

**MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

February 26, 2003 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
School of Education
IUB Room 2140
IUPUI Room 3138E

** The following are summaries of speaker contributions**

Members Present: Boone, Carspecken, Chafel, Flint, Hossler, McCarthy, Ochoa, Rosario, Sutton, Zimmerman. **Dean's Staff Present:** Cummings, Gonzalez, Lambdin, Murtadha. **Staff Representative:** Wickemeyer-Hardy **Student Representatives:** Morris, Pascoe. **Guest:** Chancellor Brehm.

Chafel opened the meeting by announcing that Chancellor Brehm would be visiting the PC today. She explained that the meeting will be postponed upon her arrival so that she may address the council.

I. Approval of the Minutes from November 20, 2002 Meeting ([03.09M](#))

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the November 20, 2002 minutes with the addition of the previously omitted text. The minutes for November 20, 2002, were unanimously approved as amended.

Approval of the Minutes from January 29, 2003 Meeting ([03.17M](#))

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the minutes as written. The minutes for the January 29, 2003 meeting were unanimously approved.

II. Announcements and Discussions

A. Report from Dean Gonzalez

1. P-16 Seamless System of Education

Dean Gonzalez was previously asked by Past-President Brand to chair a University committee that was charged with looking at ways to create a P-16 seamless system of education. There is a need in the state to facilitate collaboration between P-12 communities and the higher education community, with the goal being to increase higher education participation. This goal is of particular importance for groups who have been traditionally underrepresented in higher education enrollment.

The committee began meeting in the fall and has gathered twice. The committee comprised a draft set of recommendations that may eventually evolve into a set of recommendations for the Board of Trustees.

While this committee was in the process of discussing the P-16 goals and objectives, the Indiana Commission of Higher Education was simultaneously forming its own P-16 plan. The proposed plan has several items relating to increasing access and preparation of

students for higher education as well as recommendations for aligning admissions and higher education policies with K-12 standards and student preparation.

The recommendations formulated by the Indiana University roundtable committee and the recommendations proposed by the Indiana Commission of Higher Education were similar in purpose and process.

President Bepko has constituted another University task force to respond to the Indiana Higher Education Commission’s proposal. Dean Gonzalez has been asked to serve on the committee and possibly co-chair the committee with Bill Plater from IUPUI. The committee will begin deliberating on the recommendations shortly. In general, the items in the Higher Education Commission’s plan are directed at increasing the collaboration between PK-12 and higher education with the goal of increasing higher education enrollment and graduation.

- 2. Dean Gonzalez introduced Chancellor Brehm and invited her to address the Education Policy Council.

B. Visit by Chancellor Brehm

Deleted: . ¶

The Chancellor opened the discussion with a brief overview of the Strategic Plan (03.19) and the process by which the Plan is being approved. The Missions and Values section of the Strategic Plan is currently going through the Bloomington Faculty Council for approval, while the first part of the plan, the Academic Priorities, has already been approved. The Academic Priorities are most closely linked to resources such that they are designed to drive the Commitment to Excellence Program. The Strategic Plan is being turned over to the Review Committee for acceptance. The Review Committee is comprised of 9 members, at least 3 of which are members of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and who include the chair of the SPC, Fred Cate.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.5"

The dean’s are currently working on reviewing the submitted proposals, which have been based on the Academic Priorities. After the deans have selected the proposals that they see as encompassing and enhancing their school’s directions and priorities, the selected proposals will be forwarded to the Review Committee by March 7th. The Review Committee will then provide their recommendations to the Chancellor on March 28th. From this point, the Chancellor will engage in a consultation process, meeting with the Budgetary Affairs Committee, the Council of Academic Deans, George Walker and Susan Thorn, the interim President, and with the Board of Trustees to determine which proposals will be granted funding.

This upcoming spring, the SPC will be involved in articulating some general priorities for the University to be included in the Strategic Plan. These general priorities have not been allotted funding as of yet. By first identifying the priorities, a future funding source will be more easily identified. These general priorities are expected to be funded for the 2004-2005 academic year.

The SPC will reconvene again in the fall of 2003 to make recommendations on how to evaluate the impact of the Strategic Plan and each of the proposal projects. The objectives of the SPC for the fall are twofold: to create measures for assessing the Strategic Plan as a whole and to create measures to review the proposal projects. It is critical to the success of the Strategic Plan to have such a review process in place. The Plan is a living document and will be susceptible to change throughout the years.

McCarthy asked for clarification as to how the priorities and themes of the plan are related.

Chancellor Brehm explained that there is some subjectivity to the relationship between the priorities and themes, depending on how they are interpreted. She suggested that there is a matrix-like link, with the priorities being on one axis and the themes on the other. The priorities should have some relationship with the themes, but not every priority is going to match each theme. The themes are more cross-cutting where the priorities are more specific.

Chafel questioned the omission of economic diversity from the types of diversity highlighted in the themes.

Chancellor Brehm agreed that this was a good point. However, because the SPC has finished their work on this section, it is likely that they would not want to make any changes to the document at this time. This would be a good example of a change that may be made down the road during the review process.

