

01.22M

**MINUTES**

School of Education Policy Council  
 December 6, 2000  
 IUB - Room 2140  
 IUPUI - 3138G

**\*\*The following are summaries of speaker contributions\*\***

**Members Present:** Bichelmeyer, Burkhart, Buzzelli, Fisher, Enrique Galindo, Goodman, Klein, Levinson, McCarthy, Manset, Osgood, Rosario, St. John, Silk, Singh, Sutton, Wickemeyer-Hardy.

**Deans Present:** Brown, Cummings. **Guest:** Professor Tom Schwen, Professor Don Gray

I. Approval of the minutes for November 15, 2000 ([01.19M](#))

Minutes for November 15, 2000, were unanimously approved without objection.

II. Announcements and Discussions

a. Dean's Report

Dean Cummings gave the dean's report

-December 10 is the School of Education holiday dinner.

-Regarding outreach efforts, in the past month Dave Kinman, Ron Barnes, and Jose Rosario have been meeting with educational leaders in Indiana. The essence of the process was to collect public perceptions of the School of Education, as well as to learn what state leaders believe to be issues for the School to be considering. In the next few months there will be a number of similar focus groups conducted around the state.

b. Policy Council

McCarthy gave a brief update regarding the search for University Chancellor. Past feedback from other groups involved in the process has included praise for the current chancellor's connection with students and concerns regarding problems with structural arrangements.

The kinds of competencies that Policy Council members felt would be important for the new chancellor to possess include an understanding of budgets (both the political aspects and RCM process), an ability to communicate at many levels, a strong commitment to speaking out on behalf of issues important to the University (e.g. communicating with state legislators, writing op-ed pieces, etc.), a commitment to diversity, and a track record of civic courage. There was also a discussion with regard to the relative importance of the where the individual has worked (i.e. professional school, arts & sciences).

c. Visit from Chancellor's Search Committee Representatives

Professor Don Gray reported that the search committee conducted several similar conversations with equivalent groups across campus, and that two questions were commonly raised: "What kinds of qualities are we looking for" and "Where is the committee in this process?" In terms of important

qualities, he related the importance of past academic success and significant experience in complex academic organizations. In terms of where the committee is in the process, Professor Gray reported that it was beginning the second round review of applicants. However, he added that the committee is still open to receiving nominations, and encouraged Policy Council members to submit for consideration any individuals they felt would fit the position.

In further discussion by Policy Council regarding qualities important in a chancellor, aside from those already mentioned, it was recommended that the candidate be an individual who:

- Can address the faculty morale issue appropriately
- Honors collaboration
- Will be involved in fundraising
- Will be an advocate for the faculty, and for IU-Bloomington
- Has had some degree of international experience, or at least has shown a demonstrated appreciation of this issue.

The formal role requirements of this position were discussed (at the Bloomington campus and system-wide), as well as the non-negotiable job descriptors.

IUPUI Policy Council member reactions to this issue include an interest in hiring a chancellor who:

- Will understand the possibilities for collaboration, mutual support, and will be able to proactively go after that in whatever way they can.
- Possesses extraordinary skills as a diplomat, an ability to understand the complications of a core campus relationship, and also the opportunities there.
- Because of the core campus relationship, should have a more specific interest in terms of developing relationships with IUPUI.

### III. Old Business

#### a. General Education Proposal Update from Dean's Advisory Council (01.05)

Burkhart described the action of the Dean's Council on this item. The proposal was reviewed with the Dean on the 20<sup>th</sup> of November. The committee liked the proposal idea and, as long as all of the schools on campus agreed to one core list, the group agreed that it would accept the proposal. Additionally, the Dean's Council made a recommendation to include a foreign language requirement in the proposal. The implications regarding adding another requirement (i.e. foreign language) were discussed by Policy Council, and it was decided that the Policy Council couldn't make a decision on the issue, but could carry it on as an item to be discussed by other committees.

Cummings recommended that undergraduate advisors have a chance to look at the proposal and be encouraged to provide feedback, since they work with all the different programs, as well as with students. It was stated that the TEC has also been asked to review the proposal, along with the Teacher Ed. programs, and that, ultimately, the TEC will write the report.

A recommendation was made that a representative from the Dean's Advisory Council attend the TEC meeting, to report on the Council's response, and present the proposed language requirement.

Policy Council will review the General Education Proposal again in January, and then forward recommendations to the Campus Curriculum Committee on February 18<sup>th</sup>.

b. Faculty Work Load (01.11)

There was a motion by Osgood that the document regarding faculty workload be referred to departments and the Dean's Council for further discussion, and that these bodies then report back to the Policy Council after discussing the proposal. This motion was seconded.

Based on Policy Council comments and concerns, Schwen proposed the following modifications to the proposal:

1. Faculty deliberation (faculty collectively looking at their resources, looking at their program commitments, and asking how can we distribute this workload equitably, on the basis of reasonably stated criteria).
2. Ask departments to put forward their criteria (articulate their mechanism) for distributing faculty load.
3. The Dean's Office would receive this information, and further examine the individual workloads on the basis of any inequities that might develop and would examine the collective and economic viability.
4. Include reference to the School of Education merit review appeal process with regard to merit review decisions.

There was a general endorsement made to send the motion forward to departments after a revision, based on the changes proposed, by a subgroup of Policy Council. It will then be referred to departments for discussion, including those at IUPUI where, in the process, there will be a clarification of the 3-course load requirement.

All attending were in favor of referring the faculty work load document back to the committee for modifications.

c. Motion from Faculty Affairs Regarding Sexual Harassment Contact Persons (01.21)

This was an information item. The Faculty Affairs Committee wanted to inform Policy Council that they had passed a motion to limit the number of sexual harassment contact persons to three (one staff and two faculty) in response to a communication from the Office of Affirmative Action recommending that students not be designated as contact persons because of confidentiality and liability concerns. Members of Policy Council raised no objection to this action by the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:00pm