

IUPUI School of Education
Faculty Affairs and Budgetary Affairs Committee (FABA)

Meeting Minutes

October 7, 2015
ES 313E

Present: Deb Keller, Craig Willey, Brendan Maxcy, Thu Suong Nguyen, Robin Hughes, Tammera Moore, Ky Shaw, Flip Robison (via phone)

Guest: Pat Stites

Committee chair Nguyen calls meeting to order at 3:04pm

- I. Committee chair Nguyen welcomed student member representative Tammera Moore and administrative support Ky Shaw. Nguyen and Maxcy asked that discussions and information shared in this space stay within confidence of the members present.
- II. Approval/Discussion of Minutes from September 9, 2015 meeting –
 - a. Maxcy moves to approve minutes; Keller seconds
 - b. Unanimous vote in favor
- III. Announcements
 - a. September faculty meeting:
 - i. A vote was put forth for 10 minutes of whiteness/white privilege reflection at all meetings. Nguyen would like for FABA's reflection to acknowledge and examine current policies and enactments that need revision toward the continued goal of equity amongst the School of Education.
 - ii. Nguyen requested that this discussion occur alongside a related agenda item later in the meeting
 - iii. Maxcy agreed that for this specific meeting the topic for later discussion fit, but for future meetings the 10 minute discussion should be a standing agenda item with intentional discussion.
 - iv. Maxcy moved to approve the minutes, Craig seconds
 - v. Unanimous vote in favor
- IV. Budget discussion (Pat Stites) -
 - a. Search and Screen priorities
 - i. Faculty searches are decided by the faculty based on assessed needs. The number of searches is decided on in consultation with the Fiscal Officer and EAD.
 - b. Scholarship Committee
 - i. The committee should be:
 1. Informed of all new scholarship creations and
 2. Provided donor intent on new scholarship (documented in gift agreement)
 3. Involved in all scholarship decisions; Project TEAM is the singular scholarship with exception – Claudette Lands oversees student selection.
 - ii. Maxcy inquired on whether it would be beneficial to have more people involved in the Project TEAM selection so more people can understand the scholarship process; Stites predicted it being no problem with Dr. Lands to have that selection process funneled through the scholarship committee.
 - iii. Nguyen inquired about fellowships. Stites informed her that currently only doctoral program students receive fellowship funds. Pat envisions student fellowship recipient selection coming from the EAD not the scholarship

committee. Currently the new fellowship scholarships are more modest with four (4) students receiving \$4000/year for four years.

- iv. Nguyen inquired on the origin of scholarship money; Stites informed that Project TEAM and fellowships are funded through SOE; all other scholarships are funded through IU Foundations (IUF); direct admits have a separate pot that can be funded from either IUF or the McCloud fund – will-designated funding that isn't renewable. The Carver Teaching Initiative has also been funded by McCloud. Jomo Mutegi handles the selection process; currently two (2) candidates are receiving the funding.

- 1. Hughes clarified where the "Carver" came in the scholarship naming. Stites informed her that she wasn't aware but it could be renamed or officially named, if desired.

- v. Hughes inquired on the possibility of moving IUF/McCloud funds to the foundation to create dividends. Stites clarified that that isn't possible since the money was specifically donated to the university (in-part with IUB) and designated as scholarship funds in the donor's will. Stites clarified that this fund has the capacity to fund both undergrad and graduate students.

c. CRC Renovations

- i. Stites advised to only retain enough space to utilize for student needs given the changing environment. Any space taken over by the third party for renovations will be funded by them.
- ii. There are Renovation and Rehabilitation (R&R) funds available but all furniture would need to be purchased with fund balance funds.
 - 1. Hughes inquired on the origin of the R&R funds; Stites clarified that some funds were obtained by campus and distributed with certain parameters.
 - 2. Nguyen requested clarification on what the parameters are; Stites informed her that R&R qualifying projects have to be updates to the infrastructure; there is no plans to replenish the R&R account; Hughes inquired on if future transfers into the account is possible; Stites informed her she wasn't aware and needed to inquiry on how that would work on a campus level.
- iii. Maxcy inquired on if there is a committee in place to review renovations proposals; Stites clarified there are several committees formed with design drafts and proposals.

d. Budget Notes

- i. The funds available in the Fund Balance can be used to support SOE appropriate funding (i.e. visiting faculty) but cannot be used to support faculty/staff hire in/salary.

