

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
September 25, 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: Alexander, Barman, Bichelmeyer, Chafel, D’Ambrosio, Dilworth, Hossler, Kloosterman, Lewison, McCarthy, Ochoa. **Dean’s Staff Present:** Cummings, Gonzalez, Murtadha. **Staff Representative:** Wickemeyer-Hardy. **Student Representative:** Hanks and Singh. **Guest:** Martha Zuppann.

I. Approval of the Minutes from April 24, 2002 Meetings ([02.44M](#) and [03.04M](#))

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the minutes as written. The minutes for April 24, 2002 were unanimously approved.

II. Announcements and Discussions

A. Report from Dean Gonzalez

1. Visit by US Secretary of Education, Rod Paige

Dean Gonzalez extended his gratitude to all who were involved and participated in the visit of United States Secretary of Education, Rod Paige. Dean Gonzalez apologized for the short notice regarding Secretary Paige’s visit and further explained that due to security reasons, only those who had sent an RSVP were permitted to attend the presentation. Secretary Paige’s presentation is archived on the Education website at www.education.indiana.edu and is also available on VHS through Sarah Baumgart (baumgar@indiana.edu).

2. NCATE Pre-Visit

School of Education is up for accreditation review this year during the first week of November and is hosting a pre-visit, scheduled for early September. Frank Meyers, Dean Emeritus of the College of Education at the University of Nevada, Reno and Melba Spooner, faculty member of the School of Education of North Carolina, Charlotte are co-chairs for the review. The NCATE institutional report will be available on the web and in hard copy and should be reviewed by faculty in preparation for the NCATE visit.

3. President Brand’s State of the University Speech on September 24, 2002

Emphasized the call for research and presented 6 strategic initiatives to be emphasized over the next 5 years:

- excellence in undergraduate education
- advance diversity and accessibility

- State engagement
- focus on research with emphasis on life sciences
- ensure that all of IU is focused on same goals
- improve research base

4. Chancellor Brehm's Strategic Plan Initiative

The Chancellor has proposed initiatives that align with President Brand's strategic plan for the University. The proposed initiatives will be guided by a committee of University faculty, staff, and others to identify academic priorities and broader University priorities. These priorities will then be used to allocate funds received through the special tuition increase approved by the University Trustees for next year. Some of these funds will be utilized to reduce the student-faculty ratio, increase graduate fellowships, and financial aid for students. The Chancellor is then asking the Deans to submit proposals for how the additional funds could be used within the schools.

Input and active participation into the process of forming the initiatives proposed by the Chancellor and in determining how the funds will be allocated, is essential and incredibly advantageous for the School of Education. The School of Education has put forth nominations for seats on the committee; however, the committee has not yet been selected by the Chancellor. Priorities are scheduled to be finalized by March 15, 2003.

5. University Committee on Pre-K through 16 Seamless System of Education

President Brand has asked Dean Gonzalez to Chair a University committee that will focus on identifying ways to create a Pre K-16 seamless system of education for the State and that may serve as a model for the entire nation. The committee will be creating policy recommendations, through collaboration between the University and community schools, in creating a seamless system of education.

6. Budget

The School of Education begins this school year in good economic health. The School has met enrollment and financial targets and direct returns in research have increased. However, the state economy is still unstable. Last year the state withheld cash payments to the University in the amount of 56 million dollars. Due to the current economic state, it is possible that this budget cut will not be repaid to the University this year.

B. Agenda Committee

1. The Fall Faculty Meeting

The Fall Faculty Meeting will be held on October 18, 2002 from 9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. in the Wright Building Auditorium and via videoconference in room 3138E School of Education at Indianapolis.

2. Faculty Retreat

The faculty retreat is being held September 26 through 27 at the Abe Martin Lodge, Brown County State Park.

3. Policy Council /Agenda Committee Dates and Times ([03.01](#))

The dates and times for the Policy Council and Agenda Committee meetings for Fall 2002 and Spring 2003 were reviewed.

4. Policy Council Members ([03.00](#))

The list of Policy Council members and alternates for Fall 2002 and Spring 2003 was reviewed.

5. Review of Administrators ([96.09](#))

Cummings spoke to the dated policy for review of administrators. The Faculty Affairs Committee will review the dated policy and bring it back to the Policy Council for potential changes. Some of the titles will be updated to coincide with current titles.

There are four department chairs that are up for review this year. The Agenda Committee reviewed names to get initial list and suggested substitutions.

6. Call for Student Nominations to Serve on Committees

Students are needed for several Policy Council committees. Recommendations should be sent to Judith Chafel (chafel@indiana.edu). Students referred will be assigned to committees by the Agenda Committee and will then be brought back to Policy Council for approval.

