

**MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

November 16, 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: Delandshore, Eckes, Ochoa, Odom, Rosario, Ross,. **Alternates:** Appelman, Flinders, Torres. **Dean's Staff Present:** Brown, Gonzalez, Kloosterman, McMullen. **Staff Representative:** Wyatt. **Student Representatives:** Visitors:

I. Approval of the Minutes from September 28, 2005 Meeting ([06.10](#))

- a. Minutes from the September 28, 2005, meeting were unanimously approved.

II. Announcements and Discussions

- a. Dean's Report

Dean discussed his report to the faculty as part of the Fall Faculty Meeting. He noted that at this meeting he shared with the group the data that were previously not available to members of the School of Education community, including information regarding enrollment and degrees granted. Thanks to ETS this information is now available.

Overall, the SoE is doing well; however, the SoE does face some challenges, most notably financial challenges.

Dean Gonzalez met with Victor Borden, who has been designated as the lead person in developing an institutional research capacity for the University. Dean Gonzalez noted that he had the chance to listen to some of the goals that his office faces and was pleased to see that the University as a whole is trying to confront many of the same challenges as the School of Education, especially in using data to inform decisions. The data that are now available helps inform many decisions university-wide. One of President Herbert's goals is to develop an accountability system in order to determine how well campuses are progressing relative to their mission. This data will be used to help inform how well the campus is accomplishing its mission. Dean Gonzalez reported that he believes that in the future data will become an even greater component in the decision-making process.

Dean Gonzalez discussed the mission differentiation between IUB and IUPUI. IUB has been recognized by the Board of Trustees as the flagship campus of Indiana University and IUPUI as the urban research campus of the University. As the mission differentiation process moves forward, the University is beginning to identify areas that each campus should be concentrating on relative to their mission.

Dean Gonzalez mentioned that there are some areas to which all campuses of IU will be expected to contribute, particularly the need to transform the state's economy to be more responsive and competitive in a global economy that is largely driven by the math, sciences, technology and advanced manufacturing. The Dean mentioned Thomas Friedman's book, *The World is Flat*, which has been used by policy makers all over the country to enhance recognition of the need to respond aggressively to the challenges that international powers now present to the developed countries and particularly the United States. A report entitled "The Gathering Storm" that underscores Friedman's concerns was also released recently. This report is catching the policymaker's attention, because it notes that the United States is losing individuals capable of competing worldwide in the math and sciences. Critical to this is the preparation of teachers who can teach math and sciences. Dean Gonzalez stated that he has been appointed by President Herbert to a University committee named Advancing Indiana. This committee will address the need to create more 21st century industries and enhance workforce development throughout Indiana. Related, the education deans from public universities throughout the state will be meeting with the Governor's adviser on education issues, David Shane, to consider ways of advancing Indiana in areas of math, science, and technology.

Dean Gonzalez reported that IU has been selected to receive the Goldman Sachs award, which is one of the most prestigious awards given for international education. IU was selected for this award on the basis of the School of Education's cultural immersion program, the East Asian Studies, and the Center for Global Change. There will be a public announcement of this award on December 8, 2005.

b. Agenda Committee

Committees to review administrators were charged by the Dean and the chair of the agenda committee at a meeting on November 15, 2005. The committees will be working all year.

Suzanne Eckes volunteered to serve on the Nominations Committee.

III. Old Business

a. No old business

IV. New Business

a. Graduate Program Review ([06.12](#))

The Policy Council discussed a Memo from David Daleke regarding graduate program reviews. The Graduate School has designated that each graduate program be reviewed periodically. This issue is being discussed in Policy Council because initially the Graduate Studies Committee was given this memo and they brought it to the Policy Council to discuss. The role of the Policy Council is to look at the process for doing graduate program reviews. The Policy Council needs to decide what process that the School of Education will take in conducting the graduate program reviews. The Policy Council needs to determine today what process should be recommended, not necessarily details of the process.

Odom asked if there is a format or precedent for these program reviews to occur so that we have a model.

McMullen responded that IUPUI has been engaged in ongoing program reviews for quite some time. These program reviews are not scheduled.

Torres noted that the reason for this discussion is to determine the Policy Council's role in this process.

To clarify the background concerning this issue, Dean Gonzalez noted that after the Graduate School separated from RUGS, one of the roles of the Graduate School was to conduct graduate program reviews. David Daleke has been commissioned to oversee this process – the development, coordination, and implementation of the program reviews. Daleke met with Dean Gonzalez in regard to what the School of Education does in terms of program review, and subsequently sent the memo ([06.12](#)). Dean Gonzalez noted that, since he has been at IU, he has never been involved in a systematic program review; only the accreditation reviews by APA, NCATE, etc. Dean Gonzalez asked each department what they were doing in terms of program review and then asked Mary McMullen to bring this issue to the Graduate Studies Committee for discussion. Overall, there are questions as to how the School of Education needs to proceed with these reviews in the future, what the reviews should look like, and who will be responsible for them.

McMullen noted that the graduate school has a document with loose guidelines regarding program reviews.

