MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
September 25, 2019
1:00-3:00 p.m.
IUB - Room 2140

Members Present: J. Lester; P. Wakhungu; D. Cross-Francis; A. Brannan; J. Damico; E. Boling; Q. Wheeler-Bell; A. Maltese; A. Hackenberg; L. Rutkowski
Alternate Members Present: L. Carspecken; G. Ozogul
Student Members Present: E. Bloss; K. Helström
Staff Member Present: M. Boots
Dean's Staff Present: G. Buck; S. Lubienski; G. Delandshere; L. Watson; J. Shedd; C. Darnell
Guests: L. Gilman; K. Barton; D. DeSawal; V. Borden;

Approval of the Minutes from April 24, 2019 Meeting **(19.57M)**
    Motion: L. Carspecken
    Second: J. Damico
    Motion Passed with 13 in favor; 0 opposed; 2 abstentions; 0 recusals

Approval of the Minutes from April 24, 2019 Organizational meeting **(20.04M)**
    Motion: E. Boling
    Second: D. Cross-Francis
    Motion Passed with 13 in favor; 0 opposed; 2 abstentions; 0 recusals

1. Announcements and Discussions

   Agenda Committee
   IUB SOE Faculty Meeting is November 1, 2019
   FYI: Updated committee membership and ex-officio changes **(20.02R)**
   FYI: Charges to Policy Council committees for 2019-2020 **(20.06)**
       A. Brannan asked for clarification about how changes to the International Programs Committee will impact committee functions. Dean Watson clarified that he and A. Benitez are now ex officio and will call the committee to meet to discuss its future. G. Delandshere added that there are notes from a recent meeting with faculty regarding international engagement which she would like to share with the committee. A brief discussion ensued about how to move forward with committee work.
   FYI: Gayle Buck Review Committee Finalized **(20.07)**
   FYI: Call for nominations for Armstrong chair closes today

   Diversity Topic: *Carl Darnell* and the SOE Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
   C. Darnell informed faculty that he has been working with the Dean and Executive Associate Dean to identify priorities from the faculty diversity plan document. The office will focus on four priorities: (1) evaluate the building and how it supports the culture and climate that we are striving for; (2)

evaluate how our marketing materials and online presence relate to our goals in the diversity plan; (3) develop informal networks by scheduling diversity-focused lunches for underrepresented groups in the SOE. The fourth priority is outside the scope of the faculty diversity plan, and focuses on student issues. The Committee on Diversity is working on policies to formally establish an Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion to support students. C. Darnell is meeting with departments and the Associate Deans to discuss how to work together to support the priority goals of the faculty diversity plan as well as other objectives related to DEI that are not a part of the diversity plan.

Discussion

D. Cross Francis asked if there is a need for an expanded diversity plan. C. Darnell advocated for a plan that also includes students and staff. A. Maltese asked if there are additional supports that are needed to accomplish the goals. C. Darnell said that supports would be helpful. He has received some funds to support some student assistantships that will be very helpful. A full time staff position would be ideal. Dean Watson noted that the staff in the Dean's Office are available as support. J. Lester noted that the diversity plan is a living document and asked if there is a process to ensure that the plan is reviewed and updated annually and if the committee is planning to bring forward an updated plan. E. Boling added that this plan was developed as a faculty plan under a directive from campus but that the committee that developed the plan saw it as expanding to include the entire community down the road. She urged this approach over developing new plans.

Dean's Report

Dean Watson presented the meeting agenda from the Academic Leadership Meeting where the importance of the American Association of Universities (AAU) was discussed. This is an elite group of institutions (60) and membership is evaluated every year. Being a member is important for university prestige.

The Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs has asked for criteria/policies around lecturer rank promotion to Teaching Professor this year.

Regarding the Regional Academic Health Center, it appears that the School of Education is only taking on a small role which is related to arts education. This is a great opportunity for our programs in counseling and special education, among others. Dean Watson would like to see more faculty involvement in this opportunity.

Enrollment trends are being examined. We have no university policy about course caps and cancelations, and he recommends we monitor for courses with chronic under enrollment.

Student suicide is a concern. Note that if you are concerned about someone, you can have IU PD conduct a wellness check. Addressing suicidal students is something that has come up. If you are concerned about a student or a faculty, you can ask for a wellness check. More information on this topic will be shared through the departments.

