

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
 May 7, 2003 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
 School of Education
 IUB Room 2100
 IUPUI Room 3138C

** The following are summaries of speaker contributions**

Members Present: Akerson, Barman, Bichelmeyer, Chafel, D’Ambrosio, Hossler, McCarthy, Mason, Ochoa, Plucker, Rosario, Sutton. **Dean’s Staff Present:** Cummings, Lambdin. **Student Representatives:** Singh. **Guests Present:** Tom Duffy, Susan Klein, Faridah Pawan, Pat Stafford.

I. Approval of the Minutes from April 30, 2003 Meeting ([03.37M](#))

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the minutes with the following corrections:

IV. B. Item 1. The beginning of the fifth sentence of the first paragraph should read, “Questions addressing policies that lead to inequity were discussed” not “The question addressing policies that lead to inequality was discussed”.

IV. B. Item 1. The sixth sentence of the second paragraph should read, “There is a lack of consistency on documentation required for faculty review each year” not “Faculty consensus on their level of involvement has varied because of department inconsistencies in what the faculty need to document each year for review”.

Minutes for April 30, 2003, were unanimously approved with the above changes.

II. Announcements and Discussions

A. Announcement of PC members for 2003-2004

Chafel announced the Agenda Committee members for the upcoming academic year: Peg Sutton, Bia D’Ambrosio, and Chalmer Thompson.

Peg Sutton was also elected as the PC chair for 2003-2004.

B. Report from Dean Cummings

Dean Cummings announced that Dean Gonzalez was at the AACPE Legislative Committee Meeting in Washington, DC. That morning the group was briefed on legislative actions, including IDEA. In the afternoon, the group would be lobbying Congress.

On Friday, May 9, the Trustee’s will act on the Commitment to Excellence funds.

Dean Gonzalez will be meeting with the Trustees tomorrow, May 8, to present the report generated by the P-16 Seamless System of Education task force. The report is available on the School of Education's Website at <http://education.indiana.edu/deansview.html>.

* At this time introductions were made since there were many alternates filling in for the meeting. Chafel welcomed all alternates and guests.

III. Agenda Committee

A. Revision of Annual Performance Review Policies ([03.29](#))

Chafel reviewed the discussion on revisions to the Annual Performance Review policies that occurred during the April 30, 2003 meeting. A motion was made during the April 30th meeting to accept the document as proposed. Discussion then ensued regarding concerns about the percentages for the various levels of review. Due to time constraints, the initial motion was postponed until today's meeting. Chafel re-opened this item for discussion.

Chafel started by reading an e-mail that was sent by Genny Williamson. The e-mail reiterated that the current merit review process is criterion based. She expressed her concern that changing to a relative system that mandates at least 10% of faculty receive "satisfactory," has the potential for negatively affecting the morale and climate of the SOE.

Mason expressed similar concerns about the numerical quota system, suggesting that the implication of such a system would do more harm than good. Mason stated that the policy warrants broader consideration, scrutiny, and review on the part of all faculty. He suggested that this policy be discussed more broadly at upcoming faculty and department meetings.

Ochoa responded that the Faculty Affairs Committee had already solicited responses from the faculty, but that only 12 responses were offered. Ochoa stressed that as a council, they must recognize that the elected committee acted on their charge and did so to the best of their ability. Now, the council must decide whether or not to accept the policy as proposed.

Mason noted that the recommendations made by the faculty to the Faculty Affairs Committee regarding this policy did not include quotas. Furthermore, some of the suggestions that were offered by the faculty were not addressed or included in the revised policy.

Plucker emphasized that compromises were made. Two major issues regarding the policy were discussed. The first issue was how this policy ties into allocation of faculty time. For example, if someone negotiates their research time down to zero, what does that mean for the various categories? Plucker noted that this consideration of differential judgment was mentioned in Section C, but that this section needs to be strengthened.

