

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
October 19, 2016

1:00-2:30pm
IUB—Room 3115
IUPUI—Room 3138B
IUPUC—Room 155E

Members Present: B. Levinson, B. Edmonds, B. Chung, J. Danish, B. Dennis, A. Maltese, P. Rogan, C. Morton, S. Power-Carter

Alternate Members Present: C. Buzzelli, N. Flowers

Student Members Present: M. Kersulov, A. Hollet, M. Mikel

Staff Member Present: M. Boots

Dean's Staff Present: K. Barton

Guests: none

Approval of Minutes from September 21, 2016 Meeting (**17.10M**)

Motion made by: B. Levinson

Second by: B. Edmonds

Result: *Approved unanimously, 1 abstention*

I. Announcements and Discussions

Announcements

Core Campus Faculty Meeting is Friday, October 21, 2016 from 10-1. Lunch will be provided and there is planned dialogue at lunch time for Bloomington.

A document for the Course and Program Proposal Approval Process has been added to GSC's web page. Link is below:

<http://education.indiana.edu/about/council/committees/graduate-studies-recruitment/index.html>

This web page explains the process for proposing or changing programs. Please let everyone in your unit know about this resource. This document should have the answers to most of your questions about this process.

II. Old Business

Diversity Topic-

The Council reviewed the Diversity Committee's recommendations regarding topics and timeline for discussion at Policy Council meetings in 2016-17. The agenda committee will meet in two weeks with these items and your input from today to map out the plan for discussion topics for the year.

Discussion

B. Levinson recommended we move up the topic on faculty recruitment, in the event that we can use the information in a recruitment process this year. B. Dennis agreed and added that last year we tried to align the calendar to corresponding processes and events, and as a result, disability issues fell off the table, and this has happened a number of years. She favors keeping disability and accessibility near the beginning to ensure it is not left off the agenda again. There was consensus from the council that the topics list looked good. B. Chung added that some faculty also forwarded to the agenda committee a recommendation to link diversity topic discussions to policy actions. B. Dennis added that the council used that strategy last year and so this year it might be good to follow up on last year's attempts at engaging in policy links to see if things happened as requested or proposed. N. Flowers also supports looking at how we address issues of disability and our understanding of accessibility. B. Levinson added that some of the items connect clearly to the work of different committees and so it would be important to have the chair, or a member of the related committee in attendance during the policy council discussions of the topic. Since policy council is not a body that should be initiating policies or proposals, we should look at which committees might be charged with coming up with proposals related to the topic under discussion and ensure representatives of those committees are present. B. Chung stated that where we don't have standing committees, we might want to think about where we might need to create an ad hoc committee. J. Danish added that it will also be important to make sure the group that is discussing these issues includes some people who directly experience the challenges or issues under discussion.

III. New Business

Comments from Survey Regarding School of Education Restructuring and vote 17.12

The Council reviewed the faculty survey process and results. Response rates were: IUB- 48 of 123, or a 39% response rate; IUPUI- 21 of 34, or a 62% response rate; IUPUC- 2 of 7, or a 29% response rate. Total was 71 out of 165 or 43% response rate. The majority of comments were related to the HESA program. Regarding comments about the lack of mention of IUPUC in the restructure document, B. Chung clarified that IUPUC is actually a part of the IUPUI system, and so their representation is through IUPUI, according to the governance structure. This is the reason that IUPUC is not mentioned as a separate entity. B. Chung reviewed the purpose of the vote today, which is to reflect on the input from the faculty and, as faculty representatives, decide whether or not to go forward with the process of separation. The purpose today is not to work out the logistics of the proposal implementation. The restructure document is only recommendations for what could be addressed in the next stage and beyond, when decisions on the logistics will be made. Today, discussion should focus on the larger picture of whether the Council supports to separate or not. We also want to acknowledge some of the recommendations coming from the proposal and through the faculty survey. Our vote from today, with the comments from the survey and the report from the restructuring committee will all move forward to the next phase in the larger process.

