MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
March 22, 2023
1:00-3:00 p.m.
Zoom Online Meeting

Members Present: K. Wohlwend; L. Gilman; A. Pickard; M. Croom; D. DeSawal; R. Kunzman; J. Decker; H. Ormiston; C. Kilgo; B. Levinson; M. Nyikos
Alternate Members Present: D. Shriberg
Student Members Present: C. Brinda; C. Turner
Staff Member Present: M. Boots
Dean’s Staff Present: A. Morrone; V. Torres; D. Ferguson; S. Lubienski; C. Darnell
Guests: K. Kwon; B. Samuelson; D. Rutkowski; J. Danish

A. Approval of the Minutes from the February 22, 2023 Meeting (23.34M)

K. Wohlwend noted minor grammatical errors and the minutes were approved as corrected.

B. Announcements and Discussions

1. Agenda Committee
   a. Reviewing processes for internal letters
      K. Wohlwend reminded Policy Council members that the Provost would be attending the April Policy Council meeting to discuss the upcoming Dean search. K. Wohlwend stated that the Agenda Committee is reviewing processes for the internal letters that are required for awards and fellowships. The Agenda Committee hopes that this review will assist in reducing service loads.
   b. Guidelines for Administrator Reviews
      K. Wohlwend noted that as a way to develop consistent processes, the Executive Associate Dean’s (EAD) Office will be creating guidance for Administrative Reviews.
   c. Restructuring Policy Council Committees Results (23.36)
      K. Wohlwend informed Policy Council members that the Restructuring Policy Council Committee interest survey results were finalized. The results indicated that Policy Council members are in favor of moving forward with restructuring Policy Council Standing Committees. Five individuals stated they were interested in developing proposals. K. Wohlwend recognized the complex nature of this process, and stated that this will not proceed as a constitutional vote until sometime next year.

2. Next Steps following Faculty Retreat
   K. Wohlwend stated that instead of the Diversity Reflection, this month’s discussion will focus on moving forward on points brought up during the Faculty Retreat into actionable items. K. Wohlwend introduced D. Rutkowski and J. Danish, the chairs of the Long Range Planning (LRP) and Diversity Committee.

   J. Danish stated that the Diversity Committee received a lot of actionable feedback on the Diversity plan. J. Danish indicated that the feedback was straightforward, as it highlighted areas where the plan could be more inclusive. J. Danish shared the Diversity Committee’s current processes, which included reviewing the feedback and generating a table similar to the format of a journal review process. The feedback would then be distributed to the Diversity Committee to incorporate into the Diversity Plan by April 3rd. J. Danish stated that the goal is to provide the Policy Council with an edited plan by April 18th. J. Danish stated that not all
comments will be addressed, as they would amount to another year of work. However, the Diversity Committee is trying to incorporate items that are achievable within the next year.

K. Wohlwend stated that the Policy Council is mindful of the upcoming Dean search, and how the work of the council is presented to candidates. K. Wohlwend noted that this would be worth discussing during the April meeting.

D. Rutkowski stated that the Long Range Planning Committee was tasked to make changes to the Long Range Plan based on the feedback from the Faculty Retreat. D. Rutkowski indicated that the committee struggled with the feedback as it lacked consistency. The committee also expressed concern for the feedback not being representative of all voices. However, D. Rutkowski stated that the committee is working through the feedback as best as they can, and tracking changes made based on the feedback received. D. Rutkowski highlighted that the most challenging part of the feedback the committee received is that it does not seamlessly align with the campus’ goals. Discussion ensued.

K. Wohlwend inquired if either committee could identify ways the Policy Council could help as the Diversity and Long Range Plans move forward. D. Rutkowski stated that the Long Range Planning Committee has enough information to bring a draft forward to the Policy Council. They stated that this draft will not need as much feedback, but it would be beneficial if the Policy Council could provide feedback on how the plan could be amended.

K. Wohlwend reminded Policy Council members that at the April Policy Council meeting with the Provost, members should meet the Provost’s request and provide a laundry list of attributes that are desired for the new Dean. K. Wohlwend encouraged Policy Council members to think about the guiding goal, and priorities of the School of Education. K. Wohlwend stated that this conversation could occur during the April meeting prior to the beginning of the Dean search. M. Nyikos shared their agreement with having a conversation regarding the desired attributes of the new Dean. Dean Morrone stated that the search firm, will be hired to take what is said during the listening sessions of faculty, staff, and students and develop a position description. The key attributes that the Policy Council develop will also be considered for the position description.

