

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
 March 26, 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, Barman, Bichelmeyer, Chafel, Harste, Hossler, McCarthy, Ochoa, Zimmerman. **Dean's Staff Present:** Cummings, Gonzalez, Murtadha, Lambdin. **Staff Representative:** Wickemeyer-Hardy. **Student Representatives:** Morris, Pascoe. **Guests:** Elizabeth Boling, Pam Freeman, Jonathan Plucker, Laura Plummer, Kathy Pomeroy, Hollis Whitt.

I. Approval of the Minutes from February 26, 2003 Meeting ([03.20M](#))

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the February 26, 2003 minutes as written. The minutes for February 26, 2003 were unanimously approved.

II. Announcements and Discussions

A. Guest Introductions

Chafel introduced the guests who were joining the PC and the topics they would be addressing. Elizabeth Boling, Pam Freeman, Laura Plummer, and Kathy Pomeroy would be discussing the topic of plagiarism. Jonathan Plucker would be presenting information concerning the allocation of faculty time. Hollis Whitt would be providing background in regard to the food cart proposal.

B. Report from Dean Gonzalez

1. Budgetary Outlook

Dean Gonzalez reported on a meeting he had attended in the morning with business leaders. Because of the monetary deficits in the state, the business community is supporting a tax increase for education after recognizing that tax reconstruction last year was not enough. This unprecedented public support for education speaks to the partnerships and alliances that are forming between the business and educational communities. It was noted that the SOE has to be guarded given the reality that the State is going to approve the bi-annual budget that likely will have little increase in funding for higher education, possibly even cut-backs.

In light of the State's economic condition, it is important to recognize the relationship between higher education and industry. In order to prepare the workforce for growth and productivity, we need to have well prepared students who are taught by well prepared teachers.

2. P-16 Seamless Education

The Indiana Commission of Higher Education has proposed a P-16 Seamless System of Education Plan that is closely aligned with our own university and school goals and objectives. The plan has recommendations for increasing student preparation and access to higher education as well as affordability and financial aid. The plan focuses on increasing retention and graduation rates as well.

President Bepko asked Bill Plater at IUPUI and Dean Gonzalez to chair a task force that will respond to the Indiana Commission of Higher Education's proposal and make further recommendations for increased improvement. A draft of this response has been prepared with assistance from Jonathan Plucker and Edward St. John from the Policy Center and a number of other stakeholders, including all of the chancellors from the other campuses. The response will be going to President Bepko later this week after another review by the task force.

Dean Gonzalez stressed the importance of the above mentioned developments and the opportunities they afford to the School of Education to provide leadership in the changes that are taking place in education in Indiana.

3. Presidential Search

The presidential search has moved to the next level. Ten to twelve candidates have been identified and the process is on-track. It is possible that the committee will be able to announce a president for IU before the end of the year.

C. Spring Faculty Meeting

Chafel announced that the Spring Faculty Meeting would be held March 28, 2003 at 1:00 p.m. in the IUB Auditorium and teleconferenced to IUPUI in room ES 3138E.

III. New Business

A. Food Cart Committee Report ([03.24](#))

Chafel opened with the history of the steps taken by the PC and the Food Cart Committee at the recommendation of IST students who compiled a report looking at the quality of services provided by the food cart in the School of Education. Chafel then introduced Hollis Whitt, one of the IST students who worked on the report and a member of the Food Cart Committee, who spoke to the issue.

Whitt highlighted the limitations and constraints that are impacting the services being offered by the food cart. Limitations included variety of foods offered and the abbreviated hours of business. Three major recommendations were suggested by the Committee: (1) Increase hours of operation to 7:45am to 4:00pm, Monday –Thursday, and 7:45am-2:30pm, Friday (2) Increase variety of food options to include additional entrees to supplement the more “snack-type” items (3) Secure formalized contract for food services which incorporates each of the following items: a plan for customer satisfaction reviewed on a quarterly or biannual basis,

subsidy funding options, compliance with health codes (Monroe County and Indiana University) and allowance for outside vendors.

