

**MINUTES**  
**POLICY COUNCIL**  
**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**  
JANUARY 26, 2005, 1:00-3:00 p.m.  
School of Education  
IUB Room 2140  
IUPUI Room 3138E

\*\*The following are summaries of speaker contributions\*\*

**Members Present:** Anderson, Berghoff, Carspecken, Delandshere, Dilworth, McCarty, McClain, Ross, Stachowski. **Dean's Staff Present:** Gonzalez, Kloosterman, Lambdin, Murtadha. **Staff Representative:** Wyatt. **Student Representative:** Zhang.

I. Approval of Minutes

A. Approval of the Minutes from December 15, 2004, Policy Council meeting

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the minutes as written. The minutes for December 15, 2004, were unanimously approved.

II. Announcements and Discussions

A. Dean's Report

Dean Gonzalez commented on new governor's inaugural speech. The governor supports making the state Superintendent of Education an appointed rather than elected position. A bill has been introduced to this effect in the legislature. If passed the change would take effect beginning in 2009.

Dean Gonzalez reported that the governor also discussed economic conditions and proposed a flat budget for K-12 and higher education. That would have significant impact on IU. IU has not had an increase in state appropriations for three years. There are also questions about whether the state will be able to make good on delayed payments from a couple years ago. If it does not, that would constitute another cut. A flat state appropriation for IU would be a significant blow because it follows two years of reductions and 4% limits on tuition increases, which do not keep up with increasing costs. There are several forces converging that will make it difficult for IU and K-12 education unless the economy improves radically, which is not expected to happen soon.

Another phenomenon specific to IUB is that this year for the first time the campus' enrollment targets were not met. So there is no increase in state appropriations, a limit on tuition increases and a reduction on enrollment—the main source of income for the university—a combination that presents significant fiscal challenges.

The enrollment figures for the spring semester for school of education in Bloomington—Those for Indianapolis have not been received yet—show a reduction in academic years from 2003-2004 to 2004-2005 of about 6% in graduate credit hours. The decrease would have been larger except for the Voyager Project, a professional development initiative launched together by Indianapolis and Bloomington with a partner to provide early reading instruction. That program in Bloomington generated close to 4,000 credit hours. Without that program the actual reduction this year would have been close to about 11.5%. That is an extremely significant reduction in enrollment, and coupled with the financial pressures mentioned earlier, makes for a very difficult financial situation next year and possibly into the future.

Dean Gonzalez reported that central campus administrators have begun to do some planning and are trying to make some financial projections. There will be a meeting soon to discuss what might be expected by way of tuition increases and other ways to address the financial situation.

Dean Gonzalez mentioned that there has been concern for some time about enrollment pressures that were felt when enrollment had grown considerably and the number of faculty had not kept pace. There were pressures with space, instructors, and all that goes with rapid growth in enrollment. However, the spring this year is the lowest since 2002. The good news is that there is more space and the student-faculty ratio is better. The bad news is that there are not the funds needed to replace the faculty and make other desired investments. Dean Gonzalez called for everyone to think and work together to plan an appropriate response to statewide crises in education if the governor's budget is passed by the legislature and no new sources of funds are found.

Dean Gonzalez indicated that the news is not all bad. The good news is that the School's Commitment to Excellent funds have been approved. This will help cushion some of the blows with respect to potential loss of faculty or hiring freezes resulting from the financial shortfall.

Dean Gonzalez indicated that the current searches are going forward and he is impressed with the quality of the candidates. He hopes that all of the on-going searches will be successful.

Looking forward into the semester, Dean Gonzalez will report to the council on faculty appointments and keep the council informed on what is happening in the budgetary discussions that will begin shortly with the trustees.

Delandshere asked if there be implications for searches.

Dean Gonzalez said that at this point searches will go ahead and that there may have to be some deficit built into the budget next year.

Carspecken inquired how many searches are going on at present.

Dean Gonzalez reported that there is the quantitative research search and a higher education search. There are two learning sciences searches, which are earmarked positions using Commitment to Excellence funds. There is one targeted search in history of education.

Murtadha reported four searches going in Indianapolis: one in higher education student affairs, one in English as a new language, one in science and one in literacy.

Dean Gonzalez asked for spring enrollment data.

Murtadha reported a drop of 5.1%, which was anticipated with Columbus student teacher numbers being transferred from IUPUI to Columbus.