K. Wohlwend stated that both committees were moving forward to something that is concrete and actionable. K. Wohlwend shared their appreciation for the conversation, and the time of J. Danish and D. Rutkowski. They asked if there were any additional questions.

D. Rutkowski thanked Policy Council members for their time, and thanked the members of the Long Range Planning Committee and Dean Morrone. K. Wohlwend stated that the retreat was very productive and thanked both the committee chairs J. Danish and D. Rutkowski once again.

3. Dean’s Report
Dean Morrone indicated that the Budget Conference with the Provost occurred. Dean Morrone stated that they were joined by V. Torres, M. Dwyer and D. Ferguson. Dean Morrone noted that R. Kunzman was also present as they serve on the Bloomington Faculty Council (BFC). Dean Morrone stated that there were prior financial concerns due to the change in student academic appointee stipends and fees. At the Budget Conference the state of the School was discussed. The School of Education is in good fiscal health, and will finish with a net positive.

Dean Morrone noted that the School of Education has had to cut some GA appointments going into the next year but preserved AI positions. The goal was not to do anything that would fundamentally interfere with the instructional mission of the school. Dean Morrone stated that
the School of Education is in a good place as the campus will provide additional financial support next year. Dean Morrone indicated that the school did not pull from reserves to cover the cost of the student academic appointment (SAA) changes. However, the changes did allow reflection to occur on what work is needed for the school. Dean Morrone shared that fundraising is also up as the SoE has exceeded its fundraising goal.

Dean Morrone introduced the last topic related to the Budget Conference. Dean Morrone stated that during the Budget Conference requests are made to the Provost for cash funding of up to $100,000. Last year the campus funded the renovation for the Center for Human Growth. The Center for Human Growth is now temporarily located on the fourth floor, for the renovation process. Dean Morrone indicated that the school has a positive track record for receiving Provost funding. This year the leadership team, including C. Darnell wanted to begin to assess what a culture of care looks like within the SoE. To begin answering this question, the school has made a request to the Provost for a .5 FTE graduate assistant who would serve as an embedded counselor within the School of Education. The graduate assistant would be an advanced graduate student in counseling psychology. The SoE also requested funding to develop and renovate a space that could serve as a Balance Room. Dean Morrone described the space as a quiet room. If approved E. McCord’s assistance would be enlisted to develop programming centering mind, and body connections. Dean Morrone disclosed that they were not sure if the Provost was completely sold on the idea of the quiet room, but there will be ways to incorporate this programming if the funding is not approved. Dean Morrone concluded the Dean’s Report and discussion ensued.

Discussion:
C. Kilgo inquired if the renovations affect classes held in 0101. Dean Morrone stated that the renovations should not make a difference as the demolition is contained and should move quickly. Dean Morrone noted that noise containment should also be reasonable.

L. Gilman stated that the Center for Human Growth could also fashion a form of a quiet room with limited hours if funding is not approved. Dean Morrone agreed and shared that they are hopeful for funding as the school did take a financial hit from the SAA changes.

K. Wohlwend pointed to two questions that arose in the Zoom chat. D. Shriberg and C. Brinda asked how many fewer SAA positions will there be in the SoE in 2023-24 versus this year, and do these reductions affect students who are mid program. Dean Morrone responded that the reductions should not affect students who are mid-program. The reductions primarily occurred within graduate assistant positions, which aligned with the advice of the SAA task force. Students who are teaching are deeply valued, as the school desperately needs them. To D. Shriberg’s question, Dean Morrone stated that they do not have an exact number finalized. Executive Associate Dean V. Torres stated that there could be a handful of students who may possibly be affected, and the school is doing its best to find them alternative appointments. K. Wohlwend recognized the impact of the SAA Task Force. Dean Morrone agreed and stated that the Task Force’s work was extremely helpful, as they had a daunting task. Dean Morrone shared that they are pleased with how things will be for Fall 2023.

D. Shriberg noted that there are several students who had funding this year, that will no longer have funding for the 2023-24 academic year. Dean Morrone responded that CEP had a SAA count that was higher this year, and an agreement was made that the department would return to the original number for the 2023-24 academic year. V. Torres added that CEP has a lot of mixed positions, so the goal was to consolidate those.

