

MINUTES  
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
May 3, 2017

1:00-3:00pm  
IUB—Room 2140  
IUPUI—Room 3138B  
IUPUC—Room 155E

---

**Members Present:** J. Danish; V. Borden; C. Medina; J. Anderson; P. Rogan; A. Maltese; B. Dennis; S. Power-Carter

**Alternate Members Present:** L. Gilman; T. Sosa; A. Hackenberg

**Student Members Present:** none

**Staff Member Present:** M. Boots

**Dean's Staff Present:** T. Mason; G. Crow; K. Barton; B. Chung

**Guests:** S. Daley; A. Walton; T. Nelson-Laird; J. Lester; L. Stachowski

Approval of the Minutes from March 22, 2017 Meeting **(17.40M)**

Correction to minutes: Add 'i' in J. Danish, p. 5

**Motion to approve minutes as amended made by:** J. Danish

**Second:** V. Borden

**Result:** *Approved Unanimously*

**New Business-** *Item below was moved up to accommodate scheduling*

*Proposal for Change in the History of Education Program (17.44)*

A. Walton informed members that the rationale for these changes include (1) requiring H530, Philosophy of Education, which had been strongly recommended in practice and would now be a formal requirement; (2) to eliminate H750, which is a course they have not been able to offer for a while now; and (3) to ask students to complete one additional history of education topical seminar.

**Motion made by:** V. Borden

**Second:** J. Danish

**Result:** *Approved Unanimously*

## **I. Announcements and Discussions**

### *Agenda Committee*

C. Medina informed members that she attended a Bloomington Faculty Council (BFC) meeting for all chairs of policy councils across the campus. Here the BFC shared information on actions taken this year. The School of Education was informed of the majority of these actions as they occurred throughout the year, but in summary, these actions include: the policy on the minimum qualification for teaching, the campus-wide statement on diversity and the resolution on the campus climate, civility, and inclusion. There was mention of cyber security and the implementation of the new Duo certification system and also the campus policy on open access for the presentation of research results that are federally funded including the different initiatives that the BFC and the Provost Office are exploring to support new faculty

that need the funding to have these research results published open access. This information will be passed on to the next Policy Council chair so this can be explored further, should next year's Policy Council choose to do so. There is a new campus policy website which makes it much easier to see all of the policies in one place. The BFC briefly mentioned ongoing discussions about how non-tenure track faculty are represented in governance and decision-making. Rebecca Sprang is outgoing BFC president and Alex Tanford is the incoming president. One other thing that will be relevant for Policy Council to discuss is that the BFC would like a liaison from each unit's policy council to enhance communication and connection with the different units.

#### *Dean's Report*

Dean Mason updated members on the space utilization initiative. This week CIEDR moved into the second floor of the Education building. We continue to look at possibilities for alternate uses of space so that other research centers can move into the Education building over the next couple of years. At AERA last week Dean Mason met with the dean of Beijing Normal University School of Education, we have signed a memorandum of understanding regarding a partnership and are discussing fleshing out that partnership and expanding our research partnerships among faculty and also possible dual degree programs at the Masters and Doctoral levels.

### **II. Old Business-** *Item moved to within "New Business section" below to accommodate scheduling*

### **III. New Business**

#### *Mentoring Plan (17.48)*

S. Daley informed members that the purpose of this plan is to formalize what already exists in terms of faculty mentoring, and also further support faculty in engaging in mentoring to enhance the experience. The Faculty Development committee is in the process of developing additional resources to support this relationship. One focus of this plan is to help mentors to support the mentee in identifying a constellation of mentors, as well as finding dedicated time for a minimum of four one-on-one mentoring sessions throughout the academic year. We are also looking to provide additional support to department chairs and guidelines clarifying their role so that they can successfully support these mentoring relationships or make changes as needed.

#### *Discussion:*

C. Medina noted that in her experience, the goal setting process between the mentor and mentee is critical and so resources to support this, perhaps an external person guiding the conversation would be helpful. S. Daley noted that the resources being developed could be designed to address this. A. Maltese noted that one successful approach for pairing students with student mentors is to set up an opportunity to "try on" the different relationships first. For example, a group of potential matches are introduced so that the eventual pairing is an informed decision with some buy-in from both sides. S. Daley noted that the Faculty Development committee has discussed ways to support this type of concept. G. Crow noted that there are many ways that the pairing can be done. The important piece in this plan is that the department chairs are responsible for ensuring this happens.

