

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
March 20, 2019
1:00-3:00pm
IUB—Room 2140

Members Present: J. Damico; D. DeSawal; G. Gonzalez; D. Cross Francis; S. Martinez; P. Wakhungu; P. Carspecken, C. Lubienski; C. Bonk; J. Lester; R. Martinez

Alternate Members Present: A. Leftwich

Student Members Present: S. Hiller; J. Munson

Staff Member Present: M. Boots

Dean's Staff Present: L. Watson; G. Delandshere; G. Buck; S. Lubienski

Guests: Carol McCord; M. Hines

Approval of the Minutes from February 27, 2019 Meeting (**19.40M**)

Motion: D DeSawal

Second: J. Damico

Abstentions: A. Leftwich & J. Munson

Recusals: none

Approved Unanimously

I. Announcements and Discussions

Agenda Committee

BFC Update

Co-chair S. Martinez informed the Council that once per semester the Council of Councils, or the chairs of all unit's policy councils, get together to hear about what is in the pipeline for voting campus wide. There are some revisions to the exam policies you may have seen, particularly around online exams, that is coming forth. There is also an amendment to the constitution coming forward relating to the proportion of tenure track versus non-tenure track representation. Also mentioned at the council meeting was the diversity in the US—shared goals versus common ground discussion—which was not settled, so further discussion will be coming. Spring Faculty Meeting—March 29, 2019

Next faculty and staff meeting for strategic planning – April 26, 2019

Diversity Topic: ADA- conceptualizing disability as diversity, presented by Carol McCord, Associate Dean of Students

Carol McCord introduced herself and that her office deals with issues of institutional compliance. There are a lot of discussions going on from accommodations and compliance to consideration, or how we envision issues of disabilities. Disability is included in our diversity statements, I bring the perspective of the compliance Officer, and so there are several issues that I think are important to address. Title 9, Title 7 and ADA are the compliance laws. Regarding students, all who identify as having a disability need to be registered with Disability Services for Students in order to access those service. Faculty and staff are also entitled to accommodations to do their work. If you need to secure accommodations for staff, Human Resources is the place you should go. For accommodations relating to faculty, you would go to the Office of the Vice Provost. Many people do not know this. All academic appointees, including graduate students, go through this office as well as visitors. That is where you go to get support for accommodations. In regards to compliance, we need to provide accessibility to the school and

events, as well as technology- websites, etc. In the search and screening process, we also need to make sure that all of the materials and all of the activities are accessible.

Discussion:

C. McCord informed members that an identifiable disability is appropriate to address early in the search process. When a disability is not identifiable, it is up to the person to communicate the disability, and this does not have to happen until the hire is made. S. Martinez asked, during a candidate's visit, is it appropriate to ask the candidate if they need accommodations relating to all of the walking, etc. planned? Discussion ensued about the use of appropriate language. It is appropriate to ask a candidate if this process as schedule is working for them. At that point the candidate can say they need an accommodation. The word "accommodation" implies a disability and should only be used by the candidate, if they so choose. A. Leftwich suggested that a template helping faculty to work through appropriate language for different stages of interaction would be helpful.

Further discussion ensued related to the issue of disability being seen as an aspect of diversity. At IU, the conversation around diversity has been narrowly construed as race. The current recommendation is to shift our language and thinking from "diversity", to "inclusion". Providing for inclusivity indicates that you are providing for everyone. C. Bonk noted that last year at this time we had internal and external experts come in and inform faculty about ways to use technology to be more inclusive. It was a great start to addressing accessibility of technology. Faculty expressed that they feel most comfortable with their knowledge around how to support students with disabilities. Discussion shifted to the types of support faculty might need. Members indicated that faculty could use more support regarding the appropriate language that should be used in formal communication with staff, faculty and candidates when navigating inclusion and accessibility. The Vice Provost's Office is a good place to start for supporting resources. Also, faculty would like more information relating to how to engage with people with disabilities. Concerns were raised relating to fears of unintentionally offending people with language choices in conversation. C. McCord closed by thanking faculty for their feedback and indicating that some informational events and training webinars are being planned. She also noted that the university has goals we strive for in terms of diversity across the board, and while we are actively working at the university level to address the underrepresentation of minorities, we are below every marker relating to the representation of individuals with disabilities.