Additional Policy Council members expressed their concerns for graduate students not receiving funding. Dean Morrone shared their concern, and highlighted that they made a strong
case to the Provost that graduate students should be compensated appropriately, but financial assistance is needed. Dean Morrone stated that reducing the number of SAAs was a painful process, but the school had to have a balanced budget.

L. Gilman comment in the Zoom chat, that it would be great if doctoral students could classify as in-state. Dean Morrone commented that doctoral students cannot within the state of Indiana. Dean Morrone shared that they challenged this topic, but there is an established law that states this classification cannot occur. Dean Morrone expressed their frustration with the law and stated that they hope President Whitten can make strides to change the law over time. M. Nyikos stated that at one time, graduate students who were TAs or AIs had the opportunity to become Hoosiers. They stated that there was most likely a policy change since this new law is in effect. Dean Morrone stated that the information shared was helpful.

C. Brinda shared that they have talked to several students who are in the position of having to scramble and find positions next year. C. Brinda stated that there has been a lot of talk of reductions of SAAs being difficult for the School of Education, but not a lot of discussion has occurred on how these reductions are difficult for graduate students. C. Brinda recognized the sacrifices that graduate students make. Dean Morrone responded that C. Brinda’s points are well taken as it is not all about money. The conversation has to be about people as well as the finances of the school. K. Wohlwend thanked everyone for the discussion. Dean Morrone stated that they believe the school will get through the challenges and end up in a better position.

C. Old Business: None

D. New Business

1. Accepting DuoLingo for Graduate Admission (23.37)

K. Wohlwend stated that the proposal sought to include DuoLingo English Exam as an option for admissions. The exam considers, reading, writing, speaking, and listening, and combines skills into scores for literacy, comprehension, conversation, and production. The item came as a motion from the Graduate Studies Committee and S. Lubienski attended answer any questions.

Second: M. Nyikos

Discussion:

S. Lubienski stated that students started to ask if the DuoLingo test would be accepted for graduate admission. The test is a more affordable option, and allows students to send results to up to 40 schools for free. The TOEFL costs $255 and costs additional money to send results to schools. S. Lubienski stated that the cost effectiveness of the test caused them to look into this item as a proposal. S. Lubienski stated that they have checked with the TEPAIC office, and they did not have concerns regarding the DuoLingo test. The Graduate Studies Committee questioned test security, but concerns were minimized as D. Svetina Valdivia knows the psychometrician of the test, and expressed their comfortability.

M. Nyikos inquired if S. Lubienski consulted TEPAIC as well as Applied Linguistics as they have various safeguards in place and are knowledgeable about the psychometrics of tests. M. Nyikos added that another aspect would be if the Policy Council voted to pass this proposal, then tracking would need to occur to gauge if the test measures up to the schools expectations. S. Lubienski responded that monitoring is included as an aspect in the proposal. M. Boots stated that S. Lubienski also reached out to the TSAL office in addition to TEPAIC. S. Lubienski noted that DuoLingo has been criticized for being more conversational rather than academic but shared that D. Svetina Valdivia found that the test is broken into four areas. Students would have the opportunity to increase their average if they are
better in one area than another. M. Nyikos stated that the school is mainly looking students writing, since that is what is graded. M. Croom shared recent literature regarding the extent to which test scores help stakeholders understand student performance.

**Motion Passed.** In favor: 15; Opposed: 1; Abstain: 0

2. **Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction-Specialization in Science Education Bulletin Update (23.38)**
   K. Wohlwend stated that the proposal sought to update bulletin language for the Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction- Specialization in Science Education. The item came as a motion from the Graduate Studies Committee and G. Buck attended to answer any questions.

   **Second:** M. Nyikos

   **Discussion:**
   G. Buck stated that this proposal does not seek to change the program, but rather stems from the need to clean up language as a result of unintended consequences from prior language.

   **Motion Passed.** In favor: 16; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0

   K. Wohlwend indicated that the proposal outlines a new OCAP Certificate, Graduate Certificate in Teaching English Learners – License Addition. The rationale for the certificate is as follows: The Graduate Certificate in Teaching English Learners – License Addition will provide Indiana teachers with the knowledge, disposition, and skills they need to promote student achievement in a culturally sustaining manner. The proposal came as a motion from the Graduate Studies Committee and B. Samuelson attended to answer any questions.

