MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
February 26, 2020
1:00-3:00 p.m.
IUB - Room 2277

Members Present: J. Lester; Q. Wheeler-Bell; A. Maltese; E. Boling; J. Damico; C. Lubienski; A. Brannan; A. Hackenberg; D. Cross Francis;
Alternate Members Present: G. Ozogul; K. Wohlwend
Student Members Present: K. Helstrom; E. Bloss
Staff Member Present: M. Boots
Dean's Staff Present: G. Buck; S. Lubienski; C. Darnell; J. Shedd; L. Watson; G. Delandshere
Guests: J. Poe, V. Borden, D. Danns; T. Brush

I.   Approval of the Minutes from January 29, 2020 Meeting **(20.37M)**
    Motion Passed with all in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstention; 0 recusals
    E. Boling noted that, while the meeting minutes accurately reflect what she stated at the meeting, after the meeting she learned that no other units on campus have a graduate student misconduct policy at this point in time. According to the Student Conduct Office we are the first, and can serve as a model.

II. Announcements and Discussions
    Agenda Committee
    Policy Council Chair, J. Lester shared the following announcements:
    - March & April meetings will be in ED 2277
    - Faculty Retreat March 27, 2020. Save the date.
    - Undergraduate Scholarships Committee has had a membership change. L. Stachowski will replace C. Gray.
    - Agenda Committee will give the following charge to the Graduate Studies, Undergraduate Studies and Teacher Education Committees: Develop an internal process for online collaborative program participation that articulates processes for program proposals and/or participation in proposals from other campuses to be followed within departments, within committees and within Policy Council.
    Discussion ensued about whether or not undergraduate program process should be developed at this point in time, and how the process is managed when a collaborative program come to us from another campus. While there is not an immediate need at the undergraduate level, there is value in having a consistent internal process across the School. M. Jensen briefly explained the four stages of the online collaborative program process and highlighted that there is no clarity around during which stage or stages of the process Policy Council committees or the Policy Council should review and vote on these programs. It is important that we have a tracking process, as well as documentation of when collaborative programs are developed within the school and when a department decides not to participate in a program initiated by a different campus. S. Lubienski stated that she has served as a point person in the past, but clarity is needed around our internal process. Dean Watson noted that a big question is where is the School of Education's curriculum committee? This committee is important for addressing these types of issues. Dean Watson stated that he hopes the ad hoc committee on committee structures attends to this. The Dean also indicated that another area in need of attention is support for online programs. Further discussion ensued about whether or not it is appropriate to combine undergraduate and graduate programs under one committee, and whether it is appropriate to develop a policy at this point in time when our committee structure is under review. Dean Watson further

emphasized some of the holes he sees in our curriculum guardianship with the current committee structure and curriculum review processes—which should be ensuring programs are providing up-to-date content that reflect current needs of constituents.

E. Boling gave a brief update on the work of the ad hoc committee on committees. They have reviewed the committee structures of other institutions, spoken with committee chairs, and examined what it might look like to have a smaller number of more "umbrella-type" committees with larger membership, and which responsibilities might be better handled as an ad-hoc committee, even if these ad-hoc committees come up on a regular basis.

- Agenda committee reviewed a proposal from the Diversity Committee to establish an office of diversity, equity and inclusion in the School of Education and, in consultation with the Dean and Executive Associate Dean, determined that the establishment of an office is an organizational decision which the Dean will discuss further in the Dean's Report.

- Updates and FYIs from the Bloomington Faculty Council (BFC). J. Lester attended a meeting with the current and incoming BFC presidents. The following items were shared: 1) Steve Sanders, a professor in the law school, has put in a request to have data shared about the number of students suspended without a hearing at the IU campuses. He would like to do some comparative work around suspensions with hearings and those without over the past five years. He is concerned about abuse in this area. 2) Regarding the revisions to the consensual relationships policy, when the draft was shared with the UFC, students across the IU system noted that they did not feel the policy provided sufficient protection in that it stated that "sometimes" these relationships are consensual. Students voiced concerns that given the power differential between students and faculty, this language is not appropriate. The policy is now being revisited by a task force that includes several students and will not likely be available for review this academic year. 3) IU contracts with an external company that is photographing cars parked on campus. This is one example of data sharing/data protection needs that will be reviewed by a new data management task force that will examine data protection of students, staff and faculty at IU, not just for transportation, but across the system. This task force is being charged with developing a framework for data protection. Faculty input will likely be sought over the next year. 4) The provost is considering not renewing the contract with Elsevier publishing house because of the fees they require for access to their journals. There will be town hall meetings to gather input on this topic the second week of April. A brief discussion ensued about the impact this could have on faculty and how this might be mitigated. J. Lester noted that the Dean of Libraries requested the BFC conversation. At this point there is no formal policy or proposal. 5) The General Education task force has a steering committee that has been working over the past year and is considering four potential sub committees that will explore General Education issues. On April 16 there will be an all-day event designed to brainstorm what general education should look like in order to attend to the shifts in society. 6) There is a required shared goal with an undergraduate focus, of sustainability. A task force has been developed on campus to think about what that shared goal might mean to general education. Ideas will go to the executive committee of the BFC over the next year and from there will flow through various appropriate channels depending on the outcomes. 7) Finally, IU East passed a sustainability resolution with broad support from faculty, staff and students that called for carbon neutrality by 2040. IU East then went to the UFC to see if all faculty councils across all campuses might want to pass similar resolutions. The UFC will be voting on a resolution on this topic and our own units should be prepared to take this on in March.

