

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
March 11, 2015
1:00-3:00pm
IUB—Room 2140
IUPUI—Room 3138B
IUPUC—Room 155D

What follows is a summary of speaker contributions

Members Present: B. Edmonds, B. Maxcy, P. Carspecken, J. Cho, K. Pepler, S.P. Scribner, C. Walcott; **Alternate Members Present:** R. Skiba; D. Keller; S. Daley, V. Borden. J. Scheurich. T.S.T. Nguyen; **Student Members Present:** C. Cogswell, M. Bienz; **Staff Member Present:** T. Niggle; **Dean’s Staff Present:** G. Gonzalez, J. Alexander, P. Rogan.

- Approval of the minutes from the January 21, 2015 Policy Council Meeting (15.342M) was postponed.

IV. New Business

Racial Composition of Blue Ribbon Committee

P. Carspecken thanked everyone for attending this special meeting of the Policy Council. He indicated that the meeting has been called to discuss a proposal from IUPUI faculty that the President’s Office consider expanding the Blue Ribbon Review Committee (BRRC) from five to seven members and that the two additional members be scholars of color.

J. Scheurich, on behalf of IUPUI faculty, summarized the issues and the reasoning behind the proposal. He suggested that the IUPUI faculty’s proposal was motivated by the racial and ethnic inequities in our school system; by the presence of those same inequities among the teacher population in our schools; by the fact that these inequities are a serious concern of the school of education faculty; and by recent events around the country that indicate the continual presence of deep racial and ethnic issues in our society—issues that have a profound effect on our educational system.

Furthermore, he noted that since the late 1960s there has been an increase in the number of faculty of color on what had been predominantly white research university campuses. And as the number of faculty of color has increased, new issues, new ways of thinking, new epistemologies, and new methodologies have been brought to light. These changes require not just increased representation—new faces at the table—but also real changes in how we think about education and research.

Thus, given the role of the BRRC in evaluating the schools of education, and given that at this point there is only one person of color—an African American female superintendent—on the committee, the faculty at IUPUI think it is very important to increase the number of scholars of

color on the committee so that these scholars can bring their histories and their perspectives to the conversation, particularly since it is a conversation related to our failure to deal with the racial inequities in education.

Furthermore, the faculty at IUPUI feel that they did follow the process of submitting possible names as they understood it. Regardless, when process does not produce equity, there is no reason to get hung up about process—as if it is somehow beyond question even when it fails to address the issues at hand. And, since the addition of 1-2 more people would not be disastrous to the committee and its process, it seems that there is no good reason to draw a line in the sand over procedural issues.

The faculty at IUPUI, therefore, propose that the Policy Council request that the President's Office consider adding two scholars of color to the BRRC. This proposal has unanimous support from the faculty at IUPUI, all of whom feel that if the proposal is rejected by the Policy Council, it would be an action that damages the reputation of the School of Education. Furthermore, many IUPUI faculty of color have indicated that they would feel personally damaged by such action, which they would perceive as a lack of support.

P. Carspecken asked how many IUPUI faculty members voted in favor of the proposal at their recent meeting.

J. Scheurich noted that it was unanimously supported by what he thinks were about thirty faculty members present at Friday's meeting.

G. Gonzalez suggested that, for the sake of procedure, a specific motion should be put forth (and seconded) indicating precisely what the request is from IUPUI faculty. This would help to clarify what is being discussed and ultimately voted on.

B. Maxcy moved that the Policy Council present a request to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President to have the BRRC expanded by two members and to ensure that the two additional members are scholars of color.

S.P. Scribner seconded the motion.

Discussion of the motion ensued.

V. Borden indicated that, as Chair of the Long Range Planning Committee, he has had communication with Executive Vice President J. Applegate on this topic. He reported some of the relevant points. J. Applegate communicated to V. Borden that the substantive concern about representation is a valid and important one and that the school of education faculty is encouraged to pursue it internally. He also reiterated to V. Borden the administration's belief that it was following the process that the school of education faculty initially asked it to follow.

V. Borden suggested that the Policy Council should pursue the substantive question under consideration. He also emphasized that there is no reason to think that the administration is necessarily opposed to considering the request or that they would not respond to it thoughtfully.

Finally, he expressed a hope that members of the Policy Council can engage the question constructively and in a way that separates what we know and what don't know.

S.P. Scribner thanked V. Borden for the information he reported and joined him in expressing hope for a productive discussion.

G. Gonzalez expressed his concerns about the resolution. First, he pointed out that the President has already announced the members of the committee and designated a chair. Second, he noted that the school put a process in place through which names of potential committee members would be submitted and that this resolution potentially undermines the credibility of the school because it demonstrates, in effect, that we have failed to follow our own process. That is very troubling. Third, he pointed out that a very good committee has been put together. And, in fact, one member of the committee is a scholar of inequity who deals with concerns about privatization and social justice and who has spoken to these issues at the national level. Also, the committee chair is knowledgeable of the school and has served the school as a member of the National Board of Visitors. She has been a strong advocate for schools in Detroit and has reached out to faculty at IUPUI in the Urban Education because she wanted—through her work at Michigan State University—to better serve the needs of underrepresented students. Furthermore, one member of the committee is an African American superintendent who has received national awards as a spokesperson for black students around the country. And yet we are insisting through this resolution that additional members be appointed to the BRRC—outside of the process we had agreed to—because of our assumption that the current members cannot represent the interests of the people we serve.