   **Second:** L. Gilman

   **Discussion:**
   M. Nyikos inquired if there are issues the school should be aware of due to this being a multi-campus program. B. Samuelson responded that there are no major concerns, but it the program overall will take cohesive leadership. B. Samuelson expressed their optimism that the leadership will be in place. M. Nyikos asked if there is an agreement as to which campus teaches which course and the timetable for course offerings. Beth Samuelson stated we’re essentially teaching the same number of courses that we would have been teaching otherwise, because we offered the courses less frequently. So as a multi-campus program, bringing in teachers from all over Indiana. We’ll be teaching the same number of courses each year, but we’ll be teaching groups of people online from all of the campuses.

   **Motion Passed.** In favor: 15; Opposed: 1; Abstain: 0

4. **Paid Accommodation for SoE Graduate Students on Student Academic Appointment (23.40)**
   K. Wohlwend introduced the final item on the agenda. The item sought to propose a paid leave for SoE Graduate Students on Student Academic Appointment as a replacement to a previous sunsetted policy on Graduate Student Leave. The proposal came as a motion from the Graduate Studies Committee and S. Lubienski attended to answer any questions.

   **Second:** B. Levinson

   **Discussion:**
   S. Lubienski stated that the proposal has been in the works for the last three years. The Vice Provost Office requested this work be put on hold because the campus was discussing leave. S. Lubienski stated that there is now an unpaid leave policy that allows students on SAA to keep their health insurance. When revising the school’s policy, the new campus policy had to be considered so the SoE
policy did not conflict. The GSC voted to sunset the current policy and adopt the new proposed policy that does not use the term leave, but rather uses the term paid accommodation. S. Lubienski stated that the term leave is a bit confusing, as students are not leaving their courses. The proposed policy is only applicable to students who are well enough to continue their coursework but need time off of their SAA. S. Lubienski noted that the current policy is much more generous than other campus policies. This has become an issue as the school asks for financial support but upholds the most extravagant policy. S. Lubienski recognized the duality of the issue, as it is great for students to be protected and have coverage but there are ways that the policy needs to be tightened up.

S. Lubienski provided Policy Council members an overview of the major change, which is that instead of students being able to take an unlimited number of leaves or taking multiple leaves the proposed policy states that students can have one parental accommodation and one medical accommodation during their time at the school. S. Lubienski noted that the current policy lacks clarity, and is ambiguous. To address the lack of clarity and ambiguity, the proposed policy clarifies that students are entitled to and are protected to take leave if requested. S. Lubienski clarified that students who have to be gone for two weeks, do not need to go through the leave process. Rather students can coordinate with their supervisors for approval. S. Lubienski stated that the goal of the proposal is to conserve funds, and be consistent with the college. The School of Education would still have a more generous policy if the proposed policy was passed.

S. Lubienski highlighted that the school does not do a lot of leaves, there are possibly 4-8 per year. As a result, there is not a huge budgetary impact. S. Lubienski addressed the questions sent prior to the Policy Council meeting and responded that the proposal seeks to find balance between wanting to be generous but not being seen as extravagant in comparison to other units on campus. In regard to the second question related to faculty leaves, S. Lubienski stated that faculty receive 12 weeks of leave, visiting professors, part-time faculty and post-doctoral scholars do not receive any family leave. Staff can only take leave twice during their career, and have to be at least 30 hours employed. Staff receive two six-week paid parental leave.

C. Kilgo thanked S. Lubienski for the overview of the proposal. They shared that they were conflicted on restricting the number of leaves SAAs can have. They noted that prior in the meeting Policy Council members discussed what it meant to create a culture of care. C. Kilgo noted that creating a culture of care would mean accommodating students who may be sick more than once during their graduate studies. C. Kilgo shared that they agree the language of the policy should be clarified. L. Gilman stated that a lot of the school’s graduate students who identify as biologically female are in their childbearing years, and six weeks is a short amount of time for recovery.

S. Lubienski indicated that leaves do not relieve students of their academic duties, so in more serious cases a paid leave would not be applicable. Rather, the student may have to go on unpaid campus leave. S. Lubienski also noted that the school did not have an emergency fund until last year. Now there is a structure in place to assist students who may be losing funds.