Whitt explained that there is currently no contract between Sodexo, the food cart provider, and the SOE. She suggested that one option for the School could be to include in the contract that a specific amount of funds be allotted to student organizations within the school, an agreement that has been established with food providers in other Schools within the University. Another possibility is to secure with Sodexo the addition of vendors from the outside. If they do not wish to allow outside vendors in, then Sodexo is going to have to supplement their own services.

Whitt further explained that there are several constraints that may make this process difficult for the SOE. In order to take the next step toward food preparation, better facilities are going to have to be obtained. There is currently no hand washing station, limited electrical supply, and limited space. These issues are particularly problematic if more vendors are going to be solicited. Whitt also noted that providing services to the SOE is not going to yield large profits for outside vendors.

Bichelmeyer motioned to accept the report and pass the report to the Dean's Office to make appropriate action.

McCarthy seconded the motion.

Motion was approved unanimously.

B. Allocation of Faculty Time ([03.22](#))

Chafel introduced the item. The Faculty Affairs Committee, at the request of the Dean of the Faculties Office, had drafted a policy statement on the allocation of faculty time. Jonathan Plucker overviewed the history of this request. Last year the FAC was charged with looking at promotion & tenure, faculty time and merit review. Promotion and tenure was voted on last semester by PC and merit review is currently being looked at by the committee. Faculty time was being looked at so that the Dean of Faculties Office knows what the base-line policy is for expectations of faculty effort. The Committee took into consideration the strengths and weaknesses of various time allotments and the messages that each sends. The traditional percentages of 50% research, 25% teaching and 25% service were decided to be changed by the committee. The proposal brought to the PC recommended 55% research, 40% teaching and 5% service for Tenure Probationary faculty and 40% research, 40% teaching and 20% service for Tenured faculty.

Bichelmeyer questioned the continuation of the buy-out rate of 12.5% per course or service time in light of the proposed changes. Plucker responded by stating that the committee still felt that this was reasonable after much deliberation. The extra 2.5% would help cover the other programmatic responsibilities that incur when one buys themselves out of a class.

Cummings added that he agreed with the 40/40/20 split and felt the message being sent to Tenure Probationary faculty was particularly positive in that it reflects the emphasis of IU being a major research university.

Bichelmeyer and McCarthy questioned the 5% service allocation for Tenure Probationary faculty because it limits the responsibility for new faculty to engage in department, school, and university wide services that are necessary in forming a community framework and institutional commitment.

Plucker responded that this decision was made so that new faculty could be “buffered” from numerous requests to serve on School and University committees where they might feel obligated to oblige to in order to avoid “political discomfort.”

Dean Gonzalez indicated that the campus Strategic Plan also addressed this issue in that new faculty are not being acculturated to be active in the life of the institution. He further suggested that while this proposal may act as a protective agent, it also may disenfranchise younger faculty who will ultimately guide the future of the University. Somehow, service needs to be recognized as beneficial.

Zimmerman and Harste agreed and provided further rationale for why the 5% service allotment for Tenure Probationary faculty is not sufficient and suggested that it be raised to at least 10% and research 50%.

Plucker highlighted again that the 5% is a base-line figure and that allotment of time and effort is really to be decided each year by the needs of each department. In regard to Tenure Probationary faculty, consultation with the department chair and with the faculty’s mentor should occur to realistically develop an allotment that is appropriate. The policy is meant to be flexible.

Ochoa and Pascoe supported the proposed 5% service allotment and gave personal perspectives as evidence of the political discomfort that junior faculty can feel when approached to serve on numerous committees and the implications of saying “no.”

Cummings added that colleagues from across the nation who have served as external referees on Tenure cases have often commented about the high demands placed on Tenure Probationary faculty to be involved in service related activities and criticize IU for taking advantage of their assistant professor status. Cummings offered the breakdown of 40/50/10 for Tenure Probationary faculty and 50/30/20 for Tenured faculty.

