

TO: Policy Council
FROM: Enrique Galindo, Chair
Long Range Planning Committee
SUBJECT: Report on 2006-07 activities
DATE: April 19, 2007

During the 2006–07 academic year the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) worked on two major activities: the Core Campus retreats and revisions to the constitution of the faculty. The actions undertaken and the follow up needed are described in this end-of-year report to Policy Council.

2006 Core Campus Retreat

In spring 2006, the Long Range Planning Committee requested that the fall faculty retreat focus on the School of Education’s Long Range Plan. The 2006 Core Campus Retreat took place on Friday Oct 13, 2006, at McCormick’s Creek. Faculty worked in small groups to examine each of the 5 goals of the plan. A number of recommendations related to each of the 5 goals emerged from the retreat. Some recommendations are about actions the School should undertake, others are about proposed changes to the School’s Long Range Plan. These recommendations and the actions taken are described in the next section.

Follow Up to 2006 Retreat

The LRPC examined several options to follow up on the retreat. We concluded that rather than creating new committees or task forces to follow up on the retreat, the best way to ensure that action be taken on these recommendations is to use the existing faculty governance structure. We identified standing Policy Council Committees that we think are best equipped to follow up on specific recommendations. We submitted our recommendations to the Agenda Committee and some changes were suggested. The recommendations for each Goal that emerged from the retreat are listed in Appendix A. The specific action suggested by the LRPC in consultation with the Agenda Committee is listed after each goal. While some progress has been made this year to address these recommendations, much more needs to be done during the 2007-08 academic year. We suggest that as committees work on implementing the recommendations, they also think of developing indicators of the extent to which we have met the goals in the Long Range Plan.

2007 Core Campus Retreat

The LRPC used online surveys to request input from the faculty on the date, location, theme and format for the 2007 retreat. Some faculty members raised the issue that the location of the retreat has traditionally been closer to the Bloomington campus than to the IUPUI campus. A date was identified that maximized attendance for those who responded to the survey. The 2007 Core Campus Retreat will be on Friday October 5, 2007, at Bradford Woods. The deadline to respond to the survey about themes and format for the retreat is April 23. The LRPC will consider the suggestions received at their April 24 meeting.

Constitutional Revisions

In Spring 2007 the Policy Council asked the LRPC to engage the faculty in a process to revise the Constitution of the Faculty. One of the concerns that prompted this charge is the possibility of committee redundancy and service overload. Proposed amendments are requested by January 2008 at the latest. As a first step in identifying needed constitutional revisions, the LRPC asked Policy Council committees to provide the LRPC with an initial review of their functions in relation the functions outlined in the constitution.

Eight chairs of Policy Council committees responded to the LRPC's request to look into their charge. As they engaged their committees to reflect on their charge the committees that responded did not perceive overlap with functions of other committees, nor the need to distribute some of their functions to other committees. Two committees suggest new wording for their charge (Committee on Diversity and IUPUI Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee), and one committee noted aspects of their work not listed in their current charge (Promotions, Tenure and Contracts Committee). The Committee on Diversity raises important issues to consider. Finally the Scholarships Committee requests a review of the committee and that Policy Council considers appointing a chair. Chairs from 9 committees did not send comments. Summaries, as well as the complete responses from each committee are included in Appendix B.

The LRPC will continue work to engage the faculty in constitutional revisions during the fall semester.

A pdf version of the Constitution of the Faculty can be found at:
<http://profile.educ.indiana.edu/Portals/28/Policies/Constitution.pdf>

Appendix A
Follow up to 2006 Core Campus Retreat

The recommendations for each Goal that emerged from the retreat are listed below. The specific action suggested by the LRPC in consultation with the Agenda Committee is listed after each goal.

Goal 1 - Continue IU's Commitment to Strong Pre-Service Teacher Education

The small group made 5 recommendations:

1. Expand focus of programs and faculty and student perceptions of types of work for which they prepare from current focus on teaching in classrooms to broader view of where teaching and learning may occur and be facilitated, i.e., museums
2. These expanded views of programs suggest more flexibility in undergraduate programs AND being more "student-centered"
3. Expanded views suggest that undergraduate programs are more than just "courses", but include additional experiences and a variety of "capstone" experiences besides student teaching
4. Expanded views also suggest that teaching and courses may be in different places and may be delivered in different ways
5. Expanded view of "teaching" for faculty to be more than classroom instruction, but also work in various "teaching" settings along with an expanded sense of rewards.