#### **Two friendly amendments:**

- The inclusion of some sort of resources, possibly an outside person, to facilitate the establishment of goals

- Ensuring that it is an informed decision when assigning mentors

**Motion made by:** J. Danish

**Second:** J. Anderson

**Result:** *Approved Unanimously*

*ELPS Department Chair Selection Process (17.43)*

V. Borden described the proposed process and noted that this change in process is to accommodate the fact that the current interim chair is interested in the permanent chair position.

*Discussion:*

A. Maltese asked what happens if the nominee does not accept the position? V. Borden replied that in that case, the process would begin again, but this is not anticipated to be an issue. L. Gilman asked for clarification about a nominee's ability to decline a nomination? V. Borden confirmed that a nominee cannot decline a nomination. However, a person can decline the position. G. Crow noted that any time there is a process started to find a new chair, the process has to be approved by the Policy Council. This is why this document is before the Council today. B. Chung asked about a timeline. V. Borden explained that this process is to begin as soon as possible.

**Motion made by:** J. Anderson

**Second:** V. Borden

**Result:** *Approved Unanimously*

*Proposal for Graduate Certificate GPA (17.45)*

B. Chung explained to members that this policy is an effort to tie up some loose ends in Graduate Studies policies, to avoid situations where the associate dean has to make arbitrary decisions. Graduate Studies recommended this GPA cut-off. K. Barton asked about the use of the word "automatic", does this mean at the end of the term, or before the end of the term? The language reads pretty harsh. M. Boots recommended altering the language. J. Anderson suggested using the language "probation". A. Maltese suggested removing "automatic." V. Bordon suggested changing the language to "subject to probation and dismissal."

**Friendly amendment:** "subject to probation and dismissal" to replace "automatic dismissal"

**Motion made by:** V. Borden

**Second:** J. Anderson

**Result:** *Approved Unanimously*

*Promotion Criteria for Research Ranks- revised (16.46R)*

T. Nelson Laird informed members that this document has been evolving over the past few years. A version was approved by Policy Council last year, but as we went through some actual reviews this past year, we have come to realize that some revisions are necessary. This document represents feedback from center directors as well as the Vice Provost's Office. The major changes in this version are that it reads more clearly and is better organized. Also, feedback from the Vice Provost's Office noted that research scientists are a class "under consideration" across the university system right now, and that research

scientist should be judged only on research. Lecturers are judged on teaching, tenure-track faculty, on service, teaching and research, clinical faculty on teaching and service. Yet, in the context of centers, it is critical that research scientists contribute service to the center, but the way the University requires criteria for research scientists, you will find the topic of “service” under the “research” section, and not in a separate section. You will also see that the number of letters required is decreased, because the pool of potential reviewers is smaller, also there is some competition for letters with tenure-track faculty, and we want to minimize this. Also the number of tenure-track faculty required to serve on a committee for research scientists is 60%. This is in compliance with University requirements, though this is something that the research scientists disagree with. They would like to be reviewed by other research scientists. Such a change would require a change in University policy, and so while we value this perspective, it is important that we comply with University policy. If the University policy were to change, we could then change this policy to satisfy this desire. Two other recommendations for changes presented in a letter from John Hitchcock include slight changes to the wording of the letters requirement and the addition of some legal language around the concept of secret voting.

