

**MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

November 17, 2004, 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, Flinders, McCarty, Ross Stachowski, Sutton, Thompson. **Dean's Staff Present:** Gonzalez, Kloosterman, Murtadha. **Staff Representative: Student Representative:** Zhang. **Alternates:** Appelman, Schwen, **Guests:** Pawan, Sinclair.

I. Approval of Minutes

A. Approval of the Minutes from October 27, 2004, Policy Council meeting ([05.12M](#))

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the minutes as written. The minutes for October 27, 2004, were unanimously approved.

II. Announcements and Discussions

A. Dean's Report

Dean Gonzalez reported good news concerning the status of the School of Education's Commitment to Excellence proposal. He is encouraged that both the President and the Chancellor have indicated that they will support the School of Education's proposal; it is ultimately up to the Board of Trustees to approve it, but the President and Chancellor intend to recommend funding for the proposal. It looks like this will be put on the agenda for the Board of Trustees' December meeting. Hopefully, the Board of Trustees will agree with the President's and Chancellor's recommendations and grant funding for the Commitment to Excellence proposal. There are eight faculty positions that have been recommended for funding. The unifying theme of the Commitment to Excellence proposal is to enhance teacher education as well as the research and doctoral preparation that go along with it. However, the funding will not be available until fiscal year 2006. This means that if the proposal is approved now, then next year the School of Education will be able to initiate searches for new faculty and will be able to hire half of the new faculty in 2006 and the other half in 2007. The proposal calls for three senior faculty positions. Of course, recruiting senior faculty is a challenge and a long-term process, so the sooner we can begin to think of individuals that we might want to establish contact with, the better off we are going to be. The senior positions are in Special Education, Art Education, and Language Education, specifically English as a New Language or English as a

Second Language. The other positions, which are not senior positions, are in Science Education, Special Education, Mathematics Education, Global Education, and Technology Education.

Dean Gonzalez reiterated how encouraged he is about this proposal, which is one of a small number of proposals that will be recommended for funding by the Trustees. This recognition is a wonderful testimony to the credibility of the School of Education and to the great work of the faculty in making the case that this is a center of excellence in which the investment of these funds will produce the results that are intended by this competition, which is to advance the reputation and the esteem of the faculty and the graduates of Indiana University.

Dean Gonzalez commented that we may have seen reports in the media about the Committee on Government Efficiency, which is a committee appointed by Governor Kernan to look at ways to make government more efficient. This committee has various task forces that are looking at different aspects of state government. One of the issues or aspects of state government being looked at is K-12 and another is Higher Education. Last week, the subcommittees prepared and issued reports concerning these issues. One of the recommendations of the Higher Education committee is that changes be made to the Higher Education structure in Indiana so that more students are encouraged to attend undergraduate at the Ivy Techs and Community Colleges or 4-year institutions. The reasoning behind this is that it costs more to educate an undergraduate at a doctoral research university. In Indiana, we have what is often referred to as an inverted pyramid, where most of the undergraduates are attending schools—Purdue, Bloomington, and Indianapolis—where it costs more than the lesser number of students who are attending the Ivy Techs. However, some states are just the opposite. The example that is often given is Illinois, where there is a very large community college system, where most of the undergraduates attend the community colleges and a smaller number of students attend the more expensive doctoral research universities. This is reversed in Indiana. The recommendation from the Committee on Government Efficiency is that Bloomington and Purdue be designated as research campuses and that enrollment be held constant on the graduate enrollment, with the goal that the proportion of graduate students will increase. Then, to some extent, the research campuses will be funded, not as a function of enrollment growth, which is a traditional formula for funding of universities in the state, but as a function of external funding received. If we are designated as a research campus, it will be expected that some of our state funding will be tied to our ability to continuously increase external research funding that may be brought to the University. In exchange for that, those campuses will not be penalized for not having a growth in graduate enrollment. There is a lot of discussion around this topic that will change the makeup of Bloomington and Purdue, especially since Bloomington has historically been liberal arts, four-year institution. While the intentions are good, there are some questions about whether the government can afford to sustain a research mission without a large undergraduate body and without the growth in tuition revenue that is now necessary to operate the institution. These are not policies; they are

recommendations that will have to be reviewed legislatively and ultimately the governor will have to sign legislation based on these recommendations. But, they are recommendations worth noting, thinking about, and staying aware of. These recommendations could directly affect the work done in Bloomington and Indianapolis and upon the mechanisms that the School of Education is accustomed to. To the extent that new developments occur, Dean Gonzalez will keep the faculty informed on the implications that may impact the School of Education.