7. Core Campus Committee

Cummings explained the history of the proposed Core Campus Committee. This committee was passed last year by the Policy Council but was later dissolved when decided by the faculty to eliminate the committee in the Constitution. The initial Core Campus Committee held off further inquiries until this year.

8. Visiting Scholar

Ma Yonghong, a visiting scholar from Yunnan University, will be sitting in on the Policy Council meetings this year. He is interested in faculty governance in American universities.

III. New Business

A. Approval of Policy Council Committee Members ([03.02R](#))

Murtadha asked permission for the Policy Council to approve two IUPUI colleagues to be a part of the Graduate Studies Committee in order to replace Pat Rogan who is on sabbatical and Jeff Anderson who is rotating off of the committee. Names will be submitted to Judith Chafel and brought to the next meeting as an action item.

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the Policy Council Committee members and was passed unanimously with the stipulation that recommendations for two IUPUI faculty to be added to the Graduate Studies Committee will be addressed in the next meeting.

C. Dean's Review Survey

1. Chafel explained that the University requires that Dean Gonzalez be reviewed in his third year. This assessment will be administered in the form of a survey that is made up of 10 standard items and 3 to 7 unit specific items. The unit specific items will be developed by an elected committee decided on by Policy Council. The committee then will work with the Center for Survey Research to develop the items appropriately. The items are then submitted to the Nominations Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council for approval. The survey will be administered during the Fall semester of this year.

Action: Ed McClellan, Terry Ochoa, and Chris Leland were recommended to compose the committee to comprise the unit specific survey items.

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve Ed McClellan, Terry Ochoa, and Chris Leland to stand as the members of the Committee for the Dean's Review Survey. The motion was passed unanimously.

2. The issue of who should complete the Dean's Survey was raised. The Dean suggested that although this is a Bloomington procedure, that IUPUI be included in the survey since they are a part of our core campus.

The question of who should complete the survey was furthered by attempting to determine to what degree clinical, adjunct, professional, clerical, and support staff should be included in the survey.

Bichelmeyer noted that the Constitution provides a definition of who should be a part of voting decisions and that this should be mirrored for the survey.

McCarthy suggested that the committee look at who was surveyed in the past and what other units' decisions were on who to include in the third-year review survey as well as the rationales for these decisions.

Action: Survey group will include IUB and IUPUI tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty, professional staff and support staff. The constitution will be referenced to determine if clinical staff will be included in survey.

Motion to approve the survey group was made, and seconded, and was passed unanimously.

D. School of Education Strategic Plan and Mission Statement (03.07)

Dean Gonzalez reviewed the history of the Strategic Plan and the five goals presented at the Faculty Retreat last year that were unanimously affirmed as the core of the School's Strategic Plan.

Dean Gonzalez noted that there was one editorial change that he made after the Long Range Planning Committee submitted the draft plan and that this change was presented to the Agenda Committee at a special meeting. The alteration made was in the Long Range Planning Committee, goal 3, in two sub-items that essentially were saying the same thing concerning research and graduate education. Since the Chancellor had requested that the School send any strategic plans that we had, to her by September 1st, and since Policy Council did not meet prior to September first, the Agenda committee was consulted to assess the changes and approved the Plan with made changes.

The Plan also includes a revised Mission Statement for the School. The new Mission Statement can be utilized in various ways and presents itself as being more appealing than the previous, bulleted, Mission Statement.

Dean Gonzalez emphasized that if the Plan is approved, it will be the official Strategic Plan that will be a living document and can be constantly reviewed and updated. The Plan will be used as a framework for future strategic directions; although, this does not dictate that all future directions must be exclusively outlined in this Plan.

Murtadha asked if Columbus should be included in the History and Context Section as a part of the School of Education core campus. Hossler commented that she had raised this conversation last year and that several conversations had followed. It was her understanding that including Columbus in defining the core campus was not supported.

Dean Gonzalez replied that the decision to not include Columbus was consciously decided upon because Columbus is seen as an extension of IUPUI and that inclusion of Columbus may create more confusion than clarification.

Motion to approve the Strategic Plan was made and seconded. The Strategic Plan was approved unanimously.

* At this time, Barman asked if the items concerning New Courses could be moved up in the meeting because the Old Business items do not apply to the IUPUI faculty. Chafel agreed to this suggestion.

V. New Courses/Course Changes up for 30 day remonstrance

Chafel referred the Council to the list of courses up for 30 day remonstrance. She explained that if a remonstrance is made, the person issuing the remonstrance presents the remonstrance to the person who was in charge of developing or initiating the course and then a follow through would need to be made.