Program reviews can be used for assessments, review of program quality, department self-study, etc. and to help the programs to prepare for accreditation reviews such as NCATE and APA.

Torres said that she would like for the Policy Council to be proactive in the bounds of what has already been described by Graduate Studies and create a process and goals that won't be too onerous for the faculty within the School of Education.

Torres noted that at the present time, Policy Council needs to decide what process should be devised in order to create the implementation aspect of the program reviews.

Flinders noted that some principles for the program reviews need to be established before proceeding further into the process.

Torres noted that currently, the Policy Council is trying to answer three questions all at once: How to respond? Who should respond? What should it [the program review] include? It might be helpful to separate these items in order to be clearer. She encourages Policy Council to respond to the questions, but continue to work on a process that the Policy Council is comfortable with. Based on the first question – how to respond – should the process come from the Policy Council? Or should it come from another committee or Graduate Studies?

Gonzalez suggested that the Policy Council forward the four questions from the memo ([06.12](#)) to the Graduate Studies Committee. Then, the GSC should invite Daleke to the Policy Council to explain the purpose of collecting information in the program reviews and what the Campus plans to do with the information that is collected.

Torres suggested that the GSC work on a response to the four questions from the memo ([06.12](#)), extend an invitation to Daleke to come to Policy Council to discuss this issue, and invite program chairs and program coordinators to that meeting. She asked McMullen if she would inform the department chairs of this meeting and to ask them if the chairs would ask the program coordinators to begin gathering information for this meeting. The GSC should determine the date they would like to invite Daleke to a future Policy Council meeting.

b. Sustaining Faculty Governance

Procedure for Dean to bring forward external requests for faculty input

Torres asked what procedure the dean should use in bringing external requests for faculty input. Should it always be Policy Council that he comes to first? Or is there a certain type of issue the Policy Council would like to see and defer other issues to committees throughout the School of Education? Having a clear understanding for how things work in the School

of Education is an important aspect of faculty governance. One example for helping to enhance faculty governance would be to make faculty governance, and how governance functions in the SoE, a topic of new faculty orientation. Furthermore, in order to increase involvement in governance, it is important to understand how governance is implemented throughout the School of Education. Also, what procedures should the Dean use when external requests come to him? How should the information be disseminated to necessary parties?

Dean Gonzalez commented that this would be very helpful for him and he is willing to consider any suggestions and input that faculty members offer to him.

Rosario asked how the chair of the PC and the Dean currently interact. He suggested that, if faculty governance is to function as it is intended to, contact between the chair of the PC and the Dean should increase. Also, how does the Agenda committee fit into the picture? Are we working on the principle that the Dean can approach Policy Council committees with requests at his discretion? If so, this could be problematic. We must have some way of regulating the conversation between the Dean and the chair of the Policy Council in order to best resolve issues that arise.

In response to this, Torres noted that if this council serves as a form of faculty governance then communication between the chair of the PC and the Dean should be more formalized.

Delandshere noted that the members of the PC are the only elected body in the School of Education; other committees are appointed and often times members do not attend meetings. In order to increase faculty governance, faculty members should be more involved in the committees they are appointed to.

Flinders suggested that there is a lot to consider when determining what is a faculty governance issue and an administrative issue.

Ross suggested that whenever something is identified as likely to go to a subcommittee, then it should first come to the Agenda committee and then the Agenda committee can forward it to the subcommittee and it can then be reported at Policy Council. Anything related to faculty governance that is discussed, regardless of whether it is forwarded to a committee, could be listed in the agenda as an informational item.

Gonzalez said that this would be perfectly acceptable for him.

Enhancing Faculty Governance

Ross expressed concern that it is the members of the agenda committee's job to fill slots on the standing committees. She noted that it is becoming increasingly difficult to get faculty members to agree to serve on a committee or to participate actively in the committees to which they are appointed. Is the structure of our committees fair for all faculty members? Do some faculty members provide more service to the School of Education than others?

Torres noted that it is critical to enhance the faculty governance within the School of Education.

Delandshere stated that as a council, we have more committees than many other universities.

Gonzalez noted that committees should be structured in such a way that faculty are not only equally committed but that they feel committed to the committees they serve on.

Odom noted that the Promotion and Tenure committee members regularly attended their committee meetings, but this high attendance is perhaps because the outcomes of the decisions this committee makes are very important. It may be beneficial to look at what the outcomes are of each committee.

Torres summarized what had been discussed. She stated the Policy Council needs to consider the number and structure of committees. The Agenda committee can work on an email to send to each of the committee chairs, stating the Agenda committee's concern and ask if they would like to provide feedback to the Agenda committee regarding the committee's concerns. Also, perhaps it would be possible to add to the end of the year report faculty members who should be recognized for good work throughout the year. These are just small things the Policy Council can do to begin working on these issues.

V. Announcements

Torres noted there were four new graduate courses opened for remonstrance.

Gonzalez announced that he has selected four faculty members to serve on an advisory committee to help him interpret some of the issues raised in his Annual Review. These members include Sam Odom, Jack Cummings, Martha McCarthy, and Keith Morran.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:53.