that graduate students are aware that their academic appointments will not influence their academic standing. For graduate students to seek additional support, Policy Council members inquired if the Executive Associate Deans office would serve as a place for graduate students to submit grievances and or concerns related to their SAA. V. Torres stated that students are welcome to come to the EAD office. The processes that are being followed align with the handbook under which SAA's were hired. The process of grievances outlined by the handbook is what the EAD office is using to tend to graduate student concerns however, graduate students are requesting that processes go through the union, which the university does not recognize. M. Croom proposed ideas to move forward in order to alleviate the inadequacies of the current policies being followed. J. Danish stated that until the university recognizes the union, there would not be a point in a policy change. Until union recognition happens, graduate students are requesting union representation in the meetings with their supervisors, since the existing policies does not include that.

C. Brinda clarified that the union representative is not an outside/third-party source; rather, the School of Education has students who serve as union representatives. The purpose of these representatives is to limit potential intimidation by faculty members' overall student protection. J. Danish reiterated M. Croom's points and asked V. Torres if it was possible for the Policy Council to create a policy that reforms the structure of graduate student meetings with supervisors. V. Torres responded that another faculty member would suffice however, calling up another student would be inappropriate, and graduate students have been advised to have their faculty advisors attend meetings if necessary. C. Brinda stated that having two faculty members in the room still creates a power dynamic that they do not believe the union would agree with. They also clarified that the goal is to give students the option and access to a union representative who is another student in the School of Education. Students will not be required to have a union representative present at every meeting, however if they would like

to have support then the opportunity is provided.

C. Old Business: None

D. New Business

1. Elementary Education Program Academic Minor Proposals (22.53)

The Committee on Teacher Education proposed that all minors approved by the College of Arts and Sciences, O'Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs, School of Public Health, and School of Social Work be available to elementary education candidates. Additionally, the committee proposes the following School of Education minors also be included: Counseling, Child and Adolescent and Mental Health, Education Policy, and Community Visual Arts.

**Second: D. Danns**

**Discussion:**

A. Pickard asked the reasoning for listing specific minors within the School of Education rather than including language that indicates all approved minors. J. Anderson stated that the language stems from the way the state policy reads along with aligning for accreditation purposes. S. Daley stated that the minors listed in the documentation provided by the Committee on Teacher Education lists new minors that are in addition to the minors offered in the School of Education. G. Buck asked why the language does not read "all minors in the School of Education."

J. Shedd stated that the School of Education only offers roughly six minors, and all are approved by the School of Education. The documentation provided by the Committee on Teacher Education indicated the additional minors that are now approved.

M. Park Rogers asked what this motion means for concentrations within the school. J. Shedd indicated that the concentrations still stay available for all elementary education candidates. Additionally, they stated that academic minors will always require additional credit hours. The areas of concentration fit within the required credit hours. The proposal was created to accomplish two things, including addressing candidates' interests and help candidates later with their decision to become an elementary education major.

J. Danish indicated the proposal of a friendly amendment to accommodate the discussion on the language change.

**Friendly Amendment:** Change the language within the documentation to read all minors in the School of Education.

**Motion:** A. Pickard

**Second:** A. Cuenca

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

2. Elementary Education Program Course Changes, Fine Arts Concentration (22.54)

The Committee on Teacher Educations proposed that M235: Looking and Talking About Art, which has not been offered recently and there are no plans to offer it in the near future, be replaced with M130: Child Art for 3 credits.

**Second:** C. Bonk

**Discussion:** None

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

3. Visual Arts All-Grade Program Course Changes, Program of Study (22.55)

Members of the Arts Education Program are requesting changes to the Program of Studies in Visual Arts to reflect both the nature of our all-grades early field experiences and needs for more foundational knowledge of contemporary arts in a pluralistic society.

**Second:** D. Danns

**Discussion:** None

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

4. Proposed Format Recommendation of Department and School Level Promotion and Tenure Meetings **(22.56)**

The Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee submitted a guideline recommending that all department and school level promotion and tenure meetings be held in person.

**Second:** R. Kunzman

**Discussion:**

Policy Council members inquired about the rationale for the proposal. In response, E. Boling stated that this question came to the Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee and as a committee there was a sentiment that hybrid meetings were causing difficulties. Regarding this discussion E. Boling stated that the committee also discussed accessibility issues, and equity issues related to everyone within the meeting feeling heard and equity issues for candidates knowing the consistent meeting location.