Dean Gonzalez commented on the Board of Visitors meeting that is taking place this week. The Board of Visitors is a group of government officials, educators, and business people who provide input into the schools' strategic priorities and are friends of the schools. There will be business meetings on November 18, 2004. Research centers within the School of Education will be presenting poster sessions at an afternoon reception. Dean Gonzalez encouraged faculty members to meet with the visitors.

Delandshere asked about the Committee for Government Efficiency. She noted that the kinds of recommendations described regarding this committee are very much the same kinds of recommendations that are in the mission differentiation statement.

Dean Gonzalez stated that there are links, but, more importantly, there is a plan developed by the Higher Education Commission in Indiana called Comprehensive Plan for Postsecondary Education in Indiana that has some of the same ideas as the mission differentiation. The Committee for Government Efficiency has picked up some of those ideas and expanded them into what may be policy recommendations. Then, parallel to this, there is a separate internal discussion in Indiana regarding mission differentiation, which has tried to establish a clear mission for each of the IU campuses. This could have implications in the future for what degrees are offered at which institutions.

B. Agenda Committee

Delandshere announced the Faculty Colloquia on Friday, November 19, 2004, at 3:00 p.m. The presenters will be Troy Sadler and Genny Williamson.

C. Graduate Faculty Memo ([05.18](#))

Delandshere discussed the Graduate Faculty Memo, coming from the University Graduate School, which changes the process of nominating faculty to Graduate Faculty Membership. In the past, one had to be recommended or nominated to become a member of the graduate faculty and there were different levels of graduate faculty (associate, full, etc.). The new rules state that every tenure-track faculty member is now automatically a member of the graduate faculty. However, in order to direct and chair Ph.D. dissertations, the faculty member would have to be granted an endorsement by the school. Non-tenure-track faculty and research scientists can also be appointed to graduate faculty status.

Delandshere noted that the School of Education needs to put in place a review process to recommend faculty to receive an endorsement to chair a dissertation. Is this going to be organized at the school level or the departmental level? Are there going to be common criteria used across all departments?

McCarty commented that she would argue for a centralized procedure, within the School of Education, perhaps like the Graduate Studies Committee, as a body that could have a check on what departmental petitions were being made.

Stachowski asked if the automatic membership to the graduate faculty extends to clinical faculty as well.

Delandshere reported that this is not the case for clinical faculty members, as non-tenure track faculty members have to be recommended and nominated by their department/School for endorsement.

Dean Gonzalez noted that there is an important distinction, such that automatic membership extends to the graduate faculty. If you are tenure-track, you are hired into a tenure-track position and you automatically become a member of the graduate faculty. It is the next step, being able to serve and chair on doctoral committees that is the endorsement part. This can be extended to faculty members that are not tenure-track, but they still need to be reviewed. Dean Gonzalez suggested that each department should develop their own policies for what they would do to recommend and then subject those policies for review by the graduate council and then those individuals who may be recommended by the departmental policy would get reviewed by the graduate council to make sure that the policy has been followed.

McCarty noted that in order to have Associate membership, the professor had to have one refereed publication. In addition, when the professor had already submitted and obtained tenure, based on excellence in research, the professor was likely to receive full status. If the professor went up on teaching or service, then they might not be granted full graduate status, as the individual had to be established as a scholar. In other words, even though these individuals had gained tenure, they were turned down for full membership to the faculty. In all, there was a subcommittee of the graduate council that made the determination for graduate school status.

Kloosterman noted that the criteria for full faculty membership were often the equivalent of what it would take to get tenure based on research. He noted that he also remembered people gaining full status after tenure based on teaching, but they usually had publications as well.

Delandshere asked if anyone had ever been turned down for full faculty status.

Kloosterman replied that there have been some difficult cases. He stated that he would like for the council to think about the status for directing dissertations and to think about a procedure for those individuals who are not in tenure-track positions to have graduate status. This also includes procedures for clinical faculty, adjunct faculty, and research associates to be able to sit on research or dissertation committees.

Sutton suggested that the Council ask the Graduate Studies Committee to purvey a draft for discussion and to see whether they would recommend a unified or a hybrid process for this procedure.

Gonzalez commented that he thinks the best approach would be to ask the department to develop the criteria themselves because departments have different cultures. The idea would be that each department would develop their criteria for how they would recommend for endorsement and how they would recommend for appointment to the graduate faculty for those who aren't tenure-track. Then, those departmental criteria would be reviewed by the Graduate Studies Committee and they would determine whether or not the departmental criteria meets standard and could look across the departments to ensure compatibility. Once the policy is approved by the committee, when the person comes through, the department would follow their own procedures and make recommendations to graduate studies who would then ultimately determine if the department followed procedures for proper endorsement of that individual, therefore determining whether the individual should be recommended based on whether or not the department followed proper procedures. Gonzalez also noted that the criteria and policy cannot be so strict that there is no room for flexibility.

