

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
March 23, 2016
1:00-3:00pm
IUB—Room 2140
IUPUI—Room 3138B
IUPUC—Room 155E

What follows is a summary of speaker contributions

Members Present: Barbara Dennis, Phil Carspecken, Vic Borden, Joshua Danish, Rebecca Martinez, Farida Pawan, Danielle DeSawal, Lori Patton Davis

Alternate Members Present: Curt Bonk, Cary Buzzelli, Jim Scheurich, Jennifer Zachocki

Student Members Present: Leah Peck, Jane Bomkamp

Staff Member Present: Mary Hardesty

Dean's Staff Present: Terry Mason, Gary Crow, Keith Barton

Guests: Crystal Hill Morton, John Nieto-Phillips

Approval of the Minutes from February 24, 2016 Meeting (**16.30M**)

Result: *approved unanimously*

I Announcements and Discussions

Dean's Report

T. Mason informed members that he was part of a team of faculty from IU who visited South Sudan over the recent Spring break. It was a great experience and very valuable for those people working to improve the situation within their country.

Work on the Core Campus issue continues. We have tried to look at all of the implications for major changes in structures. There is a meeting scheduled for Friday which we hope will lead to a proposal. The proposal will come to the Policy Council for a discussion. The committee will vote and the decision will be passed along to the provost. This proposal is advisory but important for providing input to the Provost about what it is that the School of Education wants. V. Borden asked where the Creation, Reorganization, Elimination and Merger (CREM) Committee fits in. T. Mason explained that this is the university system policy on mergers and reorganizations of programs. The first step would be determining whether the policy applies to this situation. If it does, there is a series of steps dictated by the policy that will need to be followed. If it does apply, this could slow the process down.

Please join us for the IU reception at AERA- Saturday, April 9 at the Marquis Hotel. The Core Campus Faculty Meeting is April 15, 2016. It will include an open forum on some of the issues we are facing as a school.

Agenda Committee – Diversity Report and Provost's response to letter

B. Dennis informed members that the Agenda Committee asked Joel Wong, Lori Patton-Davis and Russ Skiba to speak to the committee more about faculty retention. This added to the

information already gathered through previous Policy Council diversity topic sessions. As a result we've asked ETS to help us gather more specific demographic data to be shared. It will then be part of our regular review regarding what is happening with the School. G. Crow is currently working with department chairs on the topic of mentoring and we may ask the Faculty Development committee to come up with specific structures that we can put in place around mentoring. Regarding the note sent to the Provost on the lack of a report from the Blue Ribbon Review Committee, B. Dennis had a phone conversation with the Provost. She opened the floor to questions. There were no questions. V. Borden asked how this will reconcile with the strategic plan? B. Dennis replied that the core campus structure committee will do its work and we will go from there, but there are no more internal reports required.

II Old Business

Diversity Topic –John Nieto-Phillips – Diversity Plan

J. Nieto-Phillips has enjoyed learning about the schools and the faculty as he works in his new role of Associate Vice Provost of Development and Diversity and he is available to help the School of Education articulate its plan for diversity. B. Dennis informed members that the agenda committee received the diversity plan template and forwarded it to faculty for comment. Discussion on the content and integration of the template ensued. V. Borden commented that the challenge is how to relate it to our structure and process given that we may be fundamentally changing that structure. J. Nieto-Phillips replied that he is not sure of the specific protocols of this decision making. He can help with the Bloomington campus, and would imagine that there will be similar measures for accountability at the different campuses and so the plan could potentially translate easily to either or both campuses. This plan development is a Bloomington campus initiative, but there is great interest in this type of a plan at a University-wide level. B. Dennis asked about the timeline. J. Nieto Phillips replied that the goal is fall implementation. The plan template was first circulated over a year ago and plans are intended to be working documents that can be changed with time. B. Denis asked if other units are further along in this process. J. Nieto Phillips brought a draft of SPEA's plan that has been submitted to him for feedback. Other schools also have a draft in the works. The SPEA plan is articulated as a Bloomington plan.