*Discussion:*

There was discussion of the language regarding 3-6 letters versus a minimum of three and maximum of six. Council members had different interpretations of the impact of the language on the actions of research scientist as they go through the process. B. Chung asked about the potential implications for the language in this policy for underrepresented groups, are there cultural biases present? T. Nelson Laird noted that the policy has been praised for the way it supports multiple definitions of the role. While it may have some cultural biases in it, it is difficult to create a policy document that is bias-free. V. Borden asked how we want to consider the recommendations in J. Hitchcock’s letter. J. Anderson addressed the legal language suggestion, based on his experience in an unrelated situation, commenting that such language can make the document look cleaner when it is reviewed in a legal context. J. Danish agreed that adding this language is unlikely to have a down-side and so it may be worth adding. V. Borden noted that we do not want to go against University policy regarding the first suggestion in the letter, and regarding the number of letters, because different people interpret the different language versions differently, the language should not be changed. A. Maltese asked about the implications of having only three letters. G. Crow noted that while this change is an effort to accommodate the needs of research scientists who were having a hard time finding enough qualified reviewers, one bad letter out of three looks much worse than one bad letter out of six. T. Nelson Laird acknowledged this and noted that this will require some discretion and strategizing on the part of the center director and the research scientist during this process. A. Maltese asked about research scientists not affiliated with a center. T. Nelson Laird stated that there is language in the document to accommodate this. V. Borden asked which committee a scientist would be referred to in the event they are not affiliated with a center? T. Nelson Laird noted that a new committee would be appointed, as outlined by this policy.

**Friendly amendment:** add the language suggested by J. Hitchcock regarding the secrecy legal disclaimer

**Comes as a motion from the Faculty Affairs Committee**

**Second:** J. Anderson

**Result:** *Approved Unanimously*

*Promotion Criteria for Lecturers (17.46)*

T. Nelson-Laird noted that the School of Education now has one lecturer position and so a promotion criteria policy was needed. The Faculty Affairs Committee went through this as they were also going through the process of the research scientist promotion and tenure criteria, and so this was informed by that experience and knowledge gained. This policy serves the unique aspects of the lecturer position, which focuses on teaching. You will see that service to the school's teaching mission is listed under the "teaching" criteria and not as a separate category. The senior lecturer position comes with a long-term contract, analogous to the clinical positions. Unlike research scientists, lecturers are imbedded within an academic department, and so they will go through the process within that context.

*Discussion*

L. Gilman asked about clinical lecturers, where do they fall? G. Crow noted that the position is considered a clinical position. V. Borden confirmed that there are two levels for the lecturer position. T. Nelson Laird noted that this process is most likely to be impacted by the changes anticipated at the university level for non-tenure track positions. There was a brief discussion of the rights of non-tenure track faculty where G. Crow noted that, when compared to other units, the SOE is ahead on this issue.

**Result:** *Approved Unanimously*

*Standing Committee Reports*

C. Medina welcomed committee representatives and invited Policy Council members to direct questions regarding committee annual reports to the appropriate representative. There were no questions.

**Action Taken: Reports accepted**

**(OLD BUSINESS) Diversity Topic: Diversity Plan (17.42)**

J. Lester informed members that a major effort of the diversity committee has been to develop a faculty diversity plan. This came as a charge from the Office of the Vice Provost of Faculty and Academic Affairs, and the Policy Council charged the Diversity Committee with the plan development. The Diversity Committee met last May and then contacted John Nieto Philips, who granted our request for an extension for submitting the plan so that we could utilize a more comprehensive development approach with strong faculty support. We began with an event in the summer of 2016 and then continued hosting smaller events throughout the year, culminating with the faculty retreat in March of this year. Here working groups took on segments of the plan and generated information that is directly in the plan. The final plan represents information from these working groups, the various events throughout the year and additional information gathered over the past 15 years. The plan itself includes several components that are required: mission and vision statement, set of best practices, particularly hiring practices, accountability measures and then we are invited to add additional components. The plan emerged from the interactions in the working groups for the retreat with a focus on practices which support sustained change. The plan was submitted and reviewed by the full Diversity Committee and the Deans Office which have both offered comment on the plan.

*Discussion:*

C. Medina asked about next steps, in particular, what is the role of policy council in terms of next steps? J. Lester stated that the Diversity committee was given the charge to create a draft of the diversity plan, and the committee is now presenting the outcomes of this charge to the Council. S. Power Carter noted that there are timeline considerations. This document has already received two extensions from the