McCarty noted that there should be similarities or standards across departments for the endorsement, because faculty members often serve in other departments. She also noted that she also feels very strongly about protecting junior faculty members, such that if they do not feel comfortable serving on a dissertation committee, then they would not be required to do so.

Delandshere stated that there is a provision for chairs to appeal to the Deans of Faculty for exceptions regarding the policy or recommendations.

Flinders made a motion to charge the Graduate Studies Committee to develop a draft policy, in consultation with the different departments, for (1) granting endorsement to chair and direct Ph.D. dissertation committees for graduate faculty members, and for (2) appointing non-tenure track faculty and research scientists to graduate faculty status.

McCarty seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

The Policy Council members also unanimously agreed that the procedure established by the policy should not be cumbersome. The draft policy should be sent to Policy Council for review and approval by March 9, 2005.

D. Core Campus Issues

Delandshere reported that Policy Council needs to pay close attention to what is going to happen with the mission differentiation proposals and to think about how this is going to affect the core campus issue. Does it make sense to spend time talking about the core campus when, in fact, the concept may be changing because of the mission differentiation?

Murtadha commented that they have not heard anything from the IUPUI campus in regards to getting a response or a sense of what direction the mission differentiation statements will go or what the next step in the process is.

Delandshere mentioned that Ken Gros Louis is organizing a meeting on Friday, November 19, 2004, with all the Policy Council chairs from the IUB campus, where the chairs will discuss the mission differentiation document that he has introduced.

Flinders asked what has been discussed so far regarding mission differentiation. He noted that he was a bit confused as to the difference between mission differentiation and the work of the committee for Efficiency in Government.

Gonzalez reported that the mission differentiation conversation predated the appointment of the Efficiency in Government committee when the President came and he heard from the trustees and others who interviewed him that there was some blurring of the lines between the campuses and it wasn't clear any more as to what the mission of one campus versus that of another campus might be. He initiated an internal committee to come to some agreement in what are the different missions of each of the IU campuses. Nelms and members of his group have met with representatives from each of the campuses. Each campus has already had internal conversations regarding mission differentiation with constituents of its own campus. The goal of these meetings is for the campuses to put forward what they view as their mission. Then, the university-wide committee will take all of the mission statements and the input from the various meetings and make some decisions about mission differentiation. The conversation regarding mission differentiation is an internal conversation, which may be influenced by the external conversation around efficiency in government and the higher education commission, who ultimately articulates a specific mission for each campus by virtue of their graduate degrees or to recommend funding. All of these issues are intertwined, but they are separate. The mission differentiation conversation is about how do we as constituent stakeholders in the campus in which we reside view the mission of our individual campuses. That in itself is a very complex issue.

Delandshere noted that having an institution like IUB is very expensive. We have centers, museums, and a whole infrastructure that is impossible to replicate on all campuses. We cannot develop the same infrastructure as IUB on all the IU campuses. It is not the first time that administrators have tried to make IU a research intensive institution and cut down on numbers of undergraduate students.

Gonzalez commented that the internal conversation he has been involved with has not suggested that the undergraduate mission of IUB be reduced. It does advocate for recognition of IUB as a doctoral, research extensive campus. This is not to say that a doctoral, research extensive campus cannot have a strong undergraduate mission. This is the point that Ken Gros Louis has tried to make. For instance, in the case of IUB we have been able to excel at both. IUB has a world-class research campus and it has achieved high levels of distinction in undergraduate education. And, there are several treasures on IUB's campus—the Lilly Library and the Museum of Fine Arts—which distinguishes the campus and cannot be replicated anywhere else. But, the case the Ken Gros Louis makes is that it is not an either/or situation. IUB can be a world-class research university but it can also maintain a very rich undergraduate tradition. This is different from issues related to funding.

Delandshere stated that the discussion on undergraduate selection seems to imply that IUB should be much more selective in the admission of undergraduates.

Murtadha noted that there is clearly a research focus at IUPUI as well. Thus, there is not only the sense of Bloomington as a research campus, but IUPUI is a research campus with comparable amounts of research and external funding at IUPUI as well. Part of the discussion is to ask what it means to have both campuses focused on research and doing the kind of productivity and acquiring the kinds of externally funded grants that would typically be with one of the larger campuses. Because of the extensive nature of the outreach at IUPUI, all of that is happening at IUPUI as well.

Delandshere asked Murtadha if she is saying that there is no mission differentiation between IUB and IUPUI.

Murtadha stated that the one thing that is very clear is that the board of trustees approved the mission statement that IUPUI had a long time ago. IUPUI's mission statement was clearly stating that the school was focused on urban education and the trustees accepted that mission statement that defined IUPUI as a research and teaching institution focused on urban issues and civic engagement.