D'Ambrosio asked if it would be more appropriate, given the nature of the core campuses, to start shifting away from considering courses for IUB-only. The IUB-only course designation creates a major problem for IUPUI when they decide to offer IUB-only courses because they must go through a formal process of remonstrance, through the registrar, to make the courses available at IUPUI. D'Ambrosio proposed that there be no such thing as IUB-only courses and IUPUI-only courses, but instead, all courses be core campus or system wide.

Alexander suggested that Education Council will want to vote on this because this issue goes beyond one campus and would therefore be system-wide. Cummings stressed that all courses go through Education Council for approval, regardless of campus.

Dean Gonzalez suggested that in order to eliminate confusion and hassle, a designation of IUB/IUPUI could be used for all courses unless otherwise noted.

Cummings agreed that this could be used for the current courses up for remonstrance and to all courses from this time forward, but is unsure if the Policy Council could vote to retroactively change the designations on other courses that have already been approved.

McCarthy suggested that programs should meet to decide the overall academic goals and the courses that are to be offered, as a core campus/program decision, and then decide what the course designations should be.

Dean Gonzalez contributed that if a course were to be designated IUB/IUPUI, but that a faculty member outside of the program offering the course wanted to teach the course, then the program as a whole would have to decide if that faculty had the necessary credentials to teach the course.

Bichelmeyer proposed that it should be noted on course application forms that, unless otherwise stated, all courses are designated IUB/IUPUI, from this moment forward. Therefore, the exception would need to be noted on the course application forms through checking off a box, stipulating an IUB or IUPUI-only course.

Motion: Standard course of procedure, all courses will be designated IUB/IUPUI unless otherwise noted by checking a box indicating only one or the other.

The motion was proposed, and seconded, and passed unanimously.

Bichelmeyer moved to reconstitute the core campus ad hoc for 1 year to look at core campus issues, specifically program-related issues.

The motion was proposed, and seconded.

Murtadha spoke in favor of this task force, specifying that it is much needed to aid in maintaining the spirit of the core campus and in facilitating respectful treatment between colleagues.

Cummings and Delandshere spoke against the task force because each of the formed committees should be discussing the issues and concerns.

Murtadha reiterated the need by pointing out that IUPUI has fewer faculty representatives to serve on each of the committees and therefore have a disadvantage in having their voices heard.

Cummings responded by explaining that essentially the core campus committee would address the issue and then forward the issue back to the individual committees or program responsible for the main issue.

Bichelmeyer and McCarthy suggested that it would not be the Core Campus Committee's job to solve the issues, but rather to identify and define the issues and refer them to the appropriate committees that will in turn need to follow up and remediate the issue.

Motion: Resurrect the Core Campus Committee in the form of a task force for 1 year to look at issues related to the core campus.

Motion was made, and seconded, to approve the resurrection of the Core Campus Committee for a period of 1 year and was passed with 10 votes.

IV. Old Business

C. Report of Evaluation of Food Services Offered in W.W. Wright Education Building

Last spring, a group of IST students conducted an evaluation of the food services offered in the Education Building. Bichelmeyer summarized the report from IST which identified that desires and needs of the School of Education population were not being met. The report found that contrary to popular belief, there is no contract between the School of Education and Sodexo, the current food providers.

Suggestions were made to alert Sodexo of the concerns voiced through the report and see if they would be willing to make better accommodations. Another option would be to bring additional vendors into the building.

Martha Zuppann, president of Staff Council, suggested that Staff Council be involved in this issue. It was decided to form a broad-based committee composed of one faculty member, one staff member, and one student, preferably who worked on the IST report, to continue to investigate this topic and then report back to the Council.

E. TV Proposal

This was a tabled item from last year and needed a 2/3 vote, from the Council, to be opened for discussion.

Chafel called for a vote to discuss the issue of replacing the TV in the student lounge area on first floor. 6 members voted in favor, 2 were opposed, 1 abstention. The topic received the needed 2/3 vote and was opened for discussion.

Zuppann spoke as a representative of the Staff Council in supporting the motion to replace the TV back into the student lounge. Reasons for why the TV should be replaced included: the lounge is not a study area; promotes the idea that School is a technology rich environment; provide means for students to access local and national news; and is an

asset for students and visitors. McCarthy spoke in favor of honoring the request to replace the TV and were encouraged to see staff and students working together to enhance the community of the school.

Bichelmeyer and Delandshere reviewed some of the concerns of placing the TV back in the lounge. These concerns were: the loud sound of the TV may be disturbing to those who want to study or work on projects; the quality and content of shows being viewed by the students were unprofessional; and the previous problem of students arriving to class late because of watching the TV in the lounge.

Motion: Redirect the TV proposal back to the Staff Council to review the situation and decide what the purpose of the student lounge is. If the Staff Council decides to pursue this issue, they will bring a specific proposal to the Policy Council for voting.

Motion was made, and approved, with a vote of 7 in favor, 1 opposed and 1 abstention.