

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
 October 1, 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, Boone, Buzzelli, Carter, Chafel, D' Ambrosio, Ochoa, Osgood, Sutton.
Dean's Staff Present: Brown, Gonzalez, Kloosterman, Murtadha. **Staff Representative:**
Student Representative: Pascoe. **Guest:** Jonathan Plucker.

I. Approval of the Minutes from May 7, 2003 Meeting ([03.38MR](#))

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

IV. D. 1. The fourth sentence in the sixth paragraph should read "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" **not** "If the candidates fall below 2.75 and all the other requirements are met, they are being accepted under a probationary basis until they show their potential for graduate level, or the first 6 credit hours."

IV. E. 1. The third sentence should read "The clientele for the program" not "cliental".

The minutes for May 7, 2003 were unanimously approved with above changes.

II. Announcements and Discussions

*** At this time, Jonathan Plucker (guest) spoke to agenda item B.3.**

B. Agenda Committee

3. Revision of Annual Performance Review Policy ([03.29R](#))

Sutton opened the item. Last year the Policy Council accepted the revised Annual Performance Review Policy brought to them by the Faculty Affairs Committee, with the provision that departments have an opportunity to discuss the policy during their fall meetings and provide feedback to the Faculty Affairs Committee by Oct. 1. This feedback would then be summarized by the FAC and brought back to the PC.

Plucker provided an overview of the recent activity surrounding the new policy. He and Dean Kloosterman attended all of the department faculty meetings in order to participate in the discussions, provide clarifications, and obtain feedback from the faculty regarding the policy. FAC then met to review all of the comments and suggestions obtained at the meetings. Potential revisions are currently being drafted and will then be re-circulated to

the FAC within the next week or two. Upon approval of the FAC, the revisions will be forwarded to the Agenda Committee.

Dean Gonzalez asked about the nature of the recommendations made at the department meetings.

Plucker explained that they were mostly concerned with clarifying the wording of the document. Examples include: the wording outlining what aspects of dossiers should be turned in for annual review, the break-down of the “Outstanding Category”, and clarification of scholarship of teaching as being included in the consideration of the ratings “Meritorious” or higher.

Plucker reported that faculty were pleased with having a strong voice in the process. They were particularly in accordance with the need to protect junior faculty. Faculty were also satisfied to connections being drawn between the Annual Performance Review and Promotion and Tenure processes. However, as Buzzelli emphasized, the revised policy will illustrate how Annual Review *relates* to P&T; but the two processes are independent of one another and have separate goals.

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

- A. Report from Dean Gonzalez
 - 1. Structure and Organization of the School

Last year PC discussed the need to continue the conversation surrounding the organization of the SOE. The Agenda Committee advised the formation of a task force to be charged with examining the structure and organization of the school and to make recommendations for possible changes. There are currently four main questions to guide the investigation. However, others may surface throughout the process. The four questions are:

1. Are there better ways to align our programs to enhance collaboration and increase program effectiveness?
2. Does department size influence effective academic and administrative management?
3. Where will the new degree program in Learning Sciences best be housed within the School?
4. Are there ways to increase efficiency and reduce administrative costs?

The members of the Structure and Organization of the School Taskforce are: Thomas Brush, Jack Cummings, Don Cunningham – Chair, Paulette Dilworth, Jerome Harste, David Mank, Andrea Walton, and Genny Williamson.

The task force is expected to finish its work by the end of this fall semester. Possible recommendations and mechanisms for change would be discussed during the spring semester and then we will begin to implement any changes that may be approved.

Boone asked about the process for approving recommendations.

Dean Gonzalez indicated that the PC, as well as the faculty, would be involved in the planning, review, and advisement of any decision that might be made.

Carter asked for clarification on the projected timeline. Will the anticipated changes be completed by Spring of 2004-2005?

Dean Gonzalez reiterated that the beginning stages leading up to change could tentatively begin in the spring. But that completion may have variable timelines depending on the processes leading to implementation of the recommended changes.

2. P-16 Initiative

The Indiana Education Roundtable is continuing to develop a plan for a P-16 seamless system of education. The Education Roundtable is a body created by new legislation in Indiana to advise the Governor and the Superintendent of Public Instruction on educational policy. It has been working for almost a year on developing Indiana's P-16 Plan for Improving Student Achievement. If the plan is adopted, it will provide a framework for legislative action and financial requests to the legislature for ways to align Indiana's educational system from preschool through college with the goal of increasing student achievement. The plan is partially driven by the need for economic development as Indiana changes from primarily a manufacturing-based economy to an information-driven and life-sciences economy. The new economy will need to ensure that more students are attending college and obtaining post-secondary education. The ultimate goal then of the P-16 plan is to prepare students for post-secondary education and to aid students in the transition.

The plan has evolved into specific areas that address academic standards, assessments, and accountability by focusing on teaching and learning, school and district leadership, early learning and school readiness, eliminating the achievement gaps and ensuring academic progress for all students, ensuring college and workforce success, dropout prevention, higher education and continued learning, communication, and efficient use of resources. It is a very comprehensive plan. The plan recognizes that teacher preparation and leadership preparation are central to any state-wide effort to improving student achievement and in helping students be successful.