J. Nieto-Phillips described the components of the template. It begins with the school's vision statement and how it relates to the mission statement of the university, the faculty and the students. This section expresses the school's core values and goals related to diversity. F. Pawan asked about SPEA's statement. J. Nieto-Phillips stated that it expresses a desire to focus on underrepresented minorities and women in the field. They've taken these ideas and hitched them to affirmative action policies. Another component of the plan is best practices. The university has prioritized hiring minority faculty and women at senior levels and has set aside funds to support this. He commended the School of Education's current hiring efforts. The Provost encourages units to think out of the box for hiring. Departments should think about having a running list of "dream hires" of individuals who suit your priorities. Faculty currently at some peer institutions may be very open to relocating based on the current climate in higher education. The provost office is actively promoting the strategy of targeted hires. These do not have to be at the senior ranks. The third component is to take stock of how successful your efforts have been visa vis the PhD pool within a particular field. J. Nieto-Phillips can help to access the data needed for this process. Also reflect on the experiences of past hiring efforts. It is important to be aware of what has worked for you.

J. Danish asked about models for retention. J. Nieto-Phillips acknowledged that this is a challenge. We have a recruitment fund, but not a retention fund. For faculty who are being recruited, retention may be about figuring out what is going to keep them invested in the long term and connecting new hires with community resources that may feed this interest. It might

also be a matter of allowing for more release time for a new hire to publish. B. Dennis referred to the recent agenda committee meeting on retention where mentoring was highlighted as an important strategy. J. Nieto-Phillips acknowledged the importance of finding resources such as mentorship, and different models of mentorship, including work-life balance mentoring. Considering easing new hires into their position with more time allocation for course planning and publishing. Also, it is important not to overextend the faculty who represent minorities by expecting them to be *the* resource on many levels, student mentors, faculty mentors, committee representation, etc. F. Pawan agreed that this is an issue and suggested we look at the tenure line and its identified components and whether that accurately reflects what we want our faculty to be doing. J. Nieto-Phillips noted that it is particularly important to outline expectations of faculty clearly and be aware of the burdens being placed on pre-tenure faculty and/or those with a joint appointment. Another concern is protecting opportunities for faculty to develop new programs, particularly if that was one of the goals of the hire. This can be done in a Memorandum of Understanding. Opportunities for leadership for mid-career faculty is important. If we don't provide the time or mentoring resources to support this, we may lose that person to another institution that is able to fulfill that promise. C. Buzzelli asked how do we protect the time of our minority faculty and still get diverse representation on committees? J. Nieto-Phillips noted that the long term solution is a more diverse faculty.

B. Dennis asked about how this plan should be connected with fiscal support to implement the plan. J. Nieto-Phillips suggested we think big, and then we can pare down the plan to fit the budget, but with a wider view of goals, you will be prepared to take advantage of opportunities when they arise in a strategic fashion. Be careful not to be so specific that it binds you to an impossible practice. T. Mason noted that the Dean's office has been very supportive of outreach efforts to develop relationships with faculty that we may want to recruit in the future, such as invitations to come and lecture. The Dean's office is very open to providing financial support for this. J. Nieto-Phillips noted that the Provost office has stressed that they have set aside funds for minority faculty recruitment which have not been used much. They want to see these funds used for this purpose.

B. Dennis noted that diversity at the staff level is also important and has been brought up at Policy Council in the past. J. Nieto-Phillips acknowledged that this is very important, but is not addressed in this plan. Recruitment from outside the area is typically not done at the staff level so we have the challenges of recruiting from our local population. C. Buzzelli asked if there is a rule or policy that bars recruitment of staff from outside the area. J. Nieto-Phillips stated that he didn't know of any policies preventing this. T. Mason added that higher level professional staff searches are national searches and do look much like faculty searches. B. Dennis asked what the data are on part time faculty diversity at the University. J. Nieto-Phillips indicated that there is a real concern about non tenure track faculty. B. Dennis noted that nationally they tend to be more women and people of color. J. Nieto-Phillips reiterated that he has access to a lot of data and is always willing to help in the area of data gathering.

