

MINUTES  
POLICY COUNCIL  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
March 27, 2002 1:00 - 3:00 p.m.  
School of Education  
IUB Room 2140  
IUPUI Room 3138E

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

Members Present: Bichelmeyer, Brantlinger, Buzzelli, Carter, Delandshere, Hossler, Levinson, Odom, Peng, Silk, Williamson. Alternates Present: D'Ambrosio. Dean's Staff Present: Brown, Cummings, Gonzalez, Lambdin, Murtadha. Staff Representative: Wickemeyer-Hardy. Student Representatives: Frazen (undergraduate). Guests: Borders, Chafel, Knollman, St. John, Zuppan.

I. Approval of the Minutes from February 27, 2002 Meeting ([02.29M](#))

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

The amended minutes for February 27, 2002, were unanimously approved.

II. Announcements and Discussions

A. Dean's Report

Item 1: State Funding

The legislature adjourned without approving a tax reform package. The Governor is expected to announce further budget cuts tomorrow. We do not expect to see significant new reductions for higher education. The long-term tax code is still to be reviewed.

Item 2: Strategic Plan for the University

At the Deans' meeting this morning, the Chancellor affirmed that the strategic planning process for the university for next year will require that each school submit copies of their strategic plan for input into the campus-wide plan.

The School of Education Long Range Planning Committee is working on the strategic plan and hopes to have a draft by the end of the year.

Item 3: Diversity

The Chancellor and the campus have taken a position on the diversity issue surrounding the Woodburn Hall Mural. General response to the diversity plans she announced for addressing the student concerns has been positive. The Chancellor underscored the need for leadership on diversity issues by all of us. The School of Education is already seen as a leader in diversity and we have an opportunity now to influence the way the campus is going to address the issue.

B. Agenda Committee

The Spring Faculty Meeting will be held from 9:30-11 am March 29, 2002 via videoconference in the Auditorium in Wright Building and 3138E School of Education at Indianapolis

All faculty and staff are invited to attend for the recognition of faculty and staff awards.

III. New Business

A. Draft of Amended Constitution [\(02.13\)](#)

The Agenda Committee requests that a special meeting of the Policy Council be called on April 10, 2002, from 1-3 pm to discuss the draft of the amended Constitution.

After the April 10, 2002 meeting, there will be a meeting to vote to amend the constitution. Amendments will be considered section by section and any not agreed on will be sent back or postponed until next year.

A special faculty meeting will be held on April 22, 2002 at 8 am, for discussion of the draft of the amended Constitution. Voting requires a 25% quorum of faculty for the discussion to stand. Then ballots will be mailed out with voting until May 3, 2002. The recommended amendments will pass if 2/3 of those who vote are in support (not 2/3 of quorum).

Dean Gonzalez clarified that the Policy Council is not approving the changes to the Constitution. The Policy Council approves the changes for being forwarded to the faculty for vote/approval.

Action: The Policy Council will have a special meeting on April 10, 2002 to discuss the draft of the amendments to the Constitution.

It will be announced at the Spring Faculty Meeting on March 29, 2002, that a special faculty meeting will be held on April 22, 2002, to discuss the amendments to the Constitution. Videoconferencing will be arranged.

B. Promotion and Tenure Criteria [\(02.30\)](#) [\(02.31\)](#) [\(96.18\)](#) (a 30 minute limit was set for this item)

Chafel, as chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee summarized the suggested changes to the criteria. The suggested changes are indicated in bold in the distributed document. Chafel asked that questions be asked by section.

Preamble

There were no questions regarding the Preamble.

A: 1: Three Criterion Areas

Williamson stated that the terms "adequate" and "outstanding" that are used are not consistent with the terms used under the criteria. Later in the document the terms "satisfactory" and "excellent" are used. There also needs to be consistency with the Faculty handbook.

Brantlinger stated that information that is not appropriately cited should be left out if people can't go to the original source and find the information. (Referring to the Boyer citation, not the Faculty Handbook.)

Bichelmeyer asked if members wanted to send the document back at this point for clarifications. There should be consistent language with the criteria at the university level. In addition, the most current version should be consulted.

#### A: 2: Definitions

Buzzelli stated that we need to check the document to see that there is consistency in the use of the words—"satisfactory", "excellent", "outstanding", "adequate".

Williamson noted that the balanced case is not mentioned in this section.

Peng responded that the intent was to consider the balanced case not as a separate criterion area, but as a way in which the overall work is integrated. She also noted inconsistency in the use of promotion and tenure, particularly in the headings. After page 6 the concepts are separated.

Cummings clarified that a faculty member cannot be promoted to tenure without promotion to associate. However, a person can be hired at the associate level without tenure, in which case it is separate. He also suggested that in light of the time constraints for today, the committee should focus on three controversial areas: redefinition of the teaching category; the importance of externally funded research and development; and that the candidate for promotion and tenure identify 2-4 publications and draw attention to their research statement. In addition the wording of the balanced case should be reviewed.

#### B: 1: Teaching

Bichelmeyer noted that the section on teaching is entirely new.

Frazen voiced concern with the wording that faculty "are better" at evaluation than students.