ACTION: Submit to IUB and IUPUI Committees on Teacher Education for their consideration. Add the recommendation from diversity that states, "that the School increases the number of under-represented minorities in the undergraduate teacher education program. Towards that end, a significant commitment of resources and effort will be necessary."

Goal 2 - Strengthen the School of Education's Partnerships with P-12 Schools and Communities

The small group discussed several issues for this goal:

What are the problems that get in the way of creating productive partnerships between universities and public schools/communities?

Examine three-way conversations among schools, community agencies and organizations and universities. Put all the folks involved in these partnerships in the same room so that productive communication can happen.

Create partnerships that are both collaborative and catalytic.

Partnership development requires huge time commitments from faculty – how will the faculty be valued/rewarded for this time for promotion and tenure?

When this kind of work is done well, it must be documented and evaluated so others can benefit.

What is a partnership when we are talking about working with our colleagues in P-12 schools?
How do we learn to have a dialog?

ACTION: Submit to the P-16 Center and to the Promotions and Tenure Committee for their consideration.

Goal 3 - Enhance and Expand the School's Research and Other Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Strengthen the Quality of Graduate Programs

The small group recommends that the Long Range Plan be revised so that “Enhance and Expand the School's Research and Other Scholarly and Creative Activities” and “Strengthen the Quality of Graduate Programs” are 2 separate goals.

The group had 2 recommendations for improving Research, etc.

Recommendation 1: Examine means of protecting faculty time in order to facilitate faculty research. (Possible areas to examine: revise the committee structure to eliminate possible redundancies, examine numbers of doctoral students/advisor, examine the demands of the teacher education program).

Recommendation 2: Support faculty research systematically (Possible areas to examine: providing more inquiry support, funding for new faculty).

The group had 2 recommendations for strengthening the quality of graduate programs.

Recommendation 1: Continue to commit resources to improving the web site for the School in order to attract excellent graduate students.

Recommendation 2: Explore ways to improve funding for graduate students (Possible areas to examine are: dissertation fellowships, 1 year fellowships for the first year).

ACTION: Submit the first set of recommendations to the Research Development and Equipment Committee. Submit the second set of recommendations to both the Student Recruitment Admissions and Financial Aid Committee and to the Graduate Studies Committee.

Goal 4 - Provide Leadership in the Appropriate Use of Technologies to Enhance Teaching and Learning Experiences

The group felt that for this goal moving away from infrastructure language to VISION is central.

The group proposes new language for several of the tasks within this goal (will be forwarded to the Long Range Planning Committee) and recommends the following priorities.

1. Development of a vision for how technology can be used (Create a library of exemplars, examples of student e-portfolios, faculty demonstrate it in classes, in research, in publications, both in preservice & inservice teach. prep., opportunities for faculty to use technology)
2. Use innovative technology to enhance learning *across disciplines*. Focus on technology to support learning rather than technology as an end in itself.
3. Serve as a learning laboratory for the efficacy of technology for meaningful learning.
4. Focus on “internalize and use it” rather than just have innovations available. Make what people have learned about technology available to others.
5. Focus on how technology changes the role and structure of the university.
6. Focus on technology in P-12 as part of outreach efforts. Technology could be source to help us build relationships with schools.
7. Support tech infrastructure. Continue to reinvest in innovative technology.

ACTION: The Long Range Planning Committee will work on follow up to recommendations 1, 4 and 5. Submit recommendations 2 and 3 to the Committee on Teaching. Submit recommendation 6 to the P-16 Center. Submit recommendation 6 to the Committee on Research Development and Equipment.

Goal 5 - Promote Diversity

Based on the research completed during the past year, the diversity committee and the group meeting at the retreat, **recommends that the School increases the number of under-represented minorities in the undergraduate teacher education program.** Towards that end, a significant commitment of resources and effort will be necessary.

The following recommendations considered by the small group focusing on this goal:

Recommendation 1: *Study the impact of the PRAXIS on minority student enrollment.* To what extent does PRAXIS reduce the representation of students of color either prior to application or between application and admission to the program? Are there different structures for administration of PRAXIS (e.g., taking the test earlier in a student’s college career) that may increase the success rate? Should faculty in the School make PRAXIS a research agenda? Is it possible to create a policy agenda for the state to re-examine the importance of PRAXIS in admissions to teacher training?

Recommendation2: *Develop creative and effective options for improving the proportion of*

students of color and other under-represented groups in the application pool for the Teacher Education Program. The Dean highlighted the initiative that the School is attempting to get funding for. In addition, the retreat group felt it was important to look at a variety of options, including recruitment on campus, for increasing applications to the TEP from students from under-represented groups.