The second concern was the quota system. The committee had discussed this issue extensively. While some have expressed that the current system is criterion referenced,

the faculty who responded did not agree due to the fact that the Dean's office sets the percentages. The proposed policy was actually an attempt to shift more towards a criterion referenced system.

Plucker suggested that in Section D where the current categories are discussed, the paragraph following the table be amended to read:

“Each department chair and faculty review committee should recommend the following approximate percent of faculty in the top two categories, although exact percentages may vary from year to year: 10% Outstanding and 40% Exemplary.”

This change thereby removes the percentages of the Meritorious and Satisfactory categories.

Sutton expressed concern about this policy draft not being reviewed outside of the PC. Looking back at the process for revising Tenure and Promotion policies, the drafts were posted for faculty review and comments. Sutton suggested that this policy be posted for further review and that this could be done at department meetings in the fall.

Cummings expressed concern with this proposal because the new council and committees for next year may not have the same background knowledge and understanding of the complexities of this item that the current committees have due to their involvement with the policy.

Sutton motioned that the council post this document on the PC website, allowing for comments to be made up to 2 weeks prior to the first meeting of the council in the fall, at which point the council will vote on the policy.

Bichelmeyer noted that with the motion as stated, there is no one to provide consolidated feedback to the council. Bichelmeyer suggested that this proposed policy be taken back to the FAC for posting and consolidation of feedback. The FAC would then re-present the document to the PC and summarize the feedback.

Sutton asked if the feedback had to be consolidated. Bichelmeyer suggested that this would be the best method, rather than asking the PC to sift through the raw data during the limited time they gather each month.

McCarthy reiterated that even this process has the same disadvantages as discussed earlier in that it will be a new council and new committees deciding the future of the current document. Additionally, by just posting the document and asking for feedback, the risk of having only a handful of responses is still eminent. Whereas, reviewing the document during the fall department meetings requires the attention of all faculty present at those meetings. Reviewing the document in this way would be more manageable in that the department chairs would be responsible for summarizing and presenting to the council the discussion that took place at their meetings.

Bichelmeyer suggested that the council take similar action with this document as they did with the constitution last academic year. Bichelmeyer proposed that the document be

passed as amended, with the stipulation that it will be reviewed for possible amendment at the first faculty meeting of next year and that the FAC consolidate the responses submitted to them by the department chairs for further review.

Sutton withdrew her motion.

Plucker suggested that a second review of the document be implemented in spring semester, after the policy has been activated, and that the PC charge the FAC with the task of further amending the policy as needed based on recommendations by the faculty at that point. This notion of repeated revisions speaks to the spirit of the FAC in that the current draft policy is not perfect and will need modifications as deemed necessary.

Bichelmeyer motioned that the document be passed with the amendment of Section D as noted above and with two stipulations. The document will be circulated and discussed at the first department meetings in the fall. Departments should provide the FAC with discussion results by October 1st upon which the FAC will consolidate these responses for considered amendment and present the recommendations to the PC at the October meeting. Secondly, the FAC will also review in the spring, the first implementation of this policy for consideration of further review, change, or amendment.

McCarthy seconded the motion.

The motion was passed with 7 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

B. Core Campus Committee

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. The committee has not submitted an annual report to the council after various requests by the council to do so. Bichelmeyer raised the question of whether or not the committee should be charged again next year, after their lack of response this year?

Sutton moved that the PC disband the Ad Hoc on Core Campus and request that the Agenda Committee to appoint a new Core Campus Committee and to review its charges.

Rosario commented that he believed the committee met twice and briefly reported back to the IUPUI faculty at a meeting. He recalls the committee had been raising the question of whether or not there should be a core campus; this implies that the committee may not have been functioning well since the question they were discussing was not the charge of the committee.

Cummings pointed out that since the committee was appointed as a task force it only had a one-year life span. He suggested that instead of disbanding the previous committee, that a new committee be appointed instead.

Sutton revised her initial motion to read “The agenda committee will review the status of the Core Campus Committee at their first meeting in the fall.”