G. Gonzalez continued by pointing out that the faculty collectively worked hard to have their voices heard, to have the President respond and, ultimately, to have a strong committee that we can trust. If we undermine that process, we are undermining the thing we worked hard to try to do. And so he urged members of the policy to vote against the resolution, not because he does not believe in equity or representation, but because the resolution is not in the interests of the school or the faculty. He suggested, instead, that the faculty spend time figuring out how to get our voices into the process so that the work of the committee—whoever is it composed of—takes account of the important concerns that faculty at Indianapolis and Bloomington have expressed concerning equity, social justice, and representation.

S.P. Scribner emphasized that the resolution is intended to make a contribution to the process and not, in any way, to be confrontational.

B. Maxcy returned attention to V. Borden's indication that the President's office is open to considering an expansion of the committee and noted that IUPUI faculty think it would be valuable to the committee to do so. He also noted that the process—both from the President's office and from the school—has been evolving since November and that it moved very quickly over the last several weeks in particular, making it difficult for IUPUI to participate in that process given the distance issue. Furthermore, he emphasized that several IUPUI faculty members submitted names directly to the President's office because that's what they were told to do. He also noted that IUPUI faculty have consistently advocated for a diverse committee, one that reflects the diversity not only of the faculty but also of the communities they serve. And,

lastly, he emphasized that IUPUI faculty agree that the committee as constructed is strong and that the point of the resolution is to suggest that it would be strengthened further by the addition of scholars of color.

Y. Cho asked if there were any minority opinions or comments in the discussion about the resolution (as the faculty reached consensus).

B. Maxcy responded that the IUPUI faculty was unanimous in its belief that the committee would benefit from increased diversity. There was no opposition to that point—only strong support.

G. Gonzalez pointed out that nobody would argue against the importance of equity and representation. But procedures are important. And if this was a resolution of the faculty, that is how it should have been presented, leading to a vote. Failing to follow procedures creates confusion. He acknowledged that the process did move quickly—in part because many of the school’s faculty members requested that it move expeditiously—and that it was not perfect. However, he emphasized that the school followed—and should continue to follow—the process the faculty agreed to follow.

P. Carspecken agreed that the process was followed and that many faculty thought the process had ended. However, he suggested that the concerns among IUPUI faculty are an indication that the process did not work for all faculty and that it should, therefore, continue.

J. Schuerich noted that the process wasn’t clear to faculty at IUPUI, and that they do not feel as if they got to participate in a clear process.

G. Gonzalez noted that there were faculty elected representatives of IUPUI at both the meeting of the Policy Council and the follow up discussion, during which time names were selected to be sent forth to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President.

P. Carspecken suggested that the important point is that process did not work for a large number of IUPUI faculty. If faculty of color suggest that the process was not sufficient, we should listen and be responsive. That is the basis of what we’re doing now—listening to the concerns of those who feel the committee is not sufficient.

V. Borden offered a friendly amendment to B. Maxcy’s original motion. The amended motion proposed that the Policy Council communicate to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President the following: 1) The SoE applauds the selection by the President’s office of a well-composed BRRC and the accommodation of SoE input into the process; 2) in the process of our internal review, the SoE identified a need for redoubling our efforts as a school to better represent diverse perspectives in reimagining education. Toward that end we will propose in our review steps we plan to take toward this objective; 3) we ask the President’s office to join us in redressing this issue by considering adding 2 scholars of color to the committee.

J. Alexander expressed support for the wording of the friendly amendment, but she wanted it to be clear that this is being posed as a request to the President’s office. And so it is possible that

the President's office will choose—for any number of reasons that might have nothing to do with the substantive issue—not to honor it.

B. Maxcy accepted V. Borden's friendly amendment to the original motion.

A vote on the amended motion was held.

Result: All were in favor; no abstentions.

Interim Dean Selection Process

Dean Gonzalez called attention to a copy of an email he received from L. Robel to Phil Carspecken asking that the Policy Council generate names of candidates for the interim Dean of the School of Education.

Discussion ensued about how such a process for generating names should be conducted.

R. Skiba moved that Jane Kaho send a memo to both campuses on behalf of the Policy Council soliciting nominations for interim Dean and that those names be considered by the Policy Council at its March 25th meeting prior to submission to the Vice Provost.

K. Pepler suggested the addition of a due date for the submission of names.

Discussion ensued, and it was determined that names should be submitted to Jane by Tuesday, March 24th.

The motion—with the addition of a due date for names—was seconded by Vic Borden.

A vote on the motion was held.

Result: All were in favor; no abstentions.

V. New Courses/Course Changes

P. Carspecken announced that the courses listed on the agenda are open for 30 day remonstrance.

P. Carspecken announced that a meeting would be held immediately following the adjournment of the Policy Council meeting so that a discussion could take place concerning the names that have been suggested as possible additions to the BRRC. There are six names in total, four submitted from IUPUI faculty, and two from Counseling and Educational Psychology faculty at IUB.

B. Edmonds moved to adjourn the meeting.

R. Skiba seconded the motion.

****P. Carspecken adjourned the meeting at 2:43pm****

