MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
October 29, 2003 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
School of Education
IUB Room 2140
IUPUI Room 3138E

** The following are summaries of speaker contributions**

Members Present: Alexander, Buzzelli, Carter, Chafel, Dilworth, Gregory, Ochoa, Osgood, Sutton, Thompson. **Dean's Staff Present:** Brown, Gonzalez, Kloosterman, Murtadha. **Staff Representative:** Stone. **Student Representatives:** Apple, Armstrong, Bomberg, Pascoe. **Guests:** Jonathan Plucker, Russell Skiba.

I.   Approval of Minutes

A.   Approval of the Minutes from October 1, 2003 Meeting (04.05M)

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the minutes as written. The minutes for October 1, 2003 were unanimously approved.

B.   Approval of the Minutes from April 30, 2003 Organizational Meeting (04.04M)

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the minutes as written. The minutes for April 30, 2003 were unanimously approved.

* At this time, Jonathan Plucker (guest) spoke to agenda item III.A.

III.   Old Business

A.   Revision of Annual Performance Review Policy (03.29R)

Sutton introduced this item by reviewing the process taken by the Faculty Affairs Committee over the past year to propose a revised annual performance review policy. Last year the PC accepted the Policy under the condition that it would be circulated at the beginning of the 2003-2004 academic year for further discussion by the faculty. Suggestions for improvement of the document gleaned from the faculty were then compiled and presented to the FAC at their first meeting of the semester. At the October 16 meeting, the FAC committee agreed to the following general revisions of the new policy:

1. Strengthening the emphasis on the School's promotion and tenure policy and allotment of faculty effort policy
2. Clarifying several important points that were written too vaguely
3. Broadening a few points that were written too specifically
4. Fixing typos

Specific changes to the policy are noted in the document 03.29R, indicated by comments and track changes listed in the margins. Plucker overviewed each of these major items being proposed for change.

Chafel further emphasized that there was some discussion among FAC members as to how the last paragraph in section D. "To receive a rating of Meritorious or higher . . ." should be worded and that this issue was left unresolved. Concerns raised during the discussion included the idea that "one published piece of scholarship" might not be sufficient for a rating of higher than Meritorious. Another concern was expressed in respect to the admission of any in-press or accepted articles.

The FAC motioned the Council to approve the newly revised Annual Performance Review Policy as presented.

Buzzelli seconded the motion.

Sutton opened up the item for discussion.

Skiba supported the further consideration of the wording "published piece" that was previously addressed by Chafel. He noted that this may be more of an indicator of the previous year's performance due to the lag time in the publication process.

Plucker commented that removing the word "published" may allow for departmental flexibility in determining what should be required. He did not feel that removing the word "published" would jeopardize the spirit of the policy.

Dean Gonzalez suggested that keeping the criteria of "published" promotes consistency across all departments.

Dean Kloosterman also supported keeping the wording as written. He explained that without any publications, consideration above the Satisfactory level is not likely.

Buzzelli also noted that this "published" standard will allow for easy tracking by the review committee and/or the department chair.

The motion to accept the revised Annual Performance Review Policy as presented by the FAC was unanimously approved with 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

* The meeting resumed to the order specified in the agenda.

II.   Announcements and Discussions

    A.   Report from Dean Gonzalez

       1.   P-16 Initiative

       The Indiana Educational Roundtable approved Phase I of the P-16 Plan yesterday, October 28. Phase I represents a broad framework that will guide future requests to the

legislature on policy-making initiatives the state might adopt to improve student achievement and enhance education from pre-school through college.

The Roundtable consists of a diverse group of influential people from around the state who are committed to improving educational opportunities for all students. Teacher preparation, leadership preparation, the role of technology, and professional development are all central components in this plan. The plan recognizes that teacher quality is a critical element for improving student achievement and how large, comprehensive schools of education are essential to improving education in general across the state. Many of our ideas have been included in these discussions. For example, there has been more attention to closing the achievement gap and special education, which was a concern raised by Ochoa during the last PC meeting.

Governor Kernan presided over the Round Table's meeting. He complimented the members for their work and expressed his support for the plan. Additionally, several legislators who are members of the roundtable indicated their interest in sponsoring and supporting legislation that would help advance the agenda.

It is important for all of us to be aware of what is in this plan as it will have an impact on the work we do. The latest draft, October 28, is available at http://www.edroundtable.state.in.us/.

2.   Commitment to Excellence

Six proposals were received from faculty and forwarded to the Faculty Affairs Committee for review. The FAC in conjunction with Dean Kloosterman recommended three proposals for further development. There was an effort to integrate ideas, but the proposals were so different in nature that there were no evident unifying themes to facilitate such integration.

The principal investigators will be meeting this week with Dean Kloosterman and Dean Gonzalez to discuss ideas, identify opportunities for further integration, and to share information/insights as to what is expected for selection and funding.

3.   General Education

Recently discussions surrounding General Education have been circulating around campus. There is now a lot of pressure for greater collaboration on transferability issues. Many of the pressures are external but there are also difficulties with transferability within our own campus. There is currently a desire to try to identify General Education areas that would be acceptable to most, if not all of the programs at IU. Those themes would also link to transferability across campuses.