Hossler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. New Business

A. Revision of Review Procedures for School of Education Academic Administrators ([03.28](#))

Plucker opened this item by reviewing the history of the policy which has been in effect since 1996. The policy addresses when academic administrators should be reviewed. Essentially, this policy requires that anyone who does any type of administrative work to be reviewed.

The FAC solicited feedback from the four Administrator Review Committees this year. The input was straightforward. The resulting changes in the revised policy are primarily wording changes. Changes include:

- “Procedures,” Item 1: updated the list of who should be reviewed according to the policy. Area chairs, assistant dean, and director of ETS were removed.
- “Procedures,” Item 3b: Inclusion of the “At least one member of the committee should be from outside the unit of the administrator under review.”
- “Procedures,” Item 5: questions were simplified to make clear exactly what was being asked.

Ochoa identified a typographical error in the first paragraph of the memo: 2002-3003 was changed to 2002-2003.

Bichelmeyer moved to accept the revised policy as proposed. McCarthy seconded the motion.

The policy was accepted with 8 in favor and 1 abstention.

B. TAL Program Change ([03.32](#))

Ochoa overviewed the proposed changes. The Teaching All Learners (TAL) program faculty are requesting a change of the TAL General Education math requirements to be changed from 7 or 8 credit hours to 9 credit hours. This will increase the TAL program hour requirements from 128 to 129 units (increase of 1 credit). This request has been approved by the Committee on Teacher Education.

Lambdin also requested that this change be made to the Early Childhood program. The Committee on Teaching had passed a similar change. However, this is not on the agenda for today because at the Committee on Teacher Education meeting, there was no Early Childhood faculty present to agree to the change.

Lambdin expressed her desire to have this change in requirement of 1 credit/unit passed for both programs so that it can be clearly expressed to incoming freshman this year. If they are not able to get this change passed for Early Childhood, then their program requirements will be different from the Elementary and TAL programs for one year.

Cummings suggested that the current proposal on the table could be amended.

McCarthy moved to approve the change in the math requirements for the TAL Program by an increase in 1 unit, from 7 or 8 credit hours to 9 credits and to approve this change for the Early Childhood Program, pending approval by the Early Childhood Program.

Ochoa seconded the motion.

Motion was passed with 6 in favor and 2 abstentions.

C. CoT Program Change ([03.34](#))

Susan Klein opened the item with an overview of the secondary special education program known as Community of Teachers, or CoT. When the program was designed three years ago, it overlapped with some of the TAL courses. After three years of implementation, suggested changes have evolved. These proposed changes encompass both undergraduate requirements and post B.A./Graduate requirements.

The Committee on Teacher Education has approved the program changes. However, this approval occurred with the accidental exemption of a course that needs to be added to the post BA/Graduate requirements. Therefore, this document needs to be amended to include K548 for post B.A./graduate students as an additional requirement.

Cummings noted a point of clarification: under E342 (Read/Lang Arts, with TAL), the post BA/Grads should be M464 **or** L517 not both M464 and L517.

Klein also highlighted another option for undergraduate students that was not specified in this document. Undergraduate students may take K362 as a choice of a Collaboration course. Other options also include K465 and K565.

McCarthy voiced concern about passing the document with the addition of the K362 course because it has not been approved. However, the document can be approved by PC without the addition of the K362 course and if students next year want to take K362 as their course in collaboration, they can petition to do so.

Mason moved to accept the proposal from Special Education with the addition of K548 for post B.A./graduate students and the insertion of “or” between M464 and L517.

Singh seconded the motion. The motion was passed with 6 in favor and 2 abstentions.

* Chafel introduced the next three items that pertain to new programs. Each of the proposed programs has already been approved by the Committee on Teacher Education of the Graduate Studies Committee. They have yet to be submitted for state-wide consultation. Any action the Council take on these programs will be contingent on state-wide consultation and approval.