Discussion

J. Danish asked about the impact on Columbus. P. Rogan clarified for the council that IUPUC does not have status as a regional campus. As a sub entity of IUPUI, it is difficult for IUPUC to understand how these decisions will impact them, if at all. But, just as Bloomington and IUPUI have operated many programs autonomously, the same is true for Columbus. They currently operate an autonomous elementary education program and there have been agreements regarding autonomous promotion and tenure procedures, so there is a lack of clarity for people in Columbus as to how a separation will affect them. Moving forward it will be important for IUPUI to keep IUPUC in the communication loop. B. Levinson asked for clarification about the process. Specifically, if people want more information on the details of a separation before expressing support, is policy council in a position to make an up or down vote? B. Chung explained that policy council is not a position to decide the details. B. Dennis asked if, in the further process, there are opportunities for faculty voice regarding the details. B. Chung explained that after the policy council vote, the vote results, survey results and restructuring committee report will go on to the next step, which will be an ad hoc committee that includes representatives from IUB, IUPUI, IUPUC and at least 2 external members. There is flexibility about how this can be structured. Later in this meeting we will discuss how we might want to shape that structure by nominating the ad hoc committee. There will be multiple opportunities to shape how this unfolds. C. Buzzelli asked if today's vote is to support a separation or to support the process of separation. B. Chung stated that his understanding is that the ad hoc committee would like to know if the policy council is in support of the document's recommendation to separate, without necessarily endorsing all the details. They want to know how to consider the restructuring document as they move forward with the process. P. Rogan reiterated that the vote is only to allow the process to continue to the next step, delivering the message as to whether we support a separation or not. C. Morton asked to clarify that we will be addressing the conditions of the separation as the next step. B. Chung confirmed that the ad hoc committee (next step) will address the conditions of separation, using the information that this committee provides to help guide the decisions regarding the details. There will be another chance for input to iron out the details through the ad hoc committee. B. Dennis asked, if we vote "no", would the process still move forward? Will the vote be communicated to the ad hoc committee? One way to communicate some concern could be to have a mixed vote moving forward. J. Danish asked if there is a way to vote yes with reservations, to more effectively communicate faculty concerns about the transition process. Members agreed that crafting the wording of the motion is an effective way to communicate concerns.

B. Edmonds made a motion which was withdrawn in favor of the following motion made by P. Rogan and seconded by B. Dennis:

"We move to support the next step in the process of separation, with specific attention to address the issues that have been raised by faculty."

Discussion of Motion

A. Maltese asked whether we need to be specific about where those concerns are coming from. B. Chung stated that we could name the specific sources where concerns are cited, but not limit consideration to these sources. C. Buzzelli noted that naming additional resources not yet created or reviewed by policy council is going beyond what we have been asked to do. B. Dennis countered that IUPUI has concerns that have been raised repeatedly over time and we want the process to attend to those concerns, even if we may not know what documents are out there noting them. The process should take all concerns into account. B. Chung indicated that the ad hoc committee may do their own survey and collect more information. C. Buzzelli reiterated that there is a document before us, and so taking other documents into consideration may be overstepping what we have been asked to do. B. Edmonds agreed. A. Maltese agreed with both positions, but considering that we are being asked to vote on what is currently in front of us, it makes sense to limit the language of the motion to the current document and allow the next committee to bring in additional information as needed. C. Buzzelli again asked for clarification on whether the action item before us is on the restructuring committee's document or on supporting the move. The motion before the council was re-read and council members discussed wording to clarify where the ad hoc committee can find the "issues" noted in the motion.

Friendly amendment: add "in the faculty survey dated 10.14.2016" made by C. Buzelli and B. Levinson

P. Rogan asked if we should include the restructuring committee's document as well in the friendly amendment. B. Dennis asked about the similarity of the recommendations in the structure document and the faculty survey, noting that if the concerns identified are similar, we may not need to mention both documents. N. Flowers expressed concerns that policy council's responsibility goes beyond just the survey, but also includes acknowledging all of the issues that have been raised in the past. Limiting us to one document is slighting the history and politics of all that have brought us to this transition point. Consensus from IUPUI is that the structure committee document should be included. S. Power Carter agreed.

Further friendly amendment made by P. Rogan: add "in the restructuring committee document and the faculty survey"

Complete Motion with friendly amendments:

We move to support the next step in the process of separation, with specific attention to address the issues that have been raised by faculty in the restructuring committee document and the faculty survey dated 10.14.2016.

Vote by a show of hands:

In favor (13):

A. Maltese, C. Buzzelli, S. Power Carter, B. Edmonds, B. Levinson, M. Mikel, M. Boots, A. Maltese, K. Barton, B. Dennis, P. Rogan, N. Flowers, C. Morton

