

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
April 27, 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, Joshua Danish, Rebecca Martinez, Lori Patton Davis, Russ Skiba, Dionne Danns, Samantha Scribner

Alternate Members Present: Cary Buzzelli, Martha Nyikos, Sam Museus, Sylvia Martinez

Student Members Present: Michael Kersulov

Staff Member Present:

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

Guests: Brendan Maxcy, Gayle Buck, Kathleen King-Thorius

I. Announcements and Discussions

Deans' Report

T. Mason noted the full agenda and gave a quick update on the Core Campus committee's work. The hope is to provide a recommendation to the Provost very soon. We've been asked to complete this by the end of the semester. Graduation is coming up. This will be a great event with many awards and recognitions given out. AERA was well attended by faculty and students and the turn-out at the IU reception was great. This conveys to our community that the IU School of Education is alive and well.

J. Danish asked about position openings for next year. T. Mason replied that Department Chairs and Associate Deans met regarding program and department proposals regarding positions they would like to see filled. With the challenging budget environment we are prioritizing needs of the school as a whole. G. Crow added that the budget is not approved yet. This happens in May or June. We will make decisions as soon as possible.

Agenda Committee Report

This year we approached the diversity topic time differently. We have taken some significant actions, but we have not created systematic ways to check in about this. We have been disseminating information to department chairs, but there isn't a touchpoint back. The Dean made data by ethnicity available through the faculty meeting, which was something we had recommended. G. Crow is working with ETS to get more systematic data about diversity markers and diversity information for us to have regularly available. We recommended that the diversity committee get climate information more regularly, then we heard about the Diversity Plan initiative for IUB, which is to be taken up in the fall. The Diversity Committee has decided to create a subcommittee for this. The Diversity Committee should not have the responsibility for every aspect of diversity in the school, so for the future we will be looking for the Diversity

Committee to guide us on how to spread out the work among other committees, so that we can all be actively engaged. Outstanding charges to other committee include:

- Committee on Faculty Development- developing a formal faculty mentoring program to be proposed to Policy Council by November 1. Our interest is the impact this can have on faculty of color retention.
- Committee on Faculty and Budgetary Affairs (B)- creating promotion policies for lecturers. We will be having our first lecturer position this fall, and we have no policy in place. This committee will also take on the proposal for the evaluation of center directors policy.

Also, we are having a vote on the constitutional amendment. If this passes the Agenda Committee will have to constitute a committee to manage this. It will be an IUB committee. The Bloomington Faculty Council (BFC) has been meeting regularly with representatives from Policy Council. This year I've been doing that. Their goal is to better connect the policy discussions that are happening within schools with the larger Bloomington campus policy. We need to decide who will be that representative moving forward. Based on the experience this year, the representative does not need to be the chair, and the chair has enough work as it is. One thing we have worked on this year is voting rights of non-tenure line faculty members. There is a lot of difference among the schools, with our school being one of the more liberal. The BFC would like to create a policy that works for all of the schools. That is the kind of thing that goes on.

Approval of Minutes

T. Mason noted the need for a correction to the section under the Dean's report the description of the process should be amended to say that "the committee itself will vote and the decision will be passed along to the provost"

Vote on minutes as amended

Result: *Unanimous*

II. Old Business

Diversity Topic- Recommendations from the Policy Council on strategies, ideas, values that should be included in Diversity Plan

R. Skiba stated that the committee is seeking two sources of input. One is the climate survey. It is striking the difference between subgroups in every aspect of objectives. Differences between black and white faculty, LBGT and heterosexual, men and women, etc. N. Flowers added concerns in the area of student supports, including financial and social, infrastructure and finances, particularly for students of color, and also the need to address intersecting marginalized status among students. R. Skiba explained that the diversity plan template is very extensive and specific, and read from segments of the plan template, recommending we draw from the information provided. He noted previous input received regarding the needs for a long-range strategic plan for faculty recruitment. In terms of retention of faculty of color, the agenda committee heard from Joel Wong who provided interesting information from the University of Missouri faculty. We need to ask, are we just trying to get our numbers up to look more diverse, or are we really trying to generate a climate of inclusivity? It has been suggested we get information from faculty of color who have left to find out why they left. Instituting a mentoring