Dean Watson presented a chart on strategic initiatives. There are seven strategic priorities that come from this document. A one page document will outline these further. At a retreat in May the long range strategic planning team, the leadership team and others developed a document that tied objectives, timelines and champions to each of the strategic initiatives. This work informed the one page document outlining our current strategic priorities and how we are addressing them.

2. Old Business- None

3. New Business
   Sunset 11.29 FMLA for Graduate Students **(20.08)**
   > **Motion from:** Graduate Studies Committee
   > **Second:** E. Boling

M. Boots explained that there were two redundant policies. The older policy referenced FMLA which is a federal policy. We would like to sunset the older, policy that inappropriately references FMLA.

Motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions, no recusals

Name change proposal for Curriculum Studies tracks **(20.09)**

Motion from: Graduate Studies Committee

Second: D. Cross-Francis

K. Barton explained that the name change better reflects how the field has evolved, what students are learning and also what graduates will do in future careers. This change also makes the program more searchable on the web.

Discussion

E. Boling asked if this track name is listed on a transcript. M. Boots confirmed that tracks are listed. Discussion ensued about the routing process for this change. G. Delandshere asked for clarification about whether this is paired with a content area? K. Barton noted that the track is for those who want to prepare teachers at the university level. Some focus on early childhood, some on multicultural education, pedagogy, while some do focus on a content area. V. Borden noted that some programs place the content areas in content-focused programs. Further discussion ensued about the nature of the teaching that this program develops. J. Lester asked if this name change is reflective of the way peer institutions are naming their program. K. Barton said it is.

Motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions, no recusals

Proposal to end GRE requirement in selected programs **(20.10)**

Motion: Graduate Studies Committee

Second: P. Wakhungu

D. DeSawal provided background information on criticisms of the GRE in admissions decisions. As a result, there has been a growth in the number of programs dropping the GRE as a requirement, including our competitors in the Midwest. These programs have reported increases in their application numbers. Because much of this research is coming out of the higher education field, students interested in pursuing a higher degree in higher education are choosing not to apply to programs that still have the GRE as an entrance requirement because they see it as a sign that the program does not reflect/follow current research. When this was discussed at an ELPS department meeting, other programs in ELPS also wanted to remove the GRE requirement. We will encourage students who have GRE scores to report them, because this is a requirement for many fellowships and having these scores impacts our ranking, but we propose removing the GRE from the rubric for evaluating students. V. Borden noted that he is on the GRE Technical Advisory Committee with ETS and the use of GRE scores has been discussed within that group. He went on to describe the various ways that programs use GRE scores inappropriately in the screening process. The organization is looking at other ways to screen students for admissions, but they recognize that the test is a barrier to many students, particularly students of color, and is becoming less relevant. In this proposal, the GRE will continue to be used for international students. The graduate school does not require the GRE, they leave it up to the schools/departments.

Discussion

L. Rutkowski noted that if we are using GRE scores incorrectly, that is our problem, not a test problem. She also asked what the data is that this is a barrier. V. Borden noted that the increase in applications among programs that have dropped the GRE requirement is some data. L. Rutkowski also asked how students are doing in programs that don't require the GRE. D. DeSawal noted that there are other aspects of the rubric that we can change which can provide the evidence that we need to understand student potential. E. Boling noted that when IST put out a certificate that did not require a GRE, and then created a pathway where students with a certain GPA could enroll in the masters

program without the GRE, there were a lot of enrollments. Further discussion ensued about the reporting aspect of GRE scores for ranking. A. Maltese asked why this isn't being discussed at the School level. If this could help enrollment, and is backed by research, shouldn't we explore this? S. Lubienski noted that the value of the scores are very program-specific and so it would make more sense to make the GRE requirement program specific. Further discussion ensued about the importance of additional screening tools and concerns about potential biases in any screening tool developed. There was also discussion about how the HESA program currently uses the GRE. Q. Wheeler-Bell noted that with the program emphasis on social justice, removing the GRE barrier puts forward a more consistent message. G. Ozogul asked why it is required for international students. V. Borden noted that it is an indicator of language proficiency. Additional discussion addressed the use of GREs for fellowships and the need for clear language and additional marketing that communicates the value of submitting GRE scores optionally. S. Lubienski asked if future program proposals should also come to Policy Council individually. E. Boling noted that future proposals would likely not garner such a long conversation and there is value in knowing what programs are deciding to do. M. Boots noted that in the US News and World Reports ranking process there is the option of indicating that we consider, but not require the GRE.