Gonzalez noted that IUPUI has been engaged in their mission statement conversations longer than any other campus.

III. Old Business

Discussions regarding recommendations from the Partnership and Outreach Committee [\(04.49\)](#) will be postponed until the next Policy Council meeting.

IV. New Business

A. Education Council – Bylaws [\(05.17\)](#)

Kloosterman reported that last April a new constitution was passed for the Education Council for all the IU campuses. Along with the constitution, a set of bylaws [\(05.17\)](#) was written that basically states procedures for how to implement some of the issues in the constitution. This has been written to match current policies across the Schools of Education and the IU campuses. So, these bylaws are a reflection of those policies and what we do and they need to be passed by each of the governing bodies at each of the campuses. We represent IUB and IUPUI. We need to ratify this so it can be put into place for Education Council.

Sutton made a motion to accept the Education Council Bylaws [\(05.17\)](#).

McCarty seconded the motion.

The motion to accept the Education Council Bylaws was unanimously approved.

B. Clinical Faculty Criteria for Promotion and Long-term contracts [\(05.14, 05.15, 05.16\)](#)

Delandshere reported that there is some urgency to this discussion regarding Clinical Faculty Criteria for Promotion and Long-term contracts because several clinical faculty members are up for review this year. This was articulated by the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Stachowski noted that this issue was a top priority of the Faculty Affairs Committee this academic year. The Committee began by looking at the 2002 Promotion and Tenure Criteria and all of the various documents that have been written already about the clinical faculty in order to determine what needs to be done. She also met with clinical faculty members who are up for review this year in order to talk about immediate concerns that all clinical faculty members have. The committee tried to parallel criteria for clinical faculty members as closely as it could to the already existing criteria for obtaining tenure. They also wanted to make sure that they developed criteria for clinical faculty members that reflect the broad range of activities that the clinical faculty are doing. They wanted there to be room in the document to reflect the differences in each of the activities that the clinical faculty members are doing. They also wanted to be able to bring in some of the things the clinical faculty members do that includes writing, publication, research, development, and other things that clinical faculty members may not receive credit for.

Kloosterman added that the committee tried to make the criteria for clinical faculty as consistent as possible with the tenure criteria. Since Policy Council had passed procedures for clinical faculty here in the School of Education, Bloomington

Faculty Council (BFC) has passed new policies that contradict some of the procedures done in the School of Education. In particular, the main area where there are differences is that BFC has backed off the original BFC documents that clinical faculty were not to be doing research. The newer documents stated that research is acceptable as long as it is related to the teaching and service mission. The other thing that is different is the time line. When PC set up their documents, all the clinical faculty members were hired with the expectation that they would have a review for a long-term contract in their 4th year and that contract wouldn't take effect until after the 5th year. The most recent BFC documents talk about trying to make the clinical review as parallel as possible to that of tenure track on the Bloomington campus and encourage that reviews for clinical faculty will be in the 6th year like they are for tenure track faculty. Essentially, we are looking at very similar criteria for clinical faculty that we are for tenure-track faculty and for people who have been here for a couple of years haven't had as much time to develop a portfolio as those who have been here for five or six years.

Kloosterman reported that the suggestions for long-term contracts are either a rolling three-year contract or a five-year contract with a review every five years. This process is specific to the Bloomington faculty members.

Murtadha noted that they have been going through a similar process at IUPUI.

Flinders asked if the documents could be passed tentatively or conditionally based on the possibility of making changes/revisions later.

Sutton suggested that it be passed and request that a systematic debriefing of individuals under review take place after their review.

Flinders made a motion to accept the Clinical Faculty Criteria with the amendment that it is subject to revisions as needed with future review.

The motion to accept the Clinical Faculty Criteria for Promotion and Long-term contracts was unanimously approved.

C. ICP/TACIT ESL Proposal [\(05.19\)](#)

Pawan discussed the ICP/TACIT ESL Proposal [\(05.19\)](#), which is a joint program for ESL and content area teachers. Pawan said that she is seeking the Policy Council's approval for an advanced certification program in ESL/ENL for licensed and in-service teachers in Indiana. This is not a new program, but it is a new track in an already-approved program. ESL certification is standards based and there are multiple tracks within this certification. This new proposal is based on two federally funded programs—the ICP and the TACIT programs. The program is a combination of online and on-site classes. This way, they are not taking the teachers away from their environments. It is a two and a half year professional development certification program that also gives them graduate-level credit to apply towards a Master's degree.

Delandshere reported that this program has been approved by the Graduate Studies Committee.

Carspecken made a motion to approve the ICP/TACIT Proposal [\(05.19\)](#).

Ross seconded the motion.

The motion to approve the ICP/TACIT Proposal was unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.