program was also recommended. Also we need to look at the criteria for promotion and tenure to make sure faculty of color are not at a disadvantage. We recommend having an Assistant Dean of multicultural education to help support a greater infusion of multicultural themes into the curriculum. K. King-Thorius added that IUPUI has been asked to create a diversity plan as well, and so the work of the committee will also help to shape or inform that plan. B. Dennis noted that the hope is the first diversity topic for the fall should be accessibility issues. B. Dennis noted that while diversity is a priority coming from the Provost office, it is unclear if there are funds to support this or not, but we shouldn't rule out the possibility of the availability of funds for a systematic plan. T. Mason added that a group of recent graduates of the program have created a document detailing some of the challenges that they faced along with concrete recommendations for what the program could do to better support students of color. T. Mason will forward this to the committee to help inform the plan. C. Buzzelli asked about the concern of contextualizing promotion requirements. How can the concerns about the difficulty in publishing in certain areas that exist within a particular area of study be teased out? How do you help people to understand how to interpret where the difficulties lie? K. King-Thorius replied that IUPUI created a statement on scholarly values that was voted into policy specific to scholarship, explicitly talking about multiple forms of scholarship for multiple audiences on multiple topics and with multiple purposes, and providing consideration for non-traditional formats and/or outlets of scholarship that should be fully considered as valid. This was passed along to external reviewers and is used in internal considerations. The policy itself grew out of conversations within a formal structure of a structural racism group. When it was developed it was anchored within IUPUI's institutional values and also the peer review process. R. Skiba asked for a copy of the IUPUI policy so that the Bloomington sub-committee could have it as a reference. B. Dennis stated that any reference to data or reflection on data would be important. R. Skiba noted the importance of data being collected on the front end, but finding who will do the analysis on the back end is challenging. G. Crow commented on the need for resources for retention. This budget year retention and salary increases all got collapsed together, and this poses a challenge. This is something we can urge the administration not to do in the future. C. Buzzelli noted that John Nieto-Philips might be very interested in that topic. R. Skiba asked if the plan should include suggestions of actions that would need to take place beyond the school of education? Consensus was yes. The plan should be completed for Policy Council review by November 1.

III. New Business

Annual Reports from Standing Committees

No discussion

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

Promotion Criteria and Long Term Contracts- IUPUI Clinical Faculty (16.49)

Promotion Criteria and Long Term Contracts- IUPUI Lecturers (16.50)

Proposal comes as a motion from the FAB committee at IUPUI.

B. Dennis noted that the changes read as an "up or out" policy, but at IUPUI this is against campus policy, so we need clarification as to whether this is intended to be an up or out policy. B. Maxcy informed members that university policy states that clinical faculty shall be given a long term contract and gives the unit flexibility on the terms of the contract. The current policy provides criteria and it also provides a loophole that allows for indefinite long term contracts,

which is not allowable, so this is an attempt to close that loophole while keeping the criteria the same. In terms of this being an up or out, that is an open question. If faculty are getting annual reviews and meeting the criteria, they would move along in the process of promotion. If they are not, it would not be in the university's interest to provide a long term contract. As written, the policy is not in the best interest of the faculty or the school, and also conflicts with campus policy. The goal is to strengthen our review policy and make sure people are getting consistent feedback. B. Dennis asked if there were campus level discussions about the policy. B. Maxcy replied that our reading of the policy is that it is up to the units to determine the criteria. D. Danna asked which unit would this be sent to in order to clarify if it conflicts? T. Mason suggested that the committee get the campus policy and reconcile the two before this goes further. The contact is Margie Ferguson. Item was returned to the committee.

IUB Teacher Education grade requirement clarification (16.37)

K. Barton explained that two years ago Policy Council changed the grade requirements so that courses taken through the College of Arts and Sciences would require a C-. This made our requirements and the college's requirements the same (C-). Professional education courses require a C and some courses don't fit into the categories of subject content or professional education. The policy here is to continue the default policy of a C for these courses rather than a C-.