Bichelmeyer moved to accept the policy as is, with the revision that Tenure Probationary faculty’s distribution of time be changed to 50% research and 10% service.

Murtadha suggested that this issue be given additional time so that faculty at IUPUI could have time to deliberate over it, specifically because IUPUI faculty are more likely to engage in more teaching and service related areas and would therefore be going up for tenure based on one of these two areas instead of research. Murtadha further suggested that because this is a draft policy statement that it should be discussed at both IUPUI and Columbus campuses.

Plucker replied by clarifying that the committee was only asked to look at IUB policies, not IUPUI.

Lambdin further raised the issue about “what constitutes teaching?” in regard to service and collaboration in the schools and within the university as well as other responsibilities that may be interpreted as either teaching or service.

Bichelmeyer motioned to postpone the motion on the floor until the next meeting.

Hossler seconded the motion.

The motion was passed unanimously.

C. Plagiarism ([03.23](#))

Chafel proposed the question “Does the School of Education need a uniform policy on plagiarism?” Current understanding implicates that there is no one method for handling plagiarism; instead it is handled by the discretion of the instructor.

Chafel introduced Kathy Pomeroy who is a visiting lecturer in Language Education who has recently encountered three cases of student plagiarism. Pomeroy attended a University workshop on a computer-based program called “Turn-it-in” that allows teachers and students to submit papers for review in determining if there are any signs of plagiarism. Pomeroy explained that her procedure for dealing with plagiarism was based mostly on trust. She trusted her students and felt sure that they would adhere to the values and ethics that most professionals are expected to uphold and would therefore not plagiarize. However, she began to notice circumstances with two of her students where she suspected they were handing in work that was not their own. She found out that there are three methods by which papers can be obtained over the internet: trading papers, buying papers, or downloading papers for free. This prompted Pomeroy to attend the “Turn-it-in” workshop. She found out that with students’ permission, their papers can be submitted for review and the program can search the paper for signs of plagiarizing. This process however is not 100% accurate. Pomeroy used this program to evaluate the assignments of 9 of her students and found that 3 had plagiarized. After discussing this with each of the students, excuses for their behaviors included: not having enough time to finish assignments and the stress associated with the workload of school was overbearing; the thinking that it is not considered plagiarizing if you use someone’s lesson plan posted on the internet because they posted it for other’s use; and the unawareness that paraphrasing without proper citations is plagiarizing. After meeting with these students, Pomeroy believed that they really did not understand what plagiarism was. She therefore required them to review Dr. Frick’s website on plagiarism that highlights the University’s policy and provides a tutorial and guide on how to avoid plagiarizing and write a reflection on their experience. Pomeroy felt that the student’s reflections confirmed her belief that the student’s were really unknowledgeable about plagiarism and what it is. As a result, she believes that the SOE needs to better educate students about plagiarism instead of assuming that they already know. One way to accomplish this would be to have every student visit the plagiarism website and complete the tutorial and obtain a certificate of completion. She also stressed that students need to be made aware that their work is being double checked for plagiarism. She warned against an overall, zero-tolerance policy and supported faculty in needing latitude to deal with issues on an individual basis.

Chafel introduced Elizabeth Boling who is faculty and chair of the IST department. Boling also serves on the Dean of Student’s Hearing Commission. Boling has cases where graduate

students were found to have plagiarized part of their qualifying exams. She has found that plagiarism occurs on project and grant proposals as well. This speaks to the issue as being one of concern for graduate as well as undergraduate levels. Boling expressed her realization that many professors simply do not check for plagiarism and therefore are unaware of the depth of the problem. When discussing the issue with students, many of them report the root of their offenses being ignorance or pressure. Most students understand that it is wrong to “steal” someone else’s work, but do not understand the importance of correctly citing it. Aspects of pressure include maintaining a certain GPA for fellowships, holding down graduate assistantships and teaching assistantships in addition to the workload of graduate school, and lack of confidence about writing abilities. As part of IST’s orientation to new students, they encourage everyone to visit the plagiarism website and enforce that they will be responsible for adhering to the plagiarism policies set forth by IU at all times. Outside of this, the professors in the IST department concur that they trust their students and their professionalism and therefore do not require any other type of training or requirement regarding plagiarism. Students are encouraged to turn their own papers into www.turnitin.com so that they can check and see if they made any incorrect citations and to do this as a preventative measure and an educational measure. Students taking the qualifying exams must sign a statement verifying that they understand the University Code of Ethics dealing with plagiarism. Boling added the importance of turning in students who have been identified as plagiarizing into the Dean of Students. This action is not for disciplinary reasons but for awareness.