III. No Announcement from the Agenda Committee

IV. Old Business

A. Report from the Ad Hoc Committees [\(05.26\)](#)

Delandshere summarized that the policy council chartered the committee with members representing faculty affairs from both IUPUI and IUB and people who are familiar with promotion and tenure of IUPUI candidates. Document [5.26](#) lists the recommendations of the committee. Charles Barman and Keith Moran were co-chairs of the Ad Hoc committee.

The main problem was that the procedures were diverse. There was not a single procedure. This is an attempt to standardize the process by which IUPUI candidates are reviewed. The committee also suggests that their recommendations should apply to all cases in both schools. The recommendations include the specific requirement that primary committee be composed of five faculty members, including two from the other campus, that members of the Promotion, Tenure and Contracts Committee should not participate in discussions on their own reviews. Another

change is that the committee recommends the primary committee conduct four votes: one each for teaching, research and service, plus an overall vote. This is because the rhetoric of the recommendations did not always agree with the vote recommendation. Delandshere did not think that the separate votes solved the problem.

Kloosterman concurred and suggested the recommendations reflect the majority practice. He noted that occasionally there were not five members on the committee and that a couple departments did not break voting down. These recommendations make the process. He noted the possibility of controversy regarding the involvement of faculty at department-level discussions. This has been discussed before and there is no real consensus; there is true dissension on this issue.

Discussion ensued about how practices differ between departments and campuses. Questions were raised about how the change would affect the process at IUPUI, since there is not a department structure that corresponds to Bloomington's. It was noted that in the primary committee members would come from the candidate's program area. If there were not enough faculty in the program area Murtadha would recommend someone who came closest. It was noted that the change would make clear that there would be five members on the primary committee at IUPUI, which has not always been the case in the past.

Murtadha asked to disseminate this to the IUPUI faculty to get feedback.

It was agreed that the council could postpone a vote and allow time to solicit feedback.

Delandshere suggested the department chairs to put it on the departmental meeting agendas for discussion. She pointed out that the change does not resolve the issue for the person going up for tenure or promotion. The problem was that the person did not know who would be making the decision on their case. In this situation they still do not know until they go up for tenure. Someone in the department knows that the department members make the decision. In the scenario presented here they don't know. This does not resolve the initial concern.

There was further discussion to clarify how the voting process would work.

Kloosterman offered to contact department chairs in Bloomington and to report feedback back to the council. He noted that there is a lot of difference between departments concerning who is involved in discussions before voting takes place. In some cases non-tenured faculty are involved

in discussions concerning tenure and promotions. He asked if the committee felt that needed to be addressed.

There was additional discussion concerning issues that have arisen because of differences in voting procedures. The relative merits and drawbacks of the different procedures were explored.

Delandshere said that the issue should be sent out for feedback and reported back for the March meeting.

#### B. Outreach and Partnerships

Delandshere recounted that the council was trying to decide what to do with the recommendation to have a new policy council committee that would direct outreach and partnerships. The questions are: what would the committee do? What kind of policy recommendations would they make? The agenda committee suggested that the new committee analyze and respond to the demands of the field. If school corporations want the School of Education to have a lot of courses in classroom management, is this what we should be engaging in?

Also, Murtadha suggested that we have a discussion about what our role is in society and what we stand for as a faculty.

Dean Gonzalez said the action points were that a committee be formed to oversee outreach and partnerships and reports back to the school. Another was that an office of outreach and partnerships be established with a faculty member as head of the office. He suggested that creating an office would have budgetary implications and would be difficult to initiate.

A discussion ensued about what the committee would do. Examples of current outreach and partnerships were given. Different possible responsibilities for and potential benefits from the committee were suggested.

There was a suggestion to form a standing committee to focus on outreach and partnership. It was pointed out that establishing a new committee would require amending the constitution. Further discussion addressed the constitutional implications of forming a standing committee. It was suggested that the people who promoted the committee be approached to assess their interest in serving on the committee.

The possibility of forming an Ad Hoc committee was put forth and the details and relative merits and drawbacks of that option were discussed. It was decided that any decision be postponed until the interested parties

were contacted and their interest assessed, and suggested that the agenda committee can come prepared to make a motion at the next Policy Council meeting. It was unclear if a formal motion is required to act on the recommendations and agreed that the question would be resolved by the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 P.M.