Opposed: none

Abstained (2): M. Kersulov, A. Hollet

B. Chung reminded members of the next steps in the process: The three sources of information (Policy Council vote, faculty survey and restructuring committee report) will go on to an ad hoc committee with representatives from IUB and IUPUI (which includes Columbus) and at least 2 external members. We have been discussing how to compose the committee. Rebecca Spang, of the Bloomington Faculty Council (BFC) asked if the policy council would like to make nominations for ad hoc committee appointment, or would the council members like to be the ad hoc committee? B. Chung invited P. Rogan to share with council members the approach that IUPUI is taking. P. Rogan explained that IUPUI will be asking their FABA committee to appoint members of the ad hoc committee. B. Chung noted that IUB and IUPUI can have different processes to select ad hoc committee representatives. A. Maltese asked about representation, would it be equal, or proportional? B. Chung explained that his understanding is that it will be proportional representation. B. Dennis asked if there is a logic to being proportional considering that IUPUI has more at stake. We want to insure that those most affected are heard. B. Chung stated that he will need to consult Rebecca on this. P. Rogan expressed that it is important that thought be put into the composition in terms of demographics, roles and program representation as well. B. Chung began proposing options including having the policy council act as ad hoc committee members, having policy council nominate others through a process, or having a call out for nominations or self-nominations. B. Dennis stated it would be important to have a representative from HESA on the committee. C. Buzzelli asked if there is discussion of how large the committee should be. B. Chung did not know of any guidelines as to the size. Discussion ensued about what might be a workable number, with consensus around 10-12 total committee members being a good number. J. Danish suggested that the agenda committee take on the process of nominating a committee. C. Buzzelli noted that policy council has turnover each year, which might be a consideration. B. Dennis asked about the work demands of the policy council chair taking on this role? B. Chung noted that the agenda committee would not necessarily be on the ad hoc committee, but would nominate potential members through a process that takes into consideration various factors. B. Levinson asked about the potential role of the nominations committee. B. Chung clarified that the nominations committee has the role of nominating people for policy council, but agenda committee does all committee nominations. B. Dennis asked for suggestions about the composition of the committee. B. Chung suggested a process where the agenda committee makes recommendations for nominations that will then go back to policy council and consultation with IUPUI as to their selections to ensure a representation that everyone is comfortable with. Council members agreed to this process

Math Ed EdD Proposal 17.13

C. Morton stated that the rationale for removing the language around electives needing to be taken from outside of the major and the minor is that these areas of math, curriculum and pedagogy are a part of the major, also these students are required to come into the program with a masters. The point of the program is to build content around their master's degree. The current wording forces students to take electives that do not relate to their master's degree. Instead we would like to facilitate the selection of courses that are more directly related to a student's field of study.

Motion made by: N. Flowers

Second: J. Danish

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

IST Certificate Program 17.14

M. Boots explained that at one point students could take one or the other of these two courses. The last bulletin only included one course and resulted in a lot of waivers being issued. This change is putting into the program of study a practice that has been common and accommodates both of these course choices.

Motion made by: J. Danish

Second: B. Edmonds

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

IEPE Proposal 17.15

M. Boots explained that this exam is required of any non-native graduate student. Students are automatically put into the group to take the test and there wasn't a good process for waivers. There are also many students who may meet the automatic waiver criteria, but would actually benefit from more support. The proposal would include a quick form to put the impetus on the department to initiate a waiver according to specific guidelines, rather than assuming that everyone who meets the criteria would automatically be exempted. In the past we ran into issues with people trying to get last minute waivers when documentation did not arrive to the university on time to exempt students.

Discussion

B. Chung asked how TOEFL scores factor into the process. M. Boots explained that TOEFL is a part of admissions, and these courses are now required for everyone who is an international student, regardless of TOEFL scores. It is likely that if students do well on the TOEFL, that information could be presented in support of a waiver request. B. Dennis asked for clarification on the process. M. Boots explained that TOEFL is taken before students come to campus. Everyone has to take the IEPE test, unless they meet specific criteria and request a waiver. Based on the test score, specific writing or speaking courses become required for the student. This policy would allow for a clearer procedure to request a waiver from the test earlier. K. Barton asked if grad studies would submit a list saying we want waivers for all of these people. M. Boots replied that Grad Studies sends them as they get them. This process would make things more efficient for grad studies, and help to hone in on

the students who don't need to take the exam. B. Dennis asked what the university policy is on this topic. M. Boots replied that the university policy is that all students have to take the exam, unless the Dean from Graduate Studies provides a waiver. We want a process that also facilitates professor input as to who does or does not need to take the exam, as the faculty know more about the needs of the student. B. Dennis asked if this is Bloomington specific and M. Boots said yes. K. Barton asked where the criteria for waivers in the university policy came from, particularly in regards to some criteria that some might argue does not imply fluency. M. Boots didn't know where they came from, but the new policy proposal is an attempt to address some of the issues stemming from the assumptions in the current criteria to better meet the needs of individual students. B. Levinson asked about the dissemination of this new process. It will be important to ensure that all those involved in admitting have this on their list of things to check on. M. Boots replied that it will probably work differently in different departments. There will be a quick form to be forwarded to the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, but it will be up to departments on how they want to approach this.

Motion made by: C. Buzzelli

Second: A. Hollett

Result: *Approved Unanimously*, 1 abstention

Final announcement

J. Danish asked members to nominate candidates for the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies position. He is Chair of the Search Committee.

IV. New Course/Course Changes

No courses to be considered at this time.

Adjourned 2:27 pm