

MINUTES  
POLICY COUNCIL  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
November 19, 2014  
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, C. Guarino, B. Maxcy, C. Bonk, P. Carspecken, D. DeSawal, R. Martinez, J. Cho, F. Pawan; **Alternate Members Present:** B. Levinson, R. Hughes, K. Wohlwend, J. Conner-Zachocki; **Student Members Present:** B. Jarrard (undergraduate), E. Mickey (graduate); **Staff Member Present:** T. Niggle; **Dean's Staff Present:** G. Gonzalez, J. Alexander, P. Rogan, R. Sherwood. **Guests:** A. Teemant, B. Berghoff, B. Dennis, D. Rutkowski, L. Rutkowski, M. Lewison, A. Ruddy

- Minutes from the October 15, 2014 Policy Council Meeting (**15.14M**) were unanimously approved.

**I. Announcements and Discussions**

Dean's Report: Dean Gerardo Gonzalez

In the interest of time, the Dean decided to forgo his report.

**II. Old Business**

None.

**III. New Business**

**Undergraduate Certificate in Higher Education and Student Affairs (15.16) (Danielle DeSawal)**

D. DeSawal presented the proposal and discussion ensued.

Result: Proposal passed unanimously.

**Undergraduate Minor in Higher Education and Student Affairs (15.17) (Danielle DeSawal)**

D. DeSawal presented the proposal and discussion ensued.

Result: Proposal passed unanimously.

**IUPUI Graduate Certificate in K-12 ESL Teaching (15.18) (Annela Teemant)**

A. Teemant presented the proposal and discussion ensued.

Result: Proposal passed; one abstention.

**IUPUI Elementary Education Non-Licensure Track (15.19) (Beth Berghoff)**

B. Berghoff presented the proposal and discussion ensued. Concerns were raised about what was perceived as a lack of written information accompanying the proposal.

Result: Proposal did NOT pass—6 in favor; 7 opposed; 2 abstentions.

It was suggested that more and clearer information be provided in a written statement that can be added to the proposal. P. Carspecken expressed that the Agenda Committee would be willing to make suggestions on how the proposal might be improved for the Policy Council's reconsideration.

**Resolution on Stance on Indiana University's Bicentennial Strategic Plan's "Priority Three: Re-Imagining Education" (15.20) (Bradley Levinson)**

A Policy Council member moved that the minutes taken on the Policy Council's discussion of the resolution on Priority Three of Indiana University's Bicentennial Strategic Plan record only the motion and the results of any vote on the motion.

The motion was seconded.

Discussion ensued concerning the value and importance of transparency versus anonymity in this particular discussion. The discussion resulted in a suggested amendment to the original motion. According to the amended motion, the voice recorder would be turned off, summative notes on the substantive parts of the discussion would be taken, and all Policy Council members would have the chance to review and revise the notes before they are shared outside of the Policy Council.

Further discussion ensued concerning the original motion and the suggested amendment, leading to a vote on the original motion.

Result: The original motion did NOT pass—4 in favor; 6 against; 1 abstention.

A motion was made to reconsider the suggested amendments to the original motion, particularly that the voice recorder be turned off and the minutes be distributed to all policy council members for review and revision prior to being shared outside the Policy Council.

Discussion ensued, leading to the additional suggestions that no names be included in the minutes and that the minutes capture only the general themes of the discussion. These suggestions were added to the amended motion and a vote was taken.

Result: The amended motion was passed unanimously.

**\*\*At this point, the voice recorder was turned off, and what follows is an overview of the general themes that emerged from the discussion. All participants in the discussion are referred to simply as faculty members.\*\***

A faculty member provided an overview of the events leading up to the drafting of the resolution (15.20). The idea for the resolution developed out of recent concerns expressed by faculty members both within the School of Education and from other Schools on campus about the university's Bicentennial Strategic Plan, particularly Priority Three: Re-Imagining Education.

The general concerns revolve around 1) the lack of faculty input into the articulation and announcement of the plan itself; 2) the composition of and charge to the Blue Ribbon Review Committee (BRRC) proposed in priority three of the plan; and 3) what involvement School of Education faculty would have in implementing any suggestions that emerge from the results of the BRRC's review.

Discussion ensued and further questions and concerns were raised, including:

- *The degree of involvement that School of Education faculty would have throughout the review process and, related, the kind and degree of interaction faculty would have with the BRRC during the review.*

Some faculty members expressed concern about the lack of clarity regarding how faculty feedback would be included—or not—at the various stages of the review process. One faculty member expressed particular concern for the role of faculty feedback in the action stage of the process. This led to an expression of support for the last paragraph of the resolution, which calls for, among other things, faculty input into any decisions made as a result of the BRRC’s review. Other faculty members expressed related concerns about whether or not the action taken as a result of the review will happen in concert with faculty governance. One faculty member expressed concern that the construction of the BRRC is just a way for the university to justify the eventual implementation of a preconceived plan for restructuring and reorganizing the School of Education.

- *The composition of the BRRC.*

Faculty members expressed a desire to be part of the process through which the committee is formed. Discussion ensued about whether the resolution should include a requirement to have School of Education faculty serve on the BRRC. The advantages and disadvantages of doing so were weighed. Among the former was the idea that having School of Education faculty on the committee would ensure a high level of involvement at all stages of the review process; it would also ensure that the diverse expertise of School of Education faculty members was utilized in the process. Among the disadvantages was the problem of achieving a sufficient degree of School of Education representation (from the core and regional campuses) on a small committee; and the fact that School of Education faculty representation could limit or negate the value of an “external” review.

- *The implications of the review for both the core and regional campuses.*

- *The appropriate tone and the strength of the position communicated in the resolution.*

There was discussion about how—if at all—the resolution should be revised in light of two recent gestures by the university: 1) the request for School of Education faculty members to help in the process of developing the Draft Charge to the BRRC; and 2) the suggestion that the School of Education develop a “core school committee” to offer feedback on the questions included in the Draft Charge to the BRRC. One faculty member expressed cynicism about these offers, noting, for instance, that the timeline for providing feedback was short (requested for February 1) and that there were attempts recently to block a Bloomington Faculty Council resolution from being brought to a vote. This faculty member recommended that the faculty take a strong stance in the resolution.

- *The lack of publicity of information and communication.*

Some faculty members expressed a desire for recent communication and documents (e.g., the Draft Charge to the BRRC, a recent BFC resolution) to be made available to all faculty members.

- *What to do with the final resolution.*

There was some discussion about what should be done with the final resolution—for instance, should it be shared with the media; is it simply for the faculty council and the Provost; should it be added to the site provided for comments on the strategic plan?

Discussion about the wording and substance of the resolution ensued. It was suggested that specificity be added regarding the Provost's recent efforts to elicit input and involvement from School of Education faculty. It was also suggested that the resolution make clear the faculty's desire to have input on the selection of an interim dean for the School of Education. Some of these changes were made to the document during the meeting and others were to be made to the document after the meeting.

A motion was made to pass the resolution with the understanding that the final document would reflect all of the changes discussed and that it would be subject to a vote by members of the Policy Council.

Result: The resolution was passed—15 in favor; none opposed; no abstentions.

**\*\*P. Carspecken adjourned the meeting at 3:12pm\*\***