There appear to be two conversations going on. The first conversation looks at what might be common elements across all programs and how do these elements articulate with what other institutions may be doing. This issue is of great importance to the Legislature. There is a legislative mandate to the Higher Education Commission that they monitor the progress that is made vis-à-vis articulation with the community colleges. We

also must have an understanding of common areas of knowledge that we can articulate internally and with other academic units and within education on the other IU campuses.

There is a list of courses that has already been articulated with the community colleges that has been sent to the School in anticipation of re-affirmation of those courses or changes if necessary. Diana Lambdin has indicated that most of the courses are at the 100 or 200 level. There is one 300 level course and discussions are being held about whether that course should be changed to a 200 level course.

Alexander, who is a member of the Educational Policy Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council, spoke to some of the issues surrounding these discussions. There is now talk in the College of Arts and Sciences allowing for a compromise with other schools in allowing for designation of some courses as general education courses that students from the College of Arts and Sciences could take. There is also some discussion about having a professional component in general education that everyone would be required to take a course or two in a professional school to facilitate exposure.

Dean Gonzalez reiterated that the issues surrounding this topic are very complex. Hopefully common ground will be identified where agreements can be reached.

4. Organizational Committee Update

The Organizational Committee continues to meet to discuss School reorganization. They recently held an open forum that was well attended and successful in stimulating a good exchange of questions and ideas. Since the forum there have been various groups of faculty who have continued their discussions and have passed their ideas on to the Organizational Committee. The committee is expected to produce a report that will identify the next steps needed to make changes. Don Cunningham, committee chair, will be at the faculty meeting on Friday and will make a report of the committee's progress and entertain comments or questions.

B. Agenda Committee

1. Fall Faculty Meeting

Sutton announced the date and time of the fall faculty meeting. The Fall Faculty Meeting will be held on October 31, 2003 from 9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. in the Wright Building Auditorium and via videoconference in room 3138E School of Education at Indianapolis.

IV. Old Business

B. Core Campus Committee Report (04.09)

Sutton provided a review of this item. At the beginning of the 2002-2003 academic year a Core Campus Committee was comprised and charged by the PC with looking at core campus issues. There was some confusion at the end of last year regarding the committee's submission of an annual report to the PC which they did not provide but are doing so at this point.

Because the committee was appointed as a task force, it only had a one-year life span which has ceased. This year, the Long Range Planning Committee was charged by the council to look at core campus issues, particularly the program areas. Barbara Wilcox and Gary Ingersoll are co-chairing the subcommittee charged with looking at these issues and have been supplied with a copy of this report to assist them in their deliberations.

III.   New Business

A. Statement from Diversity Committee (04.08)

Sutton introduced this item. Discussions during the SOE annual fall faculty retreat motivated the Diversity Committee to re-examine the School's statement on diversity. It has been proposed by the committee that the diversity statement incorporate the School's position regarding the sexual orientation of teachers. The following statement has been submitted to the council for review, with the request that the Policy Council endorse it:

> *"The Indiana University School of Education supports and affirms those who represent diverse sexual orientations and values them both as human beings and as contributors to the field of Education. Quality teaching is not dependent on sexual orientation, gender, race, ethnicity, religion, or nationality. Thus, we affirm the value to all students of well trained committed teachers, regardless of their sexual orientation. If we do not stand for each other, we stand for no one."*

Diversity Committee representative, Russ Skiba, spoke to this item. Due to current events surrounding the website of Indiana University Professor Eric Rasmusen which included derogatory statements concerning homosexuality, specifically the capabilities of homosexuals within the field of education, the Diversity Committee expressed a need for the School of Education to formulate an appropriate response to these comments, resulting in the above statement. The statement is meant to show our support for all of our students, some of which have expressed feelings of being threatened, as well as our support of all dedicated educators regardless of their sexual orientation. Additionally, the statement is meant to affirm that we as a School do not align with such discrimination and do not endorse the statements made by Professor Rasmusen. The Committee would like to see this statement endorsed by the Policy Council and would like to see it posted to the School of Education website.

Alexander commented that in the future there are likely to be other challenges based on discrimination and suggested that the statement, as a whole, be strengthened to encompass all types of discrimination.

Skiba agreed and noted that this was something that the Committee had struggled with also. They ultimately felt that creating a generalized statement would result in watering-down the much needed response to this specific incident. While it is anticipated that future hate incidents will target each of the identified groups, at that point attention should be directed at opposing those threats. In the end, the Committee thought that it was important to support this segment of our community directly.

Skiba clarified that the nature of the current statement is to be a response to the recent events. The proposed statement is not meant to replace the official School of Education diversity statement. Therefore, the committee's objective is to have this statement posted to the School's website as a reaction to Professor Rasmusen's comments.