The latest draft of the plan, September 16, 2003, is available on the Education Roundtable website at <http://www.edroundtable.state.in.us/> Faculty are encouraged to look at the draft and make comments and recommendations for further consideration by the Roundtable members. It is important to realize that this is a tremendous opportunity to provide input that may ultimately influence educational policies for years to come.

Ochoa asked for a sense of how the group is looking at students with special needs. Are they part of the conversation? Also, are they talking about other policies like No Child Left Behind in relationship to them?

Dean Gonzalez noted that there has not been much emphasis placed on students with special needs. Part of the proposal does discuss preparation for the workforce; but he

does not recall anything specifically mentioning special needs students. He suggested that this may be an area where additional input would be necessary.

Ochoa suggested that with the aims of eliminating the achievement gap and reducing dropout rates while also taking into consideration the increasing numbers of students with disabilities who are entering colleges, it is important that special needs students be represented in the conversation.

Buzzelli questioned how the state universities are going to handle the proposed influx of students.

Dean Gonzalez reviewed the separate, but complimentary plan that has been developed by the Indiana Commission of Higher Education. Elements of the Commission's plan are in concert with the P-16 plan in detailing future policies for higher education. Part of the strategy is to categorize institutions according to mission. Campuses like IUB and Purdue are considered *Stable* campuses, IUPUI would be an example of an *Enrollment Growth Potential* campus, and community colleges are categorized as *Expansion* campuses. The push is to extend the enrollment at Growth Potential and Expansion campuses while keeping in mind the possibility of these students later matriculating into Stable campuses.

3. No Child Left Behind Panel

Last night, September 30, 2003, alumni-sponsored a well attended panel discussion in Indianapolis on the No Child Left Behind legislation. There were several members of the SOE faculty who attended and faculty member, Jonathan Plucker, was a member of the panel. The conversation addressed some of the state and nation-wide implications of the Act. The discussion that ensued was both interesting and informative. Overall, it was a successful event.

4. Commitment to Excellence Initiative

Sutton asked Dean Gonzalez to outline the process for making decisions regarding proposals for the Commitment to Excellence Initiative.

Dean Gonzalez suggested that given the feedback from last year's experiences, it is clear that the campus is interested in large, comprehensive proposals that will have campus-wide impact.

It is important to have various ideas for proposals and so SOE faculty are invited to submit two-page concept papers. The concept papers will go to the FAC for consideration. The added stipulation this year is that the proposals look for ways to integrate ideas that compliment and correspond with each other into more comprehensive proposals, instead of a series of small proposals. The intent of the FAC then is to look for integration where possible in order to better compete for the funding. All proposals being recommended by the FAC committee are then presented to the Dean for further review prior to being sent on for consideration by the campus committee.

If faculty have questions or are seeking advice, they can contact either Dean Gonzalez or Dean Kloosterman. Dean Kloosterman looks to being a facilitator in this process by

linking people and their ideas together. It would be to our benefit to put our time and effort into submitting 1 or 2 comprehensive proposals that address the strategic priorities of the campus rather than 3 or 4 smaller proposals. We have to wait and see what comes forward though. If the ideas presented do not overlap in any way, then it makes sense to submit separate proposals.

Ultimately, the campus is looking to the proposals as a means of investing resources into something that will provide leverage for future campus-wide benefit. The idea of collaborating among ourselves is important, but including other units is also warranted for greater possible impact.

B. Agenda Committee

1. Faculty Retreat

The faculty retreat will be held October 10 at the Abe Martin Lodge, Brown County State Park.

Brown summarized a meeting she had with Christine Bennett and Daniel Baron who are on the Retreat Committee. The theme of the retreat is “Diversity.” It was recommended by the retreat planners that participants read *We can’t teach what we don’t know: White teachers, multicultural Schools* by Gary R. Howard prior to attending the retreat. Organization of the retreat is expected to be similar to last year’s retreat in that the overarching theme will be diversity, but by using open-space technology individuals could propose groups that would meet during the day. Therefore, the agenda will basically unravel that day based on participants’ interests. There will be facilitators to lead sessions on topics related to the book. Copies of the book are still available in the Dean’s Office.

Buzzelli asked about the involvement of graduate students.

Kloosterman clarified that this year only staff and faculty are invited.

2. The 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.

3. Long Range Planning Committee Charge to Review Core Campus Issues

Sutton opened this item. In the May 7, 2003 meeting of the PC it was brought to the council’s attention that the ad hoc taskforce on core campus issues hadn’t produced a report. In the meeting, the PC charged the Agenda Committee with reviewing the status of the taskforce and making a recommendation for future action.

The Agenda Committee motioned that the Long Range Planning Committee be charged with reviewing core campus issues, particularly those having to do with program areas,

and reporting back to the PC at the end of this academic year on both the issues that they identify and suggestions for addressing them.

The item was opened to discussion.

Chafel asked if it was the intent that the Long Range Planning Committee review issues related to the core campus and come up with a set of possible recommendations that they would bring to PC for consideration.

Sutton affirmed that it seemed appropriate that the committee be asked to identify major issues and where possible, to propose approaches to resolving them.

The motion was passed unanimously.

III. New Business

No new business to be discussed.

IV. Old Business

No old business to be discussed

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

New Course(s): Q612

Course Change Request(s): J653

Meeting ended at 1:55 PM