> **Motion passed** with all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions, no recusals

Revision to PhD minor in Counseling Psychology (**20.11**)
> **Motion:** Graduate Studies Committee
> **Second:** A. Brannan

L. Gilman explained that the proposal formalizes the more prescriptive program being required of School Psychology majors who want this minor. The list of course options is more restrictive.
Discussion
G. Delandshere asked why this is not just being addressed by advisors. Discussion ensued about whether this represents two different minors. L. Gilman noted that the list of courses is the same for all minors, but the choice of courses on that list is more prescribed for the School Psychology majors. M. Boots noted that this is common practice among Ed.D. and Ph.D. students. J. Lester asked for clarification that there are not two different sets of courses for the different majors. All majors have one list of courses to pick from to create the minor, but that school psychology majors have a more prescribed selection of courses within that list. E. Boling noted it might be better to have the language start with the more restrictive program and then say all others can take these classes. A. Brannan asked what problem this is designed to solve. L. Gilman explained that there is a lot of overlap between school psychology and counseling psychology because of APA requirements. By prescribing the most relevant courses for school psychology majors we avoid the double counting problem, and we ensure the course work enhances their learning program. J. Lester supported swapping the order that the information is being provided, putting the requirement for School Psychology minors at the top.

> FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: To begin this program bulletin text with the section "Ph.D. in School Psychology Students…" followed by the section that begins, "Students not majoring in the Ph.D. in School Psychology…" with all other text to remain intact.
> **Motion passed** with all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions, no recusals

Revision to EdD Committee Policy in Graduate Bulletin (**20.12**)
> **Motion:** Graduate Studies Committee
> **Second:** A. Hackenberg

S. Lubienski reminded members of the changes made to this EdD Committee Policy last year. As this approved change was implemented, the need for greater clarity became apparent. This proposed change to language addresses these issues.

Motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions, no recusals

New policy proposal: Training Requirement for Teaching Online (**20.13**)
   Motion from: Graduate Studies Committee
   Second: M. Boots
S. Lubienski reviewed the proposal and noted that people with extensive prior experience can be exempted. S. Lubienski explained that this felt like more of an HR issue than a Policy Council issue. This policy would ensure our teachers teaching online have received some training at some point in their careers and it would help us answer the question from US News and World Reports questionnaire for online programs about the number of hours of training we require for instructors. Right now we report 0.
Discussion
J. Lester asked for confirmation that "other" means adjuncts. There is a concern that adjuncts are already not well paid, and this would be an additional unpaid burden. G. Ozugul asked about the reporting. Do we report the number of hours logged into the training module? S. Lubienski explained that the School needs to report the number of hours required. It would be up to the departments to decide on how to document the fulfillment of the requirement. A. Brannan asked if the module focuses on pedagogy or logistics. If it is pedagogy, shouldn't we be training for pedagogy for any teaching format? Q. Wheeler-Bell noted that this policy has quite a bit of flexibility as to the how and when the training occurs. With this flexibility it shouldn't be such a burden. Further discussion ensued about how to support adjuncts with meeting this requirement. E. Boling noted that the lack of a strong relationship between instructor and student in an online space makes poor online teaching more damaging. Students are less forgiving. A. Brannan brought up the exceptions process. What would that look like? S. Lubienski explained that this would be addressed at the department level. J. Lester noted that having department chairs interpret the implementation of this policy language creates equity issues, as different chairs have different interpretations/requirements. S. Lubienski asked how often we hire people with no online teaching experience? Q. Wheeler-Bell noted that this policy would hold departments more accountable for making sure that the people they hire are set up to be successful. Allowing the training to occur while you are engaged in your first teaching experience could be beneficial. A. Maltese noted that if we want to address quality, then exemptions may not be the way to go. Also, we should make sure that what we are asking people to do is effective. Further discussion ensued about placing additional burdens on adjuncts and ensuring that our online courses are providing the best experience for students.

   FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Policy reworded to read: "All faculty and other instructors who teach online courses in the SOE are required to have 10 hours of training in online instruction. Department chairs may grant full or partial exemption of the 10 hour requirement for instructors with equivalent preparation. Department or program area professional development that helps prepare instructors for teaching online courses may also count towards the 10 hrs."

   Motion passed with 12 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention, no recusals

Discussion on November faculty meeting
Dean Watson explained that he would like the faculty to bring forth discussion items at the faculty meeting.
This discussion was tabled due to time constraints and will be moved to the next meeting agenda.

Meeting adjourned 3:18pm