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

IUB Secondary Social Studies Requirements (16.38)

This is to comply with state law and puts our requirements in line with the history requirements. The requirements are simpler, cleaner and will better prepare the students. This would be in place for the students entering the university in the summer of this year. Note: in the document minor and major are reversed.

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

IUB Awards of COAS Majors (MINOR) for Teacher Education Candidates (16.39)

K. Barton that the School of Ed determines the rule for determining the College of Arts and Sciences requirements. We don't have a policy for students adopting a minor in the College of Arts and Science. So a student cannot apply more than one course for both a major and a minor. The other aspect of the policy is that a student can't get a minor in the same field as their minor, so for example, a student with a major in Mathematics Education cannot get a minor in Mathematics. This is because it implies that our major is not the same as the COAS major, when it is. Also, all of our secondary education candidates are already taking all of the courses required for a minor in the College of Arts and Science. The minor would require 15 a minimum of credit hours. The content would be dictated by the College. To be effective immediately.

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

IUB Teacher Education candidate assessment requirements (16.40)

K. Barton informed members that for the last few years we have had our students complete a choice of one of two assessment. They have had the option of EdTPA or IUTPA. We now have so many teachers in states that require the EdTPA that many of our students are now choosing that exam and it is becoming unfeasible to run both. We would now require all of our students to take the EdTPA, but we are not requiring that the assessment be scored by Pearson. We would

use our own evaluators using the official rubric. C. Buzzelli asked about options for scoring. If they fail in a scoring by Pearson, do they graduate? K. Barton replied that students could have the assessment scored by either Pearson or IU, but it would need to be scored before a student could graduate. Supervisors will need to be sure that students are informed of the scoring as a graduation requirement. This change will likely mean that some scorers will have to be retrained.

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

IUB CAEP improvement plan (16.41)

K. Barton explained that we are required by CAEP to have a focus area for improvement. We decided to focus on candidate assessment. We can discuss what we want in our candidates and can focus on that across courses and in the field experiences.

M. Nyikos asked if the focus is on assessment of candidates vs. candidates assessment of children. The focus is on the teacher candidates. T. Mason asked if this will be focused on the coherence of the program? K. Barton replied that he hoped this would provide a mechanism for increasing coherence.

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

Proposed Revision to Review Centers (16.42)

G. Buck informed members that research centers are reviewed every five years. This clarifies that policy, outlining more clearly the size of the review committee and that the R&D office will be taking on many components that used to be done by the centers. It also broadens the criteria beyond fiscal.

C. Buzzelli asked how will Faculty Affairs be involved, considering this committee will be reviewing center directors? Gail replied that this is not a review of the director, but instead looking at the center itself and how it is performing. T. Mason added that these changes were informed by past experience with center reviews and feedback from the process. This helps to ensure that the evaluation is better aligned with the goal of helping the centers improve on what they do. B. Dennis added that there was a need for separating the evaluation of center directors and the centers themselves. G. Crow added that this puts the process more in line with what we do in evaluating programs.

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

Proposed Undergraduate Grading Policy (16.43)

S. Martinez informed members that several years ago the committee was tasked with examining the issue of grade inflation in the School of Education that was identified in a national report. In reading through past reports from the committee and going through data we have been exploring whether grade inflation actually exists and what contributes to this perception. The data is inconclusive. As a result the recommendation is to develop a grading policy for undergraduates modeled after the graduate grading policy. We also found that a lot of schools do not have a grading policy at either the graduate or undergraduate level so this is a good first step for IU. Then we can further explore the perceived grade inflation.

B. Dennis asked if the committee has a sense of how many faculty are aware of and implement the graduate student grading policy? R. Martinez asked if the A+ is to be eliminated. S. Martinez stated that the A+ is not addressed. C. Buzzelli brought up the point that this will influence the student experience across time or across classes. M. Nyikos noted that there is still a great deal of interpretation from the professor. J. Danish added that the expectation among graduate students