Provost's Office. V. Borden acknowledged the extensive work that the subcommittee did to engage the faculty throughout the process, reflecting the values of diversity, equity and inclusion throughout the process. He commended the strong relationship between this plan and the long range plan. V. Borden also noted the fact that this is a living document that will need to evolve further over time, but this plan has such faculty input, it seems unnecessary to evolve the plan further at this point. J. Lester and S. Power Carter explained that the connection between the Long Range Plan and this document was intentional. C. Medina suggested we consider this plan as a starting point. As a Policy Council, we need to think about what this means. Does it mean we choose to evolve it further through another committee for next year, or do we submit it as is? A. Maltese noted that the accountability piece may not be strong enough to have an impact. Should we be asking for documentation of the efforts done in each department instead? For example, asking for specific documentation of efforts that demonstrate an effort to recruit. S. Power-Carter acknowledged the importance of accountability and referred to the section of the document identifying the potential responsibility of a Dean of Diversity position in holding departments accountable. She also noted that in her experience, setting high, concrete goals in terms of numbers in a document doesn't work, though it could be something we consider. J. Lester agreed that, if we think of this as a living document, adding concrete numbers may be something to consider with each review of the document. V. Borden noted that sometimes putting specifics into words can backfire, creating resistance as people focus on disputing the numbers rather than embodying the sentiment driving the numbers.

J. Anderson asked about next steps in terms of implementation. V. Borden suggested that each committee review their work next year in light of this plan, and that these ideas are reflected through committee work and governance, as well as in the annual reports of each committee. J. Lester noted that the subcommittee discussed the implementation, and considered naming different responsible bodies. Working through the committees is likely a good next step. Discussion ensued regarding the logistics of how to proceed. S. Power-Carter noted that there are budget implications for many of the implementation ideas and these need to be considered. C. Medina noted that there are many ideas in this document that we have begun to implement or could be implemented quickly, and then there are other elements that may need more unpacking. S. Power-Carter noted that there is a fundamental tension in this plan's implementation. Some view the proposals here as taking away from something else, while others view this as enhancing the whole. This tension creates a complication that the Policy Council should be thinking about as they consider the plan. Dean Mason asked for clarification on who is submitting this plan to whom, as the charge was given before Dean Mason's tenure as Dean. There was discussion as to whether or not the charge came from the Vice Provost to the Dean and then to the Policy Council, or from the Vice Provost directly to Policy Council. Dean Mason noted that the fiscal implications of this plan appear to require involvement of the Dean's office. The involvement of the Dean's office also has benefits regarding the garnering of additional resources from campus or through other sources to help with the implementation. B. Chung praised the plan for the inclusion of a column noting responsible units in the plan. This will be valuable in communicating specific needs that can help to support the implementation and evaluation of efforts. Every department needs to do their own homework as to their holes and challenges, rather than just looking at the SOE numbers as a whole. Perhaps what the Policy Council could do today is ask all departments to look at the plan and respond, consulting with the Dean's office as appropriate. S. Power Carter noted that this plan is a piece of a much larger plan. This meets the requirements of J. Nieto Philips, but considering all of the stakeholders, it is important to add a student and staff component as well. This is future work. A. Maltese asked about how this leads into the dean search. C. Medina noted that this document will be very helpful to orient a new dean to these values.

C. Medina suggested that this Policy Council make a charge to next year's Policy Council to move this work forward. S. Power Carter asked for clarification about what happens next. V. Borden stated that the

Provost Office needs the plan and so it makes sense to turn it in with the understanding that this is a working document. Dean Mason noted that if this document is clearly a recommendation from a standing committee, or Policy Council, then it makes sense to move forward, understanding that there is more work that needs to be put into this in terms of resource allocations, etc. If this is coming from the Dean's Office, then committing to the financial element without looking at it more carefully would be irresponsible. S. Power Carter reminded the Council that submitted plans are being reviewed by the Provost's Office and they are spending time now figuring out accountability. Other Dean's Offices have approved their unit's plans. V. Borden asked what it would take to move it forward in the case that Dean's Office approval is required? Dean Mason noted it would require conversations about the potential for additional support from the campus, internal inquiry into our current budget status, decisions such as trade-offs for the allocation of resources towards this. This is a priority, and we want to figure out how to do it, but it will take time to figure out how it will happen. V. Borden asked if it could be submitted with provisos? T. Mason stated that perhaps he could add a statement regarding what we are willing to provide and what we might need in terms of support. A discussion ensued about potential changes to the language of the plan to resolve the timing challenge, without weakening the plan. A. Maltese asked if there is a way that the Council could demonstrate its support for the document as is, and then pass it on to the Dean's Office to find out what can be done in the short term. V. Borden suggested an attachment or preamble that outlines the Dean's Office's concerns regarding implementation. Dean Mason suggested he draft such a letter and send it to the committee for review before sending it on to the Vice Provost Office. A full faculty review of the plan is not necessary. A vote of support from the Policy Council should suffice. G. Crow noted that the time frame for much of the items listed, which impact faculty directly, is next year. It could be valuable to take this to the committees for their review and feedback on the feasibility for achieving the goals. This will likely require a lot of faculty time next year, and so input from committees as to what is reasonable to expect for next year may be important. J. Danish agreed that asking committees to identify priority goals may be valuable. V. Borden noted that this is a plan, not a contract. If goals aren't met, it's not a big deal. J. Danish noted that for this reason, it seems important that Policy Council approve this to move forward and charge committees to work with this next year. V. Borden noted that if we don't start doing the work outlined by the plan, we will never find out if the document is too broad or too specific. The Dean's office will submit the plan with an attached letter which will be shared with the Policy Council, including the Diversity Committee as a courtesy.