Chafel introduced Laura Plummer who is the director of the Campus Writing Program and gives workshops across the University on plagiarism. She works with faculty on assignment design and training and with students through writing tutorial services. Plummer underscored some of the common difficulties students who seek out tutoring might have. Students have difficulty with concepts of academic authority, property and ownership. Many students do not think they have been taught enough about integrating sources. Services provided for the student by the Campus Writing Program include learning how to correctly paraphrase, cite authors, and integrate sources. The Campus Writing Program also provides support for instructors. They suggest that instructors create good assignment designs that are varied and change frequently, use focused and specific assignments, have conferences with students throughout writing process to review drafts and monitor revisions, specifically teach about paraphrasing and citing, de-emphasize perfect grammar especially for non-native speakers, and set up boundaries that students must adhere to for their assignments e.g., content, length and structure. Plummer also suggested that instructors attend workshops so that they can remain up-to-date on best practices for instruction and how to deter plagiarism. For additional information about the Campus Writing Program see <http://www.indiana.edu/~cwp/>

Chafel introduced Pam Freeman who is Associate Dean of Students in the Office of Student Ethics and Anti-Harassment Programs. Freeman encouraged looking at sections 3 & 4 of the IU Code of Student Rights for further procedural information on dealing with plagiarism. Her position as Associate Dean of Students is to follow through with the disciplinary actions specified in the Code. This means they maintain faculty reports and student records, they also keep data about the kinds of things that are reported. Decisions are then made as to whether or not a sanction is going to be made. Sanctions include disciplinary probation, suspension, or an expulsion. If one of these sanctions is being considered, it is done in consultation with the student’s dean. Most of the plagiarism cases heard by the Dean of Students are the result of students having poor writing skills and who turn to the internet to

get assignments. Sanctions are rarely taken. Instead, students are referred to the Campus Writing Program for tutoring services and are encouraged to talk with their faculty. Freeman does not support a zero-tolerance policy. Faculty should be encouraged to promote awareness and set standards in their classrooms. She did stress that faculty should report students who have plagiarized to the Dean of Students Office so that a report of academic misconduct is filed in the student's records. This action in itself gets the student's attention. Evidence of plagiarism has to be clear and convincing. If it is merely suspected that a student is plagiarizing, the best approach is to talk with the student so as to let the student know you are concerned.

McCarthy suggested that a module that students would have to go through as a process of learning about plagiarism. This could be a prerequisite before credit would be granted for course completion. She suggested that copyright rules also be included in this module.

Boling found in a study that an honor code that is shared by everyone to positively establish academic behavior and support is highly effective as a positive preventative factor against academic misconduct.

Bichelmeyer agreed and brought up the notion that students need to be more process rather than goal oriented. A process approach would deemphasize the pressure component and the claim of ignorance on behalf of the students. Suggested classroom honor codes be encouraged and promoted.

Freeman added to the conversation by highlighting the "Freshman Promise" that students made at their orientation at the beginning of the Fall semester. This promise was much like an honor code and will be called upon as students complete their program of studies at IU. When students are called into the Dean of Students office for academic misconduct, they are reminded of the promise they committed to at their induction.

Chafel thanked the speakers for their presentations. Discussion on this topic will be continued at the April meeting.

IV. Old Business

There was no old business to discuss.

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

Chafel called attention to the courses up for remonstrance. Course changes included: E450 and E451. New courses included: S531, S521, E532 and E531.

Meeting adjourned at 2:58 p.m.