there is that students should be getting an A, unless it is a quantitative inquiry course or they don't attend class regularly. Will this impact students' willingness to take courses that follow a more strict grading guidelines. B. Dennis noted that it is hard to buy into the problem that instigated a policy like this. Grading is not simply a measuring tool, it includes the relationship that one has with a students. S. Martinez added that the committee is not convinced that there is a grade inflation problem. The committee is hoping that having a formal policy will help address the perception. B. Dennis noted that the policy doesn't keep the faculty from allowing students to continue to work to towards an improved grade. P. Carspeken noted that the approach to grading is likely to differ based on subject matter. S. Martinez noted that this policy is not looking to see a normal distribution of grades. B. Dennis asked if a policy could support professors to align student expectations. C. Buzzelli said, yes, this could help students to shift their thinking away from the idea that meeting minimum requirements should be an A. D. Danns noted that the policy will only help as much as the students are willing to do the work. J. Danish noted that in an area where a lot of professors only teacher for a year, and students give poor evaluations for teachers who have high grading standards, the instructor is left with a poor portfolio. B. Dennis asked about how the policy would be distributed to students? K. Barton noted that his office could help with distribution. J. Danish noted that it should be included in all course syllabi.

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

ACTION ITEM: Committee on Teacher Ed- Ensure that the information is distributed and a culture is built around it.

Proposed Minor in Literacy, Culture, Language Education (6.44)

M. Nyikos stated that this is for an online EdD. The idea is to give students an understanding of literacy and language in the context of different cultures. R. Martinez asked if there is a course on research based interventions for students struggling with literacy issues? M. Nyikos replied that it is touched on, but not a focus of any of the courses. B. Dennis asked if all three courses are variable in terms of substantive content? M. Nyikos replied that L601 would be similar across years, but the 750s courses would be various topics. Usually we have one course more literacy focused, one more language education focused and one more socially focused. M. Kersulov added that every course includes content on research based strategies for struggling readers. M. Nyikos added that social justice is also always a part of the lens of instruction. B. Dennis asked if there are other minors in the department. There is a PhD minor which requires more credits.

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

Proposed Revision to PhD in Ed Policy Studies (16.45)

D. Danns informed members that this revision is based on advice from external reviewers and a need to update the program. We've added a law concentration as well as an individualized concentration. We are also broadening minors to also include minors within the School of Education.

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

Proposed Revision to Criteria in Research Ranks (16.46)

D. Danns the previous policy was not sufficient to help external reviewers understand our process. Our committee edited down recommendation from the committee of research scientists. We received feedback from center directors, the chair of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, Terry Mason and the office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Administrative Affairs.

G. Crow added that in previous years we have had difficulties in terms of research scientists because often what they are researching cannot be published through the same channels as tenure track research. This policy is designed to help external reviewers understand that the work of a research rank individual is going to look different than the work of a tenure track individual. T. Mason noted that effort was also put in to making this relevant for the variety of centers connected to the school of education. B. Dennis noted that the School of Education is leading the way on a lot of these issues.

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

IV. New Course/Course Changes

The following new course/course change proposals have been 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.

Course Change Proposals

Q601: Professional Seminar in Science Education 1 – 3 hours BL

Description: A seminar in which students are introduced to the field of science education by a variety of methods. Faculty present an introduction to the professional organizations, journals, conferences, and meetings along with describing their ongoing research projects. Students present their own research projects and receive feedback from colleagues and faculty. Guest speakers present research projects related to science education. Primarily for doctoral students in science education. May be repeated up to four times for credit.

Justification: Typically the science education doctoral students enroll for this professional seminar in the fall and spring terms at a fixed 1 cr. The change to a variable credit hour option will provide the flexibility necessary to take advantage of unique professional opportunities that occur in a specific semester -ones that would require more time and effort on behalf of the students. The change will also allow for adjusted expectations/time obligations for first semester doctoral students.

P574: topical Seminar in Learning Science 1 – 3 hours BL

Description: Special topic seminars by learning science faculty or visiting scholars. Potential topics include higher education pedagogy, embodied cognition, gaming/simulation in problem solving.

Justification: Instruction Mode online is being added. We will continue to offer both face-to-face and online

B. Dennis acknowledged the work of Jane Kaho in helping policy council to run. T. Mason acknowledged the work of B. Dennis in chairing Policy Council this year.

Meeting adjourned: 2:58