After some discussion, it was suggested to delete this section and the first part of the one following. The section would then begin with "teaching is a complex process".

#### B: 2: Research and Development

Hossler asked for clarification regarding the highlighting of 2-4 articles for research and development. For external reviewers to evaluate the dossier they need to have an understanding of what it is supposed to represent.

Bichelmeyer proposed that the paragraph be moved to the top of part C and a section regarding the candidate's statement be covered at that point. Then it can be specified which area (teaching, service, or research) is being highlighted.

A discussion on the articles and things to be weighed for consistency ensued.

In regards to electronic publications, Bichelmeyer commented that the criteria of the number of "hits" is not a quality indicator. Citations are evidence of quality of publications for electronic publications just as they are in other publications.

Action: Delete number of "hits". The section will be moved up with the other criteria.

Delandshere questioned the need for external proposals as a separate requirement.

Chafel responded that this identifies external proposals as one type of research and development.

Peng further clarified that this was added in response to many emails from faculty and written letters.

Dean Gonzalez replied that faculty who are successful in external research competition are viewed differently in terms of their scholarship at practically every level of their review, than those who are not. He affirmed that he would like it to be very explicit that both level of effort and success at getting funding are important for tenure and promotion.

Hossler asked if the faculty at the Columbus campus have been taken into consideration in discussion of the proposed changes.

Cummings stated that Columbus has been considered. Within the document it is stated that the worth of the individual is judged in the context of the program. It is his understanding that certain things need to be highlighted to promotion and tenure committees each year when different candidates come up.

#### B: 4: Balanced Case

Buzzelli said a statement of the definition of “excellent” and “outstanding” should precede discussion of the balanced case.

Bichelmeyer summarized that there is a need for clearer guidelines. She suggested discussing the balanced case after we have identified what “adequate” and “outstanding” are. She also noted that what is currently in the document differs very much from the university handbook. The university handbook has a level called “distinction” and a balanced case requires demonstration of “distinction” in all 3 of the areas.

Buzzelli said that he brought this up because he wasn’t sure what information goes out to external reviewers. When reviewers get information on the balanced case it may be unclear to them what that means.

Cummings responded that the cases that went out to external reviewers last year received the statement from the Policy Council on what the balanced case is. This year some people actually said that helped in making the decisions.

Brantlinger thought that there was a 3-point scale—“outstanding”, “excellent”, and “adequate”. The balanced case then is having “excellent” in three areas or “excellent” in at least two areas and “adequate” in one area. Collapsing to only two areas doesn’t leave room for the balanced case. It should be a 3-point scale.

Levinson agreed that it is not currently consistent with the intent of the balanced case to define a balance of all three areas.

Bichelmeyer suggested that this be made consistent with the three levels at the university level. The terms need to be clearly defined and then the balanced case moved after that section. Then we need to clearly define what a balanced case is. She moved to send the document back to the Faculty Affairs Committee for changes that have been discussed.

The motion was seconded by Cummings and passed.

Discussion on the Third Year Review [\(02.32\)](#), and statements regarding Lecturer/Senior Lecturer Appointments [\(02.33\)](#), and Clinical Appointments [\(02.34\)](#), was moved to the next meeting.

C. Course Re-validation for Undergraduate and Initial Certification [\(02.19\)](#)

Following a brief discussion, Brantlinger made a motion to accept the proposal as submitted. The motion was seconded by Delandshere and was approved.

D. Operating Procedures for the Teacher Education Council [\(02.23\)](#)

Bichelmeyer moved to approve the operating procedures for TEC. Cummings seconded the motion with the stipulation that there be clarification in the wording of the composition. After discussion, The Operating Procedures for the Teacher Education Council were approved with one amendment. Under "Composition of the Council", add the statement, "one of whom is a member of the Policy Council" immediately following "seven School of Education faculty".

E. CAC's Request Regarding Revised Procedures for Student Appeal Hearings [\(02.24\)](#)

The item was not discussed at this time.

F. IST Specialists Degree in Education [\(02.25\)](#)

Bichelmeyer presented information regarding the proposal. The degree program is an update of the previous EDS degree. It has been approved by the Graduate Studies Committee. It is now up for approval by the Policy Council.

Brantlinger moved to accept the proposal. Bichelmeyer seconded the motion.

Following discussion, the proposal was passed by the Policy Council with one noted change: The second bullet point which originally read, "Sixty-five (65) credit hours, 35 of which must be taken at the Bloomington or Indianapolis campuses", was shortened to read, "Sixty-five (65) credit hours".

G. Post-Master's Certification on Institutional Research [\(02.26\)](#)

The program proposal has been approved by the Graduate Studies Committee and forwarded to the Policy Council for action.

St. John presented information regarding the proposal for Post-Master's Certification on Institutional Research.

Levinson moved to accept the proposal as presented. The motion was seconded by Carter and approved by the Policy Council.

H. Request from Staff Council and Dean's Advisory Council regarding TV [\(02.27\)](#)

After discussion, a vote was taken to table the motion on this proposal until the next Policy Council meeting. The proposal was tabled.

IV. Old Business

There was no old business to be discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:13 pm.