

**MINUTES**

School of Education Policy Council

April 25, 2001

IUB – Room 2140

IUPUI – 3138G

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

**Members Present:** Carter, Lambdin, Levinson, Manset, McCarthy, Osgood, Rosario, St. John, Schwen, Singh, Sutton, Wickemeyer-Hardy. **Deans Present:** Brown, Cummings, Gonzalez, Wilcox. **Guests:** Professors Tom Huberty, Bonk, Chafel, Hossler,

I. Approval of the minutes for March 21, 2001 (01.39M)

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the minutes.

Minutes for March 21, 2001, were unanimously approved.

II. Announcements and Discussions

a. Dean's Report

Item 1: The Indiana General Assembly, this session, approved an alternative certification bill, which was embedded in the Charter School bill. This comes from a perception among legislators that if someone has life experiences and strong subject area preparation, that is probably all they need to teach. There are 38 other states that have alternative certification on the books now, and it is a movement that will continue to grow. We are challenged, as never before, to show what our graduates gain as a result of their teacher preparation experiences here. We have to do everything we can to document that value-added benefit. The unit assessment system we are now developing gives us an opportunity to do just that. The passage of the alternative certification bill underscores the urgency before us to be able not only to develop a very good and effective unit assessment system, but to do whatever we need to continue to improve our programs, and ensure that when we measure our graduates' performance we can say with confidence that our students are able to perform at a higher level than had they not had teacher education experience. These issues will be addressed at the spring faculty meeting.

Item 2: Our graduate programs are ranked again this year by U.S. News and World Report as among the top 15 in the country. It is significant that Indiana University remained in the top tier group, even when U.S. News and World Report changed the data elements that they use. That's a function of the reputation, and of the quality we have in our graduate programs when we are compared to the other major research universities. This leads to the question: How do we balance our undergraduate mission with our position as a top tier graduate school of education? The strategic plan is important in this

sense, because it will help us to focus our priorities, and identify what we need to do to sustain that balance of quality.

Dean Gonzalez thanked Tom Huberty and the Long Range Planning Committee for their hard work. The reports they have distilled are now on the web, available for faculty viewing (the long-range plan and supporting documents related to the goals). The next phase is to get input from everyone, and hopefully next fall to engage in the work of prioritizing some of the recommendations that will surface as a result of these discussions.

b. Agenda Committee

1. Faculty Meeting

The Spring Faculty Meeting is Friday, April 27<sup>th</sup>, during which there will be a discussion of the long-range plan.

The faculty retreat will be at McCormick's Creek State Park, on Friday, October 12, 2001. One of the charges of the Policy Council will be to help set the retreat's agenda. Several individuals have accepted the opportunity to collaborate with next year's steering committee as a part of a retreat-planning group. They include Burrello, Winnikates, Love, and Sutley.

III. New Business

a. Reports of Standing Committees (Provided in hard copy for the Policy Council)

Committees submitting reports (and those presenting the reports):

- Teacher Education Council (Thomas Gregory)
- Research and Development (Genevieve Manset)
- Budgetary Affairs / Faculty Affairs (Judith Chafel)
- Committee on Teaching (Tom Schwen)
- International Programs (Margaret Sutton)
- Constituent Advocacy (Curt Bonk)
- Diversity (Charles Reigeluth)

b. Report from the Long Range Planning Committee

The corrected version of the long-range plan is now on the web, and will be discussed at the Spring Faculty Meeting. The five goal committee reports are also on the web.

The committee had three tasks this year:

- Doing the review of Teacher Education (suite 1000)
- Completing the long range planning report
- Reviewing the Constitution

The committee completed these in installments; and the review has been completed, as well as has the long-range plan. The report on the Constitution still needs to be completed. Because the long-range plan is not yet officially approved, the committee deferred the task of revising the Constitution. However, the Long Range Planning Committee will meet next week. At that time it will make some recommendations regarding how the Constitution should be changed. The recommendations will be given to the Policy Council, and put to a vote. The Long Range Planning Committee recognizes that the Constitution needs to be adjusted, due to the omission of the Teacher Education Council.

Dean Gonzalez pointed out that the long-range planning document was very similar in format to what he had envisioned. The Policy Council discussed various processes that could be used to prioritize goals. Schwen brought up the fact that what could be added to the process is some kind of unifying vision and mission statement that would be built on top of it.

Wilcox agreed that the long-range planning document reflects the kinds of concerns that IUPUI has, as well.

St. John solicited a recommendation for an undergraduate student to be on the retreat planning committee (there is already a graduate student member). A discussion of how to go about this was undertaken.

A motion was made to encourage full and open discussion at both the Spring Faculty Meeting and the planning-oriented retreat in the fall, to set priorities (time frames, and types of actions that are needed).

The motion was seconded, and all were in favor.

c. Policy Regarding Approval of Human Subjects Forms in School of Ed (01.43)

Christy Borders is the current human subjects compliance specialist, and has done a lot of work improving the applications, and the relations between the Human Subjects Office and the School of Education. However, there are still a large number of applications, particularly graduate student applications, coming back with major problems-even though faculty members have signed them. The committee that Sam Odom is heading recommended to the graduate programs committee that a new policy be passed. They recommend that “graduate students who conduct research that utilizes human subjects must have their human subjects protocol reviewed and signed by the human subjects compliance specialist (Christy) in the School of Education, prior to having the faculty sponsor sign the form, and prior to submitting it to the human subjects committee (the IRB)”. This would allow Christy to check for compliance issues; thus relieving faculty members from the burden of checking for those kinds of things, which are technical in nature, and allowing them to focus on the substance of the research.

Concerns about having a single person as a screen (one person who has to “sign off” before you can go forward) were raised.

Schwen recommended that the policy be put in place for a specific period of time, in order to collect some data, and that there be a review of the performance some time during the year next year.

Sutton recommended an appeal mechanism be included in the policy.

A motion was made to endorse the policy with the following two amendments.

Amendment 1: The policy decision is to be reviewed after a year (to determine whether it makes sense to continue with the practice).

Amendment 2: In cases of dispute between the compliance specialist and faculty supervisor, the faculty supervisor has the last say.

The motion, including both amendments, was seconded and approved.

d. New Programs for Informatics Majors & Pre-Service Teachers (01.44)

The program was passed by the TEC and is in remonstrance.

IV. Old Business

a. Faculty Workload (01.33)(01.34)(01.41)(01.42)

St. John summarized the feedback to the Policy Council on this issue and gave a brief history on the process. In general, the comments have been positive. There were two substantive comments that stood out: One states that there should be an academic basis for teaching appointments (from ELPS), and the second (from Language Education) highlighted the importance of re-emphasizing the 2-2 load, with one credit per term release for research as a part of the policy statement.

It was mentioned that IUPUI’s base load is different (3-3) in the text of the policy. They have a different situation regarding dissertation load, so the workload policy presented today is not applicable.

Amendment 1: Add the language to include a base, 2-2 load.

The amendment was seconded, but not approved.

Amendment 2 (From ELPs): To add an additional bullet, which says that the primary criterion in assigning faculty teaching load should be the academic integrity of the program.

Moved and seconded.

The interpretation of this amendment was discussed, with some feeling that it might be confusing and hard to measure, and others believing that the idea of maintaining academic integrity is already embedded in the base policy.

The question was called, including the amendment as a part of the policy. The motion was not accepted.

All were in favor of the base policy.

McCarthy wanted to see in the minutes a “thank you” to Ed St. John for all of his hard work this year.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:25pm