Recommendation 3: *Establish institutional funding for Project TEAM.* TEAM has been a highly successful initiative for increasing minority enrollment in Teacher Education, but is currently unfunded. It is extremely important that the school use every means possible to re-establish reliable long-term funding for Project TEAM.

Recommendation 4: *Examine the climate and culture for retention of faculty of color.* One of the clear preconditions for recruiting and retaining students of color is a sufficient presence of faculty of color. It is not at all clear, however, whether the current climate is sufficient for attracting and retaining faculty of color. Culture and climate issues need to be thoroughly examined and where necessary addressed in order to ensure that we retain current faculty of color and can attract new faculty of color.

Recommendation 5: *Utilize other institutional supports, such as the P-16 center and the Policy Council committee structure, as an opportunity for structure and support.* It is not sufficient that the SOE have diversity written in as a goal or set of goals in the long term plan. Rather, the degree of commitment to those goals may be indexed by the amount of human and fiscal resources that flow towards those goals. Thus, part of the purpose of the next report on recruitment will be to recommend ways to move beyond occasional discussions of diversity issues, or responsibility within only one committee (e.g., the Diversity Committee) to institutionalization and integration of the activities associated with Goal 5 across the entire committee infrastructure of the School of Education.

The Diversity Committee has been charged by the Policy Council with bringing back specific recommendations on how to improve minority recruitment in the undergraduate teacher education program; with the assistance of those present at the retreat, that committee will later this academic year issue a follow-up action report amplifying these and other recommendations.

ACTION: Submit to Committee on Diversity.

Appendix B
Responses from Chairs of Policy Council Committees
Review of Committee Charge in the Constitution of the Faculty

Eight chairs of Policy Council committees responded to the LRPC's request to look into their charge. As they engaged their committees to reflect on their charge they did not perceive overlap with functions of other committees, nor the need to distribute some of their functions to other committees. Two committees suggest new wording for their charge, and one committee noted aspects of their work not listed in their current charge. The Committee on Diversity raises important issues to consider. Finally the Scholarships Committee request a review of the committee and that Policy Council considers appointing a chair. Chairs from 9 committees did not send comments.

A short version of their responses is below. The complete responses from each committee are at the end.

ABRIDGED RESPONSE BY COMMITTEE

IUB Committee on Teacher Education: They do not feel there is overlap with functions of other committees.

Faculty Affairs Committee: No perceived overlap with functions assigned to other committees.

Distinguished Alumni Award Committee: No obvious intersection with missions of other committees. Something they feel they have lost after they became a Policy Council committee is the ability to recruit emeriti faculty for their committee.

Committee on Diversity: Do not feel redundancy or overlap with other committees, but suggest new wording for their charge and issues to consider. See elaboration below.

IUPUI Grievance Committee: Current structure and charge seems to work well.

IUPUI Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee: No perceived overlap but suggest new wording for their charge.

Promotions, Tenure and Contracts Committee: No perceived need to redistribute their work. Note that the constitution does not list their work reviewing dossiers of clinical faculty.

Scholarships Committee: Requests that Policy Council reviews the functions of the Scholarship Committee, they are dealing with a larger volume of scholarships every year. They ask Policy Council to consider appointing a chair, who could appoint faculty to review the applicants for new scholarships.

COMMITTEES THAT PROVIDED NO COMMENTS

Research, Development, and Equipment

IUB Grievance Committee
Student Recruitment, Admissions and Financial Aid
IUPUI Committee on Teacher Education
Lecturers and Seminars Committee
Graduate Studies Committee
Committee on International Programs
Committee on Teaching
Education Council

COMPLETE RESPONSES

1. Committee on Teacher Education.

The Committee on Teacher Education coordinates the teacher education curricula across all departments in the school and those outside the school that have teacher education programs (i.e., Drama; Health, Physical Education and Recreation; the School of Music). It has responsibility to provide initial approval of any and all changes to specific courses (name, number, content, credit hours, new offerings, etc.) in the teacher education programs, as well as the overall program sequences themselves. This committee is also the central reviewing body for the teacher education programs' unit assessment systems. In this capacity we review each program periodically in terms of student diversity and performance, and program strengths and weaknesses. This is a necessary part of the program accreditation process. Finally, the Committee on Teacher Education is serving as a central coordinator of the program review processes that each specific licensure program must undergo in anticipation of the next overall NCATE accreditation review. The advising functions are not as emphasized in our basic operations, but the teacher program overview and accreditation oversight certainly are.