Diversity Topic: General information about the Hudson and Holland Scholars Program- Jennifer Poe, Associate Director
J. Poe informed members that Hudson and Holland is a scholarship and support program that has been around for 32 years and currently serves over 2000 students. The program is open to all undergraduate students but has a focus on underrepresented minority students. Over the years the program has broadened their definition of diversity beyond race and ethnicity to include other marginalized populations. The scholarship is $6,000 per year. It is renewable as long as students maintain a GPA of 3.0. In addition to these scholarship the office has partnerships with many units

on campus, including the School of Education. These units provide additional partnership awards for their Hudson and Holland scholars that vary in amount depending on the unit. Hudson and Holland also provides funding for overseas studies opportunities.

In addition to the funding, Hudson and Holland provides ongoing leadership development and support to participating students. The program is driven by service and leadership. Students engage in service opportunities and are required to participate in learning opportunities which are developmentally appropriate and targeted to align with the needs of undergraduates through the different phases of their time at IU. Hudson and Holland scholars can also participate in wellness and retention programs through a collaboration with the School of Public Health. That program has grown over the years, as often students' greatest challenges stem from psychosocial, cultural and sometimes financial issues. Hudson and Holland tries to carefully attend to the development of a sense of community, particularly now that the population of students in the program has exploded in recent years. J. Poe then briefly described some of the specific programs and activities Hudson and Holland has done to address this focus.

Hudson and Holland is in the process of expanding programming, services and staff. Currently over 2000 students are being served by just three full time academic advisors and one wellness and retention coordinator. Regarding the selection of students the program takes a holistic approach, recognizing that GPAs and test scores are not the only data points that serve as indicators of future success. There are two opportunities to apply—one in the fall and then another for students who apply later, accepting applications up through May. Students do not have to be incoming freshman. Sophomore and junior undergraduates can also apply for the next academic year. The program has developed great partnerships over time, which is a strength. Looking forward, there are opportunities to grow the partnership with the School of Education. J. Poe expressed interest in working with the new SOE Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion and noted that some units do specific programming to support their Hudson and Holland scholars. Also there are opportunities for faculty to be mentors through the Faculty and Staff for Student Excellence program.

Discussion:

C. Darnell spoke about his relationship with the Hudson and Holland program and the emerging office of DEI at the School of Education. He indicated that he is open to talking with the program about some of the programming happening in the SOE that could also support Hudson and Holland students. E. Boling asked how many SOE students are Hudson and Holland students. J. Poe estimated there are 30. E. Boling shared that the SOE has an online mentoring program for undergraduates that all freshman are encouraged to participate in.

Dean's Report

Regarding the establishment of the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) in the School of Education, Dean Watson explained that, in conjunction with the Diversity Committee and C. Darnell, Interim Assistant Dean for DEI, the School of Education administration is working on providing services that align with the concept of an office of DEI, including hiring a full time staff person to support this work. Dean Watson would like to remove "interim" from the title of C. Darnell to stabilize this position during these the early stages of the work. Dean Watson noted that C. Darnell's role with Balfour is coming to an end, but his work with DEI is just beginning. There is a need to maintain continuity. Dean Watson noted that there have been concerns that this position should be a faculty position, and pointed out that this is a staff position in many other units at IU and at other universities. There is value in having someone dedicated to this full time.

Discussion:

Discussion ensued regarding the title of assistant dean, whether it should be a faculty or staff position and how these administrative positions should be reviewed. D. Danns noted that in her position at the Office of the Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion (OVPDI) all of the DEI representatives she worked with were staff positions. Further discussion ensued about the difference between removing the interim title for C. Darnell versus having an office. Dean Watson explained that he sees offices as compartmentalizing the work and this work needs to be integrated across all offices and departments. Dean Watson explained that all assistant deans have a budget allocation, so

not being designated as an "office" will not hinder the work in this regard. D. Cross Francis asked about the process for moving someone from an interim position. Before this is done officially, is there a mechanism in place for faculty and staff to communicate concerns about an individual's performance? Dean Watson indicated that this Policy Council meeting venue serves as such a mechanism. He also stated that ongoing feedback from faculty regarding C. Darnell's performance gave the Dean the confidence to bring this proposal forward today. J. Lester asked if there is a process in place to review assistant deans in a way that mirrors the anonymous feedback that faculty can provide regarding the performance of associate deans. G. Delandshere noted that associate deans have an opportunity to go back to their faculty position should they have a negative review, but an assistant dean would not have this safety net. A. Maltese noted that in the past, interims who were hired as a place holder until a permanent replacement was found, may not have had a clear understanding of the expectation of the role. It will be important that C. Darnell have a clear understanding of expectations so that he can evaluate his own performance. Dean Watson reiterated that this action and the removal of interim in two recent Associate Dean appointment titles have been in response to faculty concerns about the lack of stability in administrative positions. He sees stabilizing these roles as a priority. Further discussion ensued about whether there is a need to formalize this process or if the University has such polices.

