

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

January 27, 2016

1:00-3:00pm

IUB—Room 2140

IUPUI—Room 3138B

IUPUC—Room 155E

****What follows is a summary of speaker contributions****

Members Present: Barbara Dennis, Phil Carspecken, Vic Borden, Joshua Danish, Danielle DeSawal, Rebecca Martinez, Farida Pawan, Lori Patton-Davis, Samantha Scribner

Alternate Members Present: Cathy Brown, Jim Scheurich

Student Members Present: Jane Bomkamp, Michael Kersulov, Leah Peck

Staff Member Present: Mary Hardesty

Dean's Staff Present: Terry Mason, Gary Crow, Keith Barton

Guests: Ghangis Carter

Approval of the Minutes from December 9, 2