Dean Gonzalez suggested that if the Committee's intent is to counter Professor Rasumsen's offensive remarks, perhaps they should be specifically directing the resolution at that. Without providing this meaningful context, the statement may be less effective and even confusing. By emphasizing sexual orientation in the statement, it appears as though the School may be devaluing the importance of the other groups mentioned. If someone reads this on the School's website and is not aware of the controversy over Professor Rasmusen's website, they are likely to be confused about why we are highlighting sexual orientation in our diversity statement.

Skiba affirmed the utility of specifically directing a response from the School of Education to Professor Rasmusen's website and agreed to take this recommendation back to the Diversity Committee.

Upon recommending that a link to Professor Rasmusen's website be included in the reaction by the School of Education, Dean Gonzalez noted that it is his understanding that much of the offensive language in question has been removed. Alexander noted that links to newspaper articles may be more useful for providing a context from which the rebuttal is being made.

Thompson suggested further strengthening the School's overall statement on diversity and then in times of conflict, writing letters referring back to the statement thereby not jeopardizing the watering down of emphasis and intent in the general statement. This method would suggest that we are not going to reinvent a statement every time a reaction is needed.

Alexander suggested two outlets for dissemination, review, and possible acceptance once the revised statements have been completed: the Educational Policy Council and then Bloomington Faculty Council. Doing so would document the School's reaction and response to Professor Rasmusen's website and his comments pertaining to teachers and teacher behavior.

Skiba clarified that the Council suggests that the Diversity Committee look at two distinct tasks: possibly strengthening, overall, the School's diversity statement and creating a direct letter/statement in reaction to Professor Rasmusen's website.

Sutton noted that the Diversity Committee should consider who the intended audience will be once the letter is comprised (i.e., Chancellor Brehm, University Faculty Council) and what actions will be requested of the Policy Council regarding the distribution of the letter.

B. Educational Policy Committee

Alexander called attention to BFC's Educational Policy Council's review of extending and/or making permanent the University's relationship with turnitin.com which is a

6

plagiarism website. The University is currently running a test trial to evaluate the utility and effectiveness of the program. Instructional Support Services is now asking faculty if they want to continue using the system after the test trail is finished. Alexander asked for reactions to this question from the Council.

Chafel asked about the requirement of students' permission to have their papers submitted.

Alexander replied that last year University Faculty Council was concerned about the students' papers becoming part of the intellectual realm once they were submitted for review over the internet with turnitin.com. As a result, an arrangement was made with turnintin.com that students' papers would be saved on a separate server and would only be accessible by IU-Bloomington faculty, staff, and students. Therefore, students' did not have to give permission for their papers to be submitted. Conditionally, at the end of the trial period, students' papers would be deleted.

If the University decided to continue their affiliation with turnintin.com, students will not have to give permission to have their papers submitted because IUB will continue to maintain their own database. The database does not save the papers as a whole per se, rather, it stores the papers' content through algorithms – that way complete papers can not be accessed through this server.

Students will be told at the start of the class that one way plagiarism will be checked is by using turnitin.com. Students will also be encouraged to use the system themselves as a developmental writing tool for proofing their papers and making needed revisions before turning the papers into their professors.

Pascoe spoke to the usefulness of turnitin.com as she has used it in preparing for her qualifying exams. She commented that it was rewarding to have a system to review her work and yet not have someone "looking over my shoulder" before turning it in.

Sutton also commented on the benefits of this program for international students who may be struggling with the concept of plagiarism.

Alexander reported that current findings have indicated that of the undergraduate papers submitted during this trial process, 25% have included plagiarized content with 1 in 8 being of a "worrisome" amount. The report that is generated by turnitin.com breaks down the paper into color coded sections that represent the percent chance that the section may be plagiarized (100% to 10% chance).

Armstrong and Bomberg expressed the possible benefits to having such a system for students to check their writing before turning it in to their professors. Armstrong suggested that this may help clarify what plagiarism is as this concept is still confusing to many students.

Bomberg questioned what happens when a student chooses to submit their paper for review prior to handing it in to their professor, and then the professor re-submits the paper to turnitin.com – does the paper display as being 100% plagiarized since it has already been through the database?

Alexander clarified that the program actually identifies the source from which it was plagiarized so it would site the writer as being the source. One faculty member is using this as a way to monitor the change in papers as they progress throughout the drafting and revision stages.

Thompson brought up the conversation of civility and trust relationships between instructors and their students and questioned how this practice may influence the learning climate.

Alexander reiterated that these issues are why the Educational Council is soliciting responses from professors. They are hoping to get recommendations for guidelines.

Ochoa suggested that this marriage of technology and classroom learning may facilitate students being proactive in their education.

Thompson agreed that there appears to be many benefits for incorporating this tool into the learning dynamic but that it depends on how it is ultimately used. It could be something that instructors and students use collaboratively to build trust rather than as a policing method.

Armstrong noted that how the program is presented to students will greatly influence how the program is accepted and whether or not the students welcome it.

Sutton thanked Alexander for presenting this topic for discussion.

V.   New Courses/Course Changes open for 30 day Remonstrance

New Course(s): none

Course Change Request(s): W301 and W401

Meeting ended at 2:35 PM