R. Kunzman reiterated that the logistical aspects, specifically technical difficulties, should be avoided as much as possible considering the high stakes environment. E. Boling stated that there is a similar guideline for dissertation defenses. The Graduate School states that defenses should be either all in person or online. A hybrid option is not available. The policy proposed by the Faculty and Budgetary Affairs committee was seen to be the most equitable decision after discussion.

**Motion lost.. In Favor: 5; Opposed: 5; Abstain: 4; Recusals: 0**

J. Danish indicated that the even split in votes warrants the proposal to be sent back to the committee to take up concerns from the Policy Council. E. Boling asked for clarification regarding what Policy Council members are concerned about. D. Danns stated that the meetings have been run successfully prior to this proposed legislation, the meeting format can be dependent on the departments.

J. Kinzie stated that one of the perspectives that could be included in this conversation and more explicitly discussed is the last line of the proposal which states "Provisions should be made to ensure that an individual attending online is afforded the chance to speak on equal footing with those in the room, and that those in the room can be heard clearly by the individual attending online." J. Kinzie noted that this line alludes more to the quality of the meeting space, rather than the meeting format itself.

M. Croom noted that the policy may be misplaced. Rather than it be a policy regarding where the meetings are held and format, the policy focuses on how the meetings are held, discussing inclusivity of voices. M. Croom stated that there is potential for the policy to highlight how the meetings are conducted..

5. Revisions for Policy 11.53R IU Bloomington Promotion and Tenure Criteria for the School of Education **(22.57)**

The Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee proposed revisions for Policy 11.53R IU Bloomington Promotion and Tenure Criteria for the School of Education.

**Second:** J. Kinzie

**Discussion:**

Policy Council members called attention to discrepancies in language within the document. J. Kinzie asked if the parallel guidelines for Research Scientists have also been reviewed with the new updates included within this proposal, specifically noting the inclusion of language regarding a committee to diversity, equity and inclusion. E. Boling responded that the Faculty and Budgetary Affairs committee plans to implement a rolling review of policies that are related to the committee. J. Kinzie stated that the language should be transferrable to both sets of guidelines to ensure consistency. E. Boling stated that since the Policy Council charges committees each year, the Policy Council can charge the committee to ensure the language is transferred to other related policies and guidelines.

**Motion passed. In Favor: 10; Opposed: 1; Abstain: 2; Recusals: 0**

#### 6. Development of 45% FTE Task Force

The School of Education is an outlier as SAA's are appointed on a 45% FTE basis. The Agenda Committee proposed a motion to develop a task force to adjust the 45% FTE appointment terms.

##### **Discussion:**

J. Kinzie shared their support of the task force. J. Shedd also shared their support and stated that the task force would benefit from staff representation. D. Miller noted the commendable work of the Graduate Studies Office, and also mentioned the potential for the task force to propel the Graduate Student Association (GSA) as it currently does not have a lot of recognition across campus. D. Danns stated that the goal should be to attend to this issue quickly, prior to the new Dean. J. Danish stated that the next step in the process would be to ask the Agenda Committee to create a motion for creating the task force, including faculty, staff, students, and finance, to explore how the School of education can transition from 45% to 50% FTE rates.

**Motion by J. Kinzie:** Move the idea of a task force to address graduate student wages to the Agenda Committee.

**Second:** D. Danns

##### **Discussion:**

A. Pickard asked if the language represents the purpose and goals of the task force. J. Kinzie stated that the language is a bit limiting. J. Danish noted the importance of not putting too much on one task force. They reiterated the point made by D. Danns and stated that this task force would have to work fairly quickly with a challenging financial puzzle. J. Danish also mentioned that the Graduate Studies Committee to come back with additional suggestions for other task forces in the Fall, so there are continuous efforts for improvement.

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

#### 7. Charge for Faculty Development Committee

A policy shift occurred relating to teaching quality. This shift recognized the biases within student surveys and called upon units to identify alternative methods for evaluating teaching quality.

##### **Discussion:**

The Agenda Committee proposed to charge the Faculty Development Committee on developing policies and/or guidelines in evaluating teaching quality without relying on student surveys. D. Danns shared their support for the proposal and noted that whatever is created should be flexible.

**Motion by R. Kunzman:** Move to charge the faculty development committee to explore how to identify better measures of teaching quality without relying on the biases within student surveys.

**Second:** D. Danns

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

E. New Course/Course Changes

**None**

**No additional business was proposed by Policy Council members. J. Danish declared the meeting adjourned.**

Adjournment: 2:55 pm