III.   Old Business- None

IV.   New Business
ELPS Chair Selection Process (**20.39**)
D. Danns reminded members that when there is a change in department chair, the department's selection process for a new chair must be approved by Policy Council. She explained that the current change in process reflects the desire of the department to consider a newly hired faculty who is a returning faculty.
Discussion:
J. Damico asked for more details about the process, will the incoming person participate in the vote? D. Danns explained the details of the voting process, noting that the vote would occur this spring, and so the new person would not vote. A. Maltese asked if it is standard across departments that people cannot refuse the chair position if elected. E. Boling noted that nothing about the process is standard across departments, but that is not uncommon. G. Delandshere asked if staff have a vote. They do not. A. Brannan asked about split appointments. D. Danns noted that a faculty must have at least a 50% appointment in the department to be eligible to vote.

> **Motion:** A. Brannan
> **Second:** E. Boling
> **Motion Passed** with all in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstention; 1 recusal

Proposal to change the application requirements for IST EdD program (**20.40**)
T. Brush explained that the IST department has been examining the policies and procedures related to the EdD program. Applicants must have a masters to be eligible to apply. In the past the department required the GRE and there was a waiver process that included securing a faculty sponsor and approval of the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies. The department decided to eliminate the requirement for the GRE for those who meet the admissions criteria in this policy because these students have already proven that they can handle the rigor of graduate work.
Discussion:
   A. Maltese noted that Policy Council has approved several proposals to remove the GRE and GPA requirements. How did this trend impact the program's decision to make this change? T. Brush explained that after reviewing the performance of admitted students over the past few years, evidence indicated that GPA in the master's program was a better indicator of success than the GRE score. Further discussion ensued about the PhD program not requiring a masters, and thus the GRE remaining a requirement for admission. K. Wohlwend noted that this program has very few, if any international students. T. Brush confirmed this. Further discussion ensued about how old a master's

degree can be. There is no stipulation as to how long ago the degree was conferred.

> **Motion:** Graduate Studies Committee
> **Second:** G. Ozogul
> **Motion Passed** with all in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstention; 0 recusals

Program change: Change to minor requirement for IST EdD (**20.41**)

T. Brush explained that over the past three years the Graduate Studies Committee has had an EdD subcommittee. The work of this subcommittee led to the elimination of the requirement that EdDs have a minor. With this flexibility now in place the IST faculty decided that, based on the attributes of applicants who are almost exclusively working professionals with focused goals, these students would benefit from the opportunity to choose electives that are more in line with their goals, rather than requiring nine hours towards a minor.

Discussion:

J. Damico asked if students provided feedback about the minor. T. Brush noted that in his experience as program coordinator, the minor requirement garnered the most concerns among students. M. Boots noted that EdD students often are not familiar enough with faculty to be able to find a minor advisor. Further discussion ensued about how focused these elective courses could be. There is flexibility in this area—students could take all of these courses within IST if they chose.

> **Motion:** Graduate Studies Committee
> **Second:** K. Wohlwend
> **Motion Passed** with all in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstention; 0 recusals

Policy Revision: Remove school-wide default master's minimums and separate verbal and
      quantitative GRE score minimums for doctoral students (**20.42**)

S. Lubienski and V. Borden and K. Wohlwend are part of a subcommittee of the Graduate Studies Committee that reviewed the School of Education's use of the GRE, including a combined quantitative and qualitative score minimum. V. Borden explained that ETS guidelines specifically encourage that scores be evaluated separately and explained various rationales for this. S. Lubienski explained that the specific cut-offs in the proposed change stem from the fact that these scores reflect similar percentiles. The verbal score requirement is slightly higher than the quantitative minimum, given that all education doctoral programs require strong verbal skills. Additionally, S. Lubienski explained that because the GRE has been dropped in many master's programs, it no longer makes sense to post a school-wide minimum for master's applicants. Instead, they propose that the website refer prospective students to program-specific requirements.

Discussion:

      A. Brannan asked about the posting of these minimums. S. Lubienski noted that the web site is currently softening the language to reflect the flexibility present. E. Boling noted that for the IST program, the major impact would be in who is electing to apply. S. Lubienski analyzed past GRE data for the School of Education, and found that the relatively few students who scored low on both verbal and quantitative reasoning tended to either take a long time to graduate, or they did not finish their degree. However, for other students, there did not seem to be a strong relationship between GRE scores and degree completion. G. Delandshere asked if there had been a discussion of the validity of the interpretation of GRE scores for international students. V. Borden noted that Educational Testing Services (ETS) is looking to promote the test among this population, and they have internal reports supporting this, but external studies provide less support.

> **Motion:** Graduate Studies Committee
> **Second:** M Boots
> **Motion Passed** with all in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstention; 0 recusals

Meeting adjourned 2:42PM