**Motion:** to accept and endorse the diversity plan and charge the responsible units and Policy Council committees to move forward with first steps as indicated in the plan and report on progress or alternative strategies in the October Policy Council meeting.

**Motion made by:** A. Maltese

**Second:** J. Anderson

**Result:** *Approved Unanimously*

#### *Ad Hoc Committee for School Structure document (17.47)*

B. Dennis noted that the purpose today is to give an update on the process and get a Policy Council vote to support the document. We have a near final document. From here forward we have conversations planned with or separate faculties. We will put the document out for a vote by the faculty, the wording will be something like "we endorse the conditions for separation as outlined by the ad-hoc committee in this report." It will be a yes/no vote with a space for comments. We will work comments into the document before it moves forward. We would like Policy Council's endorsement of the report. In Bloomington the Q&A is tomorrow morning in room 2277 at 10:00. P. Rogan noted that the IUPUI

faculty conversation will be this Friday at our faculty meeting. We know there will be some final tweaks, but we are very interested in the tally of the voting from each campus and also the comments provided by the faculty. This report has gone through many iterations and so we really want to help faculty reach an understanding with the document and make sure we are aware of any concerns that people may have that we may not have addressed in the process. This Policy Council vote will be separate from the faculty vote, and we wanted the vote to be anonymous. We thought it would be important to have that as a statement from the elected core-campus body. Dean Mason clarified that the vote will not take place until both campuses have given feedback and the plan is tweaked as needed. B. Dennis stated that comments asking for substantive changes may be worked in as a separate comments section added to the document, rather than changing the report itself. The committee has been through a long process to get to this document, and so the committee is aware of issues regarding why things have been added or removed. As a result, the document may include comments and the committee's response to the comments as a separate addition to the report. The final draft will likely only be available in a complete form after the vote. Dean Mason noted concerns that if the comments are contradictory to the report, it could cause concerns moving forward.

Faculty will vote and Policy Council members will vote, but no one can vote twice. A. Maltese suggested Qualtrics be used rather than Survey Monkey, and if anonymity is a great concern, use the Center for Survey Research.

**Motion to adjourn M. Boots  
V. Bordon second**

**IV. New Course/Course Changes**

The following course changes 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.

*Proposed New Courses:*

**G310 Addictions Counseling            BL-Bloomington            Cr: 3**

This course is a survey of the field of counseling for addictive behaviors. The focus will be largely on alcohol and other drug use. Course topics will include models and theories of addiction, psychological processes and addiction, diversity and health disparities in addiction, and prevention and treatment models. The final portion of the course will cover other non-substance related addictive behaviors such as gambling. Throughout the course, students will be encouraged to challenge common conceptualizations of addictions as portrayed in our society.

*Justification:* This course is being developed to be part of the counseling minor in the school of education. Addictions are a significant problem facing many Americans with broad impacts to family, school, work, and community life. Students who are minoring in counseling and pursue jobs in human services will need to be equipped with knowledge about addictions and what treatments are effective. Students in other fields such as education and human development would also benefit from a course that surveys the addictions and counseling interventions.