I think our functions are somewhat unique. Other committees may consider some similar specific issues with regard to diversity, program reviews when they come up, etc., and obviously other groups consider program changes (i.e., the Elementary Ed. and Secondary Ed. councils) . But the responsibility of considering the school-wide big picture with regard to teacher education, making sure that everything is proper for accreditation, as well as the unit assessment/program review oversight seems to be basically ours. In that regard, we really do not seem to have that much overlap with other committees. Our decisions get passed on to Policy Council, of course, but in my 4 years on the CTE there really has not been a lot of back-and-forth with other PC committees. I always took that to indicate that our mission is sufficiently unique from that of other bodies.

David Estell

2. Faculty Affairs Committee

As chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), you should know that we have also been looking into this issue. (A bit of duplication perhaps?) At any rate, the FAC looks at any issue facing the faculty. This year, in addition to the concern about service overload, we have explored the issue of promotion guidelines for individuals working in various Centers related to

the School of Education. We also look at budget issues as they directly impact on faculty. Peter Kloosterman would actually have a better handle on the FAC as this is my first year on the committee in some time.

Jesse Goodman

3. Distinguished Alumni Awards Committee

It has only been in recent history that this committee has been under the auspices of the Policy Council. While I understand the rationale in doing so, I think we have lost something important under this structure. As an independent committee I recruited not only active faculty but also emeriti – 2-3 emeritus faculty served each year. Given the nature of this committee, emeriti faculty enriched the process because of their depth and breadth of knowledge about the school, our alumni and the professions. Please know, however, the faculty committees I have worked with in recent years have indeed done an outstanding job. But I do think that this particular committee lends itself nicely to involving individuals who have an interest and ability to serve the school well into retirement.

Back on topic!

The Distinguished Alumni Award (DAA) Committee meets only once. In total, I estimate the entire time commitment between 2-3 hrs (includes reading nominations prior to the meeting). As I reviewed the current standing committees of the PC, it wasn't obvious to me that the mission of any other committee intersects with the DAA.

Hope this helps.
Sarah Baumgart

4. Committee on Diversity

Thank you for the request to consider the charge and functions of the Committee on Diversity as part of the upcoming revision of the Constitution of the Faculty. We have indeed been engaged in a year long process exploring the meaning of an institutional diversity committee and will bring some of that discussion forward in our conclusions and recommendations.

1) We did not feel that the Committee on Diversity overlapped to a significant extent with other committees, that we should take on charges from other committees, or should move our responsibilities to other committees.

2) In reviewing the current charge in the Constitution, however, the Committee strongly felt that the current wording does not and cannot represent the charge of the Committee. The current description of the Committee on Diversity in the Constitution reads in part:

“This committee shall institutionalize diversity initiatives that become a lasting form of institutional commitment demonstrated to external and internal constituencies of the School of

Education.”

In reviewing all of the committee descriptions in the Constitution, it is striking that this is the only committee charged with institutionalizing efforts. Other committees are charged with making recommendations, developing plans, providing advice, or reviewing policies or dossiers. Indeed, without a budget or paid staff, a Policy Council committee has no means for institutionalizing any policy or initiative. The appropriate function of a Policy Council committee is advisory or oversight. Thus we would recommend that the first sentence of the Committee on Diversity description be changed to:

“This committee is responsible for monitoring the progress of diversity initiatives that demonstrate the extent of the School of Education's commitment to diversity to its external and internal constituencies, and making recommendations as to how that commitment can be more comprehensively operationalized.”

3) In conversations during the course of the year, the Committee has questioned the exclusive use of the term diversity for describing the role of this committee. Diversity is in and of itself something of a vague and undefined term, suggesting that our goal is simply to have a more diverse population. There are however, a number of issues of cultural responsiveness, equity, and social justice that such a committee must consider if it is to adequately represent and advocate for the concerns of those who have been historically marginalized in our society. Thus, we would recommend, as part of the constitutional revisions, that a discussion be engaged on both the Committee, the Policy Council, or both on the extent to which these other terms should be included in the name of this committee.

4) A perennial concern of the Committee on Diversity has to do with issues of distributed leadership and authority. In an ideal world, a diversity committee would not be necessary, as all of the other institutional structures would, as a matter of course, integrate cultural values into all of their policy initiatives and decision-making. Since it is unlikely we will reach that point in the near future, some form of oversight committee will continue to be necessary. Yet it is important to balance the practical need for the continued presence of this committee with the principle that, if diversity is a real value for the School of Education, it must be a responsibility shared by all institutional structures, not simply the Diversity Committee.