F. Pawan noted that 1 in 4 students do not speak English as a first language and wondered how is this being addressed in terms of infrastructure, ESL instructors, etc.? J. Nieto-Phillips noted that these are very important pipeline issues close to his heart and own personal mission. The Office of the Vice President for Diversity, Equity and Multicultural Affairs (DEMA) has done a very good job of outreach and pipeline issues with first generation students and so the numbers have improved, but not quickly enough or far enough. F. Pawan noted that faculty development is also important to work with these students. J. Nieto-Phillips indicated that there are some programs within the university that provide faculty with the opportunity to do mentorship. C. Buzzelli noted that it is also important to have a conversation about international students, because they have a very different set of issues than first generation students. They are particularly vulnerable when it comes to student teaching,

because their school experience is so vastly different. J. Nieto-Phillips closed the conversation noting that it is apparent that this Policy Council has had a lot of prior conversations on this topic and he hopes that this template will help us to tailor our diversity plan to our specific needs as a school.

III. New Business

Proposed Revisions to Constitution (16.32)

B. Dennis reminded members that there are three sources of revisions. One from the agenda committee with structural revision, another from Long Range Planning Committee and the final was what began this review of the constitution, the request for a new Undergraduate Studies Committee. After a discussion of the comments which did not include a specific revision, and acknowledgment that the time constraints of this meeting do not allow for the individual discussion of each comment, a further discussion ensued regarding tabling the issue. B. Dennis confirmed that tabling the issue now and doing an email vote next week would enable us to remain in compliance with the timeline. The committee agreed to table the issue. ACTION ITEM: Agenda committee will make additional revisions and forward the revised document for review, comment and vote by the Policy Council by Monday March 28, 2016.

Proposed Revisions to T2T (16.33)

C. Hill Morton stated that with this change the T2T Woodrow Wilson students will be taking courses as described. F. Pawan asked for clarification about which is the required language course and diversity course noting that if you are going to be working with teaching English Language Learners, the specified course is less about teaching methods or approaches, and more about diversity issues related to teaching students who are English Language Learners. N. Flowers stated that at IUPUI students will get some foundational strategies for dealing with English Language Learners through this course.

Result: *Approved unanimously, 1 abstention*

Proposed Revisions to Secondary Education program (16.34)

C. Hill Morton stated the first change is in which course students will receive instruction around literacy for second language learners. This change will provide our students with a deeper foundational understand of supporting second language learners. It also works better with scheduling. The second change assigns credit hours differently to alleviate a problem with faculty load and clarifies student requirements. It also keeps things in compliance with student financial aid.

Discussion:

F. Pawan asked if this is a substitution or a replacement. N. Flowers confirmed that it is a replacement. B. Dennis praised the removal of a zero credit hour course.

Result: *Approved unanimously*

Proposed Revisions to Social Studies (16.35)

C. Hill Morton stated that these changes better align with preparation for the Pearson content exam and reflect the feedback from Specialized Professional Association (SPA) reports to increase the number of core courses. To facilitate data reporting for the SPA reports we need more common courses among students.

No discussion.

Result: *Approved unanimously*

Proposed policy on Qualifying Exams –Urban Education Studies Doctoral Program (16.36)

J. Schuerich stated that this new program is compliant with school policy and has gone through the appropriate committees. This is a new policy.

Discussion: B. Dennis noted that in Bloomington you can agree to waive the minor qualifying exam and this is done program by program, but not by student. J. Shuerich confirmed that if the minor program decided not to waive the exam, this would go into effect.

Result: *Approved unanimously*

B. Dennis reviewed expectations for the constitutional amendment review.

IV. New Course/Course Changes

The course changes listed on the agenda were reviewed and approved by the Graduate Studies Committee or the Committee on Teacher Education. These course proposals will be forwarded to the next level of approval unless a remonstrance is received within 30 days.

Meeting Adjourned 2:32PM