Dean's Report

Dean Watson informed members that this semester has brought forward a lot of international initiatives and travel. An initiative with Turkey is being planned, Dean Watson went with the University Delegation to Thailand to celebrate our 75 years there and it continues to be fruitful. There is lots of promise for programming, professional development and other opportunities. Dean Watson also went to Kosovo with the project, "Transforming Leadership". There are many opportunities there as well. A recurring issue is around the effective use of technology, also, issues relating to special education are particularly pressing in Thailand and Kosovo, and leadership as well. Exploring ways of thinking about education systemically seems to be something that is needed and is a place where we could have an impact. The biggest thing for us is what does it look like? How do we find the funds to support this? The challenge is to get something going systemically so that when we go into places we have a school vision that will enable us to have the greatest impact.

Also, I would like keep our team of interim associate deans intact. I've been hearing from faculty and staff that constant turnover is a concern. I plan to address this by appointing our current interim associate deans to two-year positions beginning in the Fall, in addition to their interim year. The Faculty Affairs Committee supports this, with the caveat the some faculty may be concerned about the lack of a process. I understand that perspective, but we have a strong team, and with all that we have going on to bring cohesion to the school, I would like to keep this team in place. Also, we had a search for the new Dean of DEI position. Everyone did their

job and the process worked well. The different stakeholder groups, from the faculty and staff, to the Dean, to those across campus, had differences of opinions about what is needed. We will work on narrowing our focus about what is needed so that we staff the position in a way that intentionally meets our needs. At this point we have closed the search as we continue to work on this.

We are still moving forward with strategic initiatives. This will be discussed more at the Spring faculty meeting, and especially at the next all-school strategic planning meeting.

We continue to manage the budget downward. I think we will be fine as long as we are continually assessing the data regarding classes, enrollment, and load. This involves everyone in the school, as we have to do things a little differently. At the University-level Dean's meeting, we spoke of the financial outlook at the university level. We are expecting a shortfall at the university level with continued drops in enrollment. At the School of Education, we need to continue to look at marketing, moving forward with relevance and being excellent. Also, the university is looking more broadly at reimagining education #4 for their strategic plan. They are looking at a university partnership office that would support all of the unique campuses in their work with all the various school corporations. The concept is under development, as we work to understand what this would look like.

Regarding proposals for programs and proposals, the online Masters in International and Comparative Education was temporarily held up, as another campus expressed interest in participating, but that has since been resolved, and moved through. Also, the Improvement Science Certificate is moving forward.

II Old Business

None

III New Business

Policy Revision: Department Chair's Duties and Responsibilities (19.42)

M. Park Rogers explained to policy council that the Faculty Affairs Committee has been updating policies identified as needing updating during last year's policy review process. This policy was unnecessarily long and included outdated criteria. In talking with departments, it is clear that the duties and responsibilities vary quite a bit by department. We decided to streamline the policy for clarity, simplicity and to provide flexibility to departments.

Friendly amendment from the Faculty Affairs Committee. After the second paragraph, add: "department chair reviews should also be done in accordance with the policy on the review of academic administrators (03.28R)"

Discussion:

G. Delandshere asked if there is a current document outlining department chair responsibilities?

M. Park Rogers noted that a formal document isn't in place right now. This document replaces the old document that had an outdated job description. The language in this policy proposal allows departments to provide and update their job descriptions as needed.

Motion: Faculty Affairs Committee

Second: Anne Leftwich

Abstentions: None

Recusals: None

Approved Unanimously

SOE Bulletin Revision: Masters Policies- Using 6 Credits from a Previous Masters (19.43)

M. Boots explained that this came from a line in the bulletin which has been interpreted differently by different people. This language change clarifies that a degree must be conferred for the credits to be able to be transferred into a current masters program, and would not apply to dual degrees. Also, transferring in graduate coursework credit is never a problem, the 6 credit

limit is for coursework that was part of a conferred degree.

Discussion

D. DeSawal confirmed that students will still be able to transfer in coursework that was not a part of a conferred degree. This can be more than 6 credits.

Motion: Graduate Studies Committee

Second: J. Lester

Abstentions: None

Recusals: none

Approved Unanimously

SOE Bulletin Revision: EdD Policies- Residency (19.44)

S. Lubienski explained to members that some of the policies relating to EdDs have not been working well, particularly as more hybrid and online EdD programs are being offered. We had a few open forums with program representatives, students and Chad Lochmiller, who works with the Carnegie project for education doctorates. This expertise helped us to identify national trends. These conversations have informed the proposals for changes that the Graduate Studies Committee has put forth for today's meeting. This revision strives to alleviate the residency requirement in the traditional sense, which is a national trend among EdDs, while still encouraging deep student engagement in their programs through program-specific engagement requirements.

Discussion

None.