V. Old Business

a. Faculty Search Recommendations –

- i. Maxcy moves that we recommend moving forward with the search in school counseling and the search in education technology; Hughes seconds
 - 1. Discussion: Hughes mentioned her concern about the status of the Ed Psy position as a third position; Nguyen reported that Erik felt the student need was isolated to one pre-block class and assessed that a search wasn't appropriate for this need with the suggestion of filling this position with an adjunct; Nguyen expressed her concern about our attentiveness to how the search process for the technology faculty will be conducted; Keller requested clarification on the need for a technology education faculty; Nguyen clarified that since the approval of the masters in

technology education two years ago the stipulation of hiring expert professors in that field before offering the program wasn't met. Nguyen also spoke about partnerships from other campuses with interest and resources already established; Maxcy additionally added that since we have to add expert professors the next question to address is whether this position tenure or clinical level with 80% SOE goal and 60% campus goal; Hughes added that there is support and interest from expert professors at IUB/IUS/IUN and student interest for the online degree; Nguyen lastly added that with moving forward it's important to remember our SOE mission and urban focus with future hires.

- ii. Unanimous vote in favor
- b. Proposal regarding Recruitment, Selection and Review of the IUPUI School of Education Executive Associate Dean (Drafted January 2015)
 - i. Maxcy moves to alter the agenda and address point b and c in the interest of time; Robison seconds; Unanimous vote in favor
 - ii. Maxcy moves to bring the proposed appointment of procedure for the IUPUI EAD to Policy Council for consideration at their next meeting; Willey seconds
 - 1. Discussion: Logistical question on how that will happen since a meeting was just held.; Willey wanted clarification on urgency; Nguyen expressed the desire to expedite this matter
 - iii. Maxcy amended to change the motion to: bring the proposed appointment of procedure for the IUPUI EAD to Policy Council for consideration at their next available meeting
 - iv. Unanimous vote in favor
- c. Policy on Teaching Graduate Level Courses
 - i. Maxcy moves that the proposed revision of 13.37 are brought to the Policy Council at the next opportunity for consideration; Willey seconds
 - 1. Discussion: Maxcy made aware that we are currently not in compliance with this policy due to its complicated nature to implement; Nguyen proposed the friendly amendment that the appointment must be approved by the EAD or the EAD designee; Hughes brought up concerns about the comparable courses for doctoral students in HESA/UES/or other programs to T650: *Teaching Internship in Urban Education*;
 - ii. Unanimous vote in favor
 - iii. Maxcy moves that its recommended for the programs to review staffing needs and projected growth by March with plans for searches moving forward; Willey seconds
 - 1. Discussion: Maxcy suggested creating a package to present to doctoral students with how they can get involved at the outset instead of having their involvement be an afterthought;
 - iv. Unanimous vote in favor
- d. Merit Review Procedures
 - i. Maxcy moves that FABA will develop a charge and associated procedures for the merit review process; Willey seconds
 - 1. Discussion: Hughes expressed that while there needs to be procedures that are adhered too there also needs to be flexibility; Nguyen agreed that policy language does need to be cleaned up; Keller suggested that the committee be updated on what is suggested verses what is required; Hughes agreed and added further that the people who are submitting also needs to be informed; Nguyen requested ways the process could be

streamlined from the committee; Maxcy addressed the ambiguity amongst the committee about “at load” verses “not at load” standard and the need to provide guidance on clarification of the difference.

- ii. Unanimous vote in favor
- e. Agenda Items for November
 - i. Priorities Discussion
 - ii. Timeline for the Merit Review Procedures
 - iii. Follow up on BRRC & Self Study
 - iv. Proposed change to the IUPUI SOE Policy 06.43 regarding promotion and long term contract to be forwarded to faculty agenda committee for the next faculty meeting.

Maxcy moves to adjourn, Unanimous second and vote

Meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.