D. 18 Hour Graduate Certificate Program in Community Building and Urban Education [\(03.33\)](#)

Pat Stafford overviewed highlights of the program including its purpose and rationale. The proposed program is interdisciplinary that brings together the School of Nursing, Social Work, and the School of Education. The program is recruiting a variety of students from various walks of life.

The program will begin in the summer of 2003, Summer Session I, with W505 – pending approval. In addition to the courses listed, the students will be expected to complete an independent study. The independent study will involve working with partner agencies in addressing a significant community problem that the student will work intensively with.

Future ambitions include incorporating a Masters and a Doctoral program.

Chafel brought to attention the funding sources as mentioned at the bottom of page three. Stafford responded that there are currently no scholarships at this time, but they are continuing to work towards that.

There are 12 applicants who are being reviewed. There are several others who have inquired about the program and who already hold Master's degrees.

Chafel asked for clarification concerning GPA criteria. Rosario responded that GPA is not being used to determine acceptance. Many of the current applicants have not done a lot of graduate work. They are coming into the program with undergraduate degrees. If a candidate's prior GPA is below 2.75 but they met all the other requirements for the program, they are being accepted under a probationary basis until they show their potential at the graduate level, or the first 6 credit hours.

Chafel reiterated that GPA is not listed on the [\(03.33\)](#) document as an admissions requirement. Stafford clarified that it is a requirement and it has been made clear to all of the applicants and is also listed on the website that advertises the program.

Boone motioned to accept the new IUPUI Certificate Program on Community Building and Urban Education as proposed.

Mason seconded.

The program was passed unanimously.

E. ESL/EFL Certificate Program Via Distance Education [\(03.30\)](#)

Faridah Pawan introduced the program. It is an online program, offering 5 courses (15 credit hours) for ESL/EFL instructors who are seeking professional development. The clientele for the program has been ESL/EFL instructors from various parts of the world and teachers in Indiana who are seeking to participate in the program. The program courses focus on current issues of instruction and assessment in ESL/EFL. There are three core courses and two other elective courses. The program can be tailored to the

requirements of the sponsoring agency through the accessibility of the two elective courses. The courses are offered throughout the year via the internet.

Chafel reminded the council that whatever action is taken, it is contingent on state-wide consultation.

Ochoa motioned to accept the ESL/EFL Program in Distance Education as proposed.

Bichelmeyer seconded.

The program was passed unanimously.

F. Distance Ed Certificate in Instructional Systems Technology ([03.35](#))

Tom Duffy spoke to this item. He clarified that this program is not for state-wide implementation as of yet. Rather, it is a School of Education Certificate Program at this point. The objective of the program is to allow students to get graduate credit as an introduction to instructional technology and not have to go all of the way to a doctoral degree. An e-mail was sent out to the 800 people that were interested in IST and mentioned the certificate program as a possibility and numerous responses were received. This illustrated that there is a real market for this program.

The courses are going to be the same courses the people in the masters program take. Therefore it would be analogous to obtaining a specialist degree such that it is for students who want more than a master's degree, but not a Ph.D.

The application process is the same. The applicants will need TOFAL and are focusing on written TOFAL. The applicants will also need letters of recommendation and transcripts for the application process. The students will not have to submit GRE scores however.

Duffy has worked with Luise McCarty in establishing a process for the applications to be reviewed and managed so that this will be handled as part of the graduate program and not as non-degree studies in the management process.

Bichelmeyer motioned to accept the proposed Distance Ed Certificate in Instructional Systems Technology.

Ochoa seconded.

The program was accepted unanimously.

* Cummings, on behalf of the Dean's Office, thanked Chafel for her role as Chair of Policy Council this year. Her dedication was highly appreciated, especially in light of her serving as Chair during her sabbatical.

G. Courses up for Remonstrance

Chafel noted the courses up for remonstrance. There are some notations in respect to level of approval.

Kaho clarified that the Graduate Studies Committee met this afternoon and approved L528 with contingencies that have to be met by June 1st. So this course may be up for remonstrance again in the fall if the problems have not been resolved.

Meeting ended at 2:40 p.m.