Motion: Graduate Studies Committee

Second: M. Boots

Abstentions: None

Recusals: None

Approved Unanimously

SOE Bulletin Revision: EdD Policies- EdD Coursework and Minor Requirements (19.45)

S. Lubienski explained that we are able to make these changes to the EdD Policies because they are governed by the School of Education and not the University Graduate School. While in the past, the School of Education has chosen to keep the requirements for the EdD and PhD programs aligned, recent national trends in online education and the growth of our online programs has led to a feeling that such alignment is no longer advantageous. This particular change focuses on striking out the requirement of a minor. Superintendents are pushing back on paying for minors for individuals they support through an EdD program. Also, some programs feel that it would be beneficial to have a course or two that supports the dissertation process, and helps students to complete the program once they hit the dissertation stage. Removing the minor would free up the possibility for adding other credits that could be more helpful to students. S. Lubienski noted that any changes here simply change the general requirements. To take advantage of these changes, departments would need to go through the program change approval process. M. Boots noted that if a program decides to remove their minor requirement, it would apply to all students within the program. Programs cannot exempt individual students from the minor requirement.

Discussion

D. Cross Francis asked what this would mean for students who wanted to put together a concentration of courses to constitute a minor. M. Boots explained that a minor is transcribed, while concentrations are not. S. Lubienski added that if a program does not require a minor, no minor would be transcribed, but the student could still take a concentration of courses if they choose to. There was a brief discussion of the number of EdD programs at the school. Every department has EdD programs.

Motion: Graduate Studies Committee

Second: J. Lester

Abstentions: None

Recusals: None

Approved Unanimously

SOE Bulletin Revision: EdD Policies- Forming a Research Committee (19.46)

S. Lubienski explained that most of the time, EdD students, who often are not here on campus and know a limited number of faculty, keep the same people from their advisory committee to their research committee. In the forums with EdD students, many students expressed frustration at the extra paperwork or confusion about the distinction between these committees. This proposed change moves from two separate committees, to one committee that stays with the student from the beginning, though the students have the option to change committee membership as needed.

Discussion

There was discussion about the representation of the minor in the committee. M. Boots explained that it is not required that a minor advisor be a part of the committee. The minor department can waive representation, and this waiver needs to be approved by the committee chair. In the case of a waiver request, the student would put forth the paperwork, and the minor department, as well as the committee chair, would sign off on the paperwork, so everyone has a voice. J. Damico asked when the committee is constituted. M. Boots explained that in submitting the program of studies form, students identify their committee. This usually happens at the end of the first year.

Motion: Graduate Studies Committee

Second: J. Lester

Abstentions: None

Recusals: None

Approved Unanimously

SOE Bulletin Revision: PhD Policy- Residency- AI, RA, GA (19.47)

M. Boots explained that this language comes directly from the University Graduate School bulletin. It reflects a practice that we have had for years, which has recently been put in writing in the University Graduate School Bulletin. Now we are making it explicit in the School of Education bulletin. It is important to note that this does not supersede program requirements or residency requirements for international students, etc. It is describing PhD requirements only.

Discussion

G. Delandshere expressed concerns that this is confounding residency requirements and full time enrollment status and that confusion may come from not stating that other, stricter enrollment requirements for residency may be required depending on a student's funding situation. D. Cross Francis recommended that a disclaimer be added to caution students from over-applying this statement. G. Gonzalez cautioned against specifically defining the specific ways the residency policy can be applied, as there will always be something that is missed. Even a general statement could cause more problems than it solves. Others expressed concern about the use of residency in this context versus residency in terms of in-state or out of state. Further discussion ensued regarding the fairness and rationale for allowing AIs, RAs, and GAs to take fewer credits as counting for residency requirements. There was also discussion about the semantics of requiring 6 hours to hold an assistantship, versus students with assistantships only needing to take 6 hours of credits to be considered enrolled full time. D. DeSawal expressed concerns about allowing 6 hours as full time because of how long it will take students to graduate if they take courses at this pace. Also, requiring fewer hours of those with assistantships isn't fair to those who are working full time but must still take 8 hours to meet the

residency requirements. D. DeSawal asked if two paragraphs could be created, one describing full time, and one describing minimum enrollment requirements for students to hold assistantships. M. Boots reiterated that the Graduate School language is describing 6 credit hours as meeting the full time residency requirement and is not defining the contract requirements for the position. D. Cross Francis reminded members that the intent of the proposal is to align with the University Graduate School language and asked members to think about whether or not this proposal is in alignment. Members reviewed the language in the University Graduate School Bulletin. Consensus emerged that while it might be important to consider how to make the requirement more fair, this language is consistent with the UGS Bulletin.

Motion: Graduate Studies Committee

Second: J. Lester

Abstentions: J. Munson

Recusals: None

Approved Unanimously

Adjourned at 2:37 PM