At this point, it is important to note the Committee has a severe under-representation of senior faculty or administrators, raising real concerns about the extent to which institution-wide commitment to diversity initiatives is being demonstrated. Thus, we would recommend, as part of the constitutional deliberations, a re-evaluation and consideration of the type of structure for the Committee that would best ensure that leadership on and commitment to issues of diversity, equity, and social justice is well-distributed throughout the School of Education.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment. We welcome further discussion with the Long-Range Planning Committee or Policy Council.

Russ Skiba

5. IUPUI faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee.

The IUPUI Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee met today and reviewed the functions of our committee. At this point we do not see any glaring overlap with the functions of other committees nor do we see a need to add additional functions. We do; however, believe that the charge of the committee could be clarified with some new wording and I have attached a copy of the new description we are proposing.

IUPUI Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee:

Proposed Description of Committee Functions

This committee shall be concerned with faculty affairs including, but not limited to, faculty grievances, promotion, tenure, reappointment, recruitment, search and screen, load, in-service development, merit review and sabbatical leaves. The committee shall also be concerned with budgetary implications for policies related, but not limited to, faculty affairs issues. The committee shall advise the IUPUI School of Education Executive Associate Dean on faculty and budgetary affairs. When dealing with matters of faculty affairs, the committee shall consist of members of the faculty only. When dealing with matters of budgetary affairs, the committee shall include one staff member and one graduate student of the school. 4/4/07

Keith Morran

6. IUPUI Grievance Committee

The current structure for the grievance committee seems to work well. The not only hear grievances but also requests for exceptions to admission and retention requirements.

Linda Houser

7. Promotions Tenure and Contracts Committee

After studying the constitution, I doubt we could redistribute any of the work of the P&T committee to other committees, or vice versa. We have limited and specific assignments. The constitution does not refer to the committee's responsibility for reviewing the dossiers of clinical faculty, but this is an area of work that has grown in recent years. I'm not suggesting an amendment, given the time and process required for that, only that Policy Council should be aware of this new development.

Don Warren

8. Scholarships Committee

The School of Education Scholarship Committee has traditionally been made up of people who have volunteered to be on the committee, or who have been assigned to the committee by Policy Council. Generally, 5-7 people are listed as being on the committee. The awards given are for undergraduate students in the School of Education.

The committee meets once a year. Students apply for scholarships beginning in late December, or when they come back to campus after winter break. We have an application deadline around

Feb. 8 or 9. Folders are assembled in Room 1000 and the application folders are divided equally amongst the number of faculty members who have said they can come to the meeting. Each faculty person will review approximately 20 applicants. We have at least a three hour meeting where the faculty brings their “best people” to the table and we award scholarships to the most qualified student who meets the criteria of each scholarship. There are certain undergraduate scholarships that are awarded through the various departments, such as Math Education and Special Education.

Recently, the School has received several “new” scholarships. One of these, the Jepsen International Scholarship is specifically for students who will be student teaching overseas through the Cultural Immersion project. The donor has provided the award for the past two years. We quickly assembled a committee of faculty, staff and a graduate student to make these awards. The Jepsen award was not awarded through the committee appointed by Policy Council.

This year, we also have a scholarship for incoming freshmen who will be majoring in Special Education. This scholarship was part of the matching grant program through the university. Again, we have had to quickly assemble some willing faculty to make this award. As I write this, we are still in the process of choosing a recipient.

In the 2008-09 school year, we will have two more matching grant scholarships for incoming freshmen. One of these will be for Special Education students, another will be for any outstanding incoming freshmen. We hope to work with the Honor’s college to identify highly qualified students, but we need Education faculty to make the final decision on recipients.

I am respectfully asking Policy Council to review the functions of the Scholarship Committee.

Do we need separate committees to review new scholarships as they become available? The committee that we hurriedly assembled when the Jepsen scholarship became available has done a wonderful job of choosing recipients for the past two years, but faculty on that committee have received no service recognition.

We do not have a chair of the Scholarship Committee. Up until now, there was really nothing a chair needed to do other than be part of the committee. Would Policy Council consider appointing a chair, who could appoint faculty to review the applicants for these new scholarships?

I realize that time is limited at Policy Council meetings, but I would be able to attend the next meeting if you believe the entire committee needs more information.

Dorothy Slota