Chafel asked Chancellor Brehm to speak to the particular types of funding requests that might be made and the projection, over time, of the funding that will be available.

Chancellor Brehm explained that there will be roughly 28 million dollars available as base funding for mostly 4 years, but is a 5 year program. This is a cohort project where only the new students will be charged the new tuition and will be a surcharge that remains throughout the duration of the undergraduate education. Some of the base funding has already been designated: financial aid will be allotted about 4 million dollars and 3 million dollars will provide matches for private monies for graduate fellowships. The remaining 21 million dollars will be divided, rough 11 million for faculty lines and 10 million for other academic program needs.

It is anticipated that faculty will have four chances/years to apply for this funding. This opportunity depends on how the committee allocates the monies for funding projects during the beginning years of the Plan. If for some reason the committee allocates large amounts of base and cash monies for multiple years to several projects early on, then these projects have the potential for utilizing most of the funds for future years. However, it is not projected that the committee would approve these types of decisions. It is very important that we think of this as a four year project when allocating funding.

Chancellor Brehm stressed that this is an incredible opportunity to draw the campus together in unique ways. The priorities were designed such that they provide cross school as well as within school collaborations.

The University will also be doing a new Bloomington Fundraising Campaign probably around 2005. There is a partial overlap between the Commitment for Excellence funding and the Bloomington Campaign. This does open the possibility to get an infusion of money over a short period of time. If we maximize the impact of the funding, it is possible to have made a significant advance as a campus in the near future.

Sutton asked for the Chancellor's suggestions on how to measure the impact of the Strategic Plan.

Chancellor Brehm responded that there would be various ways to assess the priorities, themes, and projects and to do so both on individual and comprehensive levels. She would specifically want to see a true advance in the academic programs themselves. This could be assessed through rankings, faculty recruitment, faculty recognitions and faculty funding. There really would be multiple ways of measuring advancement. The goal would be to find comprehensive approaches of measurement, which is the charge of the SPC this fall. Additionally, each of the project proposals had to incorporate a plan for their own evaluation. These plans will also aid in the advent of general review processes.

Chancellor Brehm highlighted that IUPUI also has its own Commitment to Excellence funding and Strategic Plan. The process at Indianapolis is parallel to that of the Bloomington campus.

Murtadha commented that it is time for IUPUI faculty to begin the process of submitting proposals as well.

Dean Gonzalez suggested that IUPUI will also be looking to support major initiatives as opposed to distributing monies in small amounts over a broader spectrum in order to upgrade the impact.

Murtadha added that the Strategic Plan allows for another means by which the notion of Core Campuses can become more actualized in a realistic way. She further proposed that technology be used to work more effectively in these kinds of initiatives and that we use the strengths of the campuses in more collaborative ways to benefit the State.

Chancellor Brehm agreed and suggested that it is probable that project proposals will encompass the use of technology and cross-campus collaborations.

Zimmerman commented that even if funded projects do not evolve this year, this process has brought many ideas to the foreground for collaborations and partnerships. This in itself has increased awareness of the opportunities and will motivate further action for next year.

Dean Gonzalez asked to what extent will the strategic priorities become the strategic priorities for the campus?

Chancellor Brehm answered that she sees the academic priorities of the Strategic Plan as the academic priorities of the Campus. The themes have more character of general priorities. She wants the committee to decide if there are more priorities that are not academic priorities and are not included in the themes but that need to be articulated and

should therefore be a general priority. Once this has been done, Chancellor Brehm sees the results as being the Strategic Plan for the Campus, knowing that it will be a revolving plan.

C. Agenda Committee

No items were discussed.

III. New Business

There was no new business to be discussed.

IV. Old Business

- A. Recommendation of Long Range Planning Committee regarding Goal 2: Strengthen the School of Education's Partnerships with P-12 Schools and Communities ([03.16](#)) (postponed from January 29, 2003 meeting)

Chafel reviewed the minutes from last meeting in order to reconstruct the discussion which was postponed. A motion was on the floor to approve the Long Range Planning Committee's recommendation to assign Strategic Goal 2 to the Committee on Teacher Education and that it also be referred to the Technology, Research, Diversity, and Graduate Studies committees.

Lambdin reinforced the idea that it would be overwhelming for the TEC to report the activities and objectives of the entire School, which was the reason this goal was referred to additional committees.

Dean Gonzalez added that it is unrealistic for any committee to take over the sole ownership of any one of the Strategic Goals. Rather, the committees should report to PC on the progress or lack of progress of each goal, not to carry through with the implementation and monitoring of the activities. Dean Gonzalez further suggested that there may be a need for another committee to take the primary responsibility for the oversight of this particular goal.

Zimmerman moved that the PC set up a task force for outreach and partnerships and that the agenda committee be given authorization to determine the members of this task force.

The motion was seconded by Sutton.

Motion was approved with 7 in favor and 1 abstention.

Meeting adjourned at 2:36 p.m.