C. Brinda asked if there was an influx of graduate students asking for multiple leaves on a regular basis. S. Lubienski responded that it is very rare for students to ask for multiple leaves. In the Zoom chat, C. Kilgo inquired if students were consulted on the policy change. S. Lubienski stated that the student representatives on the Policy Council and the Graduate Studies Committee were the only students who were consulted. M. Croom asked about the financial benefits if the policy were passed. S. Lubienski reiterated that the current policy is generous in comparison to other entities on campus. This proposal is more about tightening up the language of the policy and aligning more with other units.
C. Kilgo stated that they are curious how this policy change would be perceived by current and prospective students. S. Lubienski responded that they do not believe student know the policy exists until they need to use it. B. Levinson inquired if S. Lubienski and the Graduate Studies Committee would entertain possible changes to the proposal. B. Levinson proposed two changes, the first being that all students are entitled to two accommodations, including any combination of parental and medical. The second proposed change included opening up the language for students to select which accommodation structure is fitting to their circumstances. B. Levinson noted that these changes could be achieved by including language that read “in exceptional circumstances.”

S. Lubienski supported Policy Council members proposing changes to the proposed policy. Regarding B. Levinson’s changes, S. Lubienski stated that they are worried about changing the language to two leaves of any type because women are more likely to need the parental leave, and therefore the language change feels like it would take away the option of medical leave. S. Lubienski stated that they are in favor of the “in exceptional circumstances” language as it would still provide the necessary clarity for the policy, while also providing a safeguard for use. In the Zoom chat, C. Kilgo asked how the term exceptional would be defined and who would define it. S. Lubienski stated that their office would review the definition in conjunction with department chairs or whoever a student’s direct supervisor is. S. Lubienski expressed that it would be best for the Policy Council to make a decision during the meeting. If not, the policy would not be able to go into effect until the following Fall.

Additional policy council members expressed their concerns for the proposal and advocated for this change to remain equitable to students. The following friendly amendments were proposed:

**Friendly Amendment by B. Levinson:**
Additional Terms Specific to Parental Accommodation:
The accommodation must be taken within six weeks of the birth or adoption of a child. Student Academic Appointees may TYPICALLY receive at most one parental accommodation during their SoE graduate studies

Additional Terms Specific to Medical Accommodation:
Student Academic Appointees TYPICALLY may receive at most one medical accommodation during their SoE graduate studies.

**Second:** C. Kilgo

**Discussion:**
R. Kunzman inquired if the inclusion of vague language aligned with HR practices, or would it cause additional issues. D. DeSawal stated that if the language is inconsistent then issues would arise. B. Levinson proposed alternative language for the friendly amendment and stated that the phrase “exceptional or in special circumstances” could be included. B. Levinson indicated that Policy Council members would have to define the terms exceptional and special circumstances. S. Lubienski stated that another alternative would be to stick to the language in the current policy. M. Croom suggested additional language that alluded to students being able to access leave accommodations automatically. M. Croom stated that including automatic language shows that students do not have to gain permission for a leave, but there is no longer an expectation that students are afforded an unlimited number of leaves. S. Lubienski responded that the automatic language does not align with the leave process, as students are asked to provide medical documentation. D. DeSawal stated that another alternative to the language could be to remove “at most” language as a way to provide more flexibility, but still have parameters to the policy itself. They reminded Policy Council members that policies can be edited
annually.

C. Kilgo and S. Lubienski shared concerns with including “automatic” language as it alludes that students are entitled to leave without some form of verification.

**Motion did not pass.** In favor: 8; Opposed: 7; Abstain: 2

**Friendly Amendment by A. Pickard:**
Additional Terms Specific to Parental Accommodation:
• The accommodation must be taken within six weeks of the birth or adoption of a child.
• Student Academic Appointees may receive at most one parental accommodation during their SoE graduate studies

Student Academic Appointees may receive at most one medical accommodation during their SoE graduate studies. Additional leaves may be considered on a case-by-case basis.

**Second:** J. Decker

**Discussion:** B. Levinson suggested that the policy could be approved in principle but sent back to the Graduate Studies Committee to finalize wording and language. D. DeSawal shared their agreeance with the amendment.

**Motion Passed.** In favor: 14; Opposed: 1; Abstain: 1

**Vote for passing policy as amended**
**Second:** B. Levinson

**Motion Passed.** In favor: 15; Opposed: 1; Abstain: 0

E. 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.

**Course Change**

**BL EDUC- Y 660**

Course Title: Affinity Research Group

Is S-F grading approval being requested: No

Repeatable for credit: Yes

Total career credit hours allowed: 36

Total career completions allowed: 6

Allow multiple enrollments in term: Yes

Justification: The course is regularly offered with different foci and thus students regularly enroll across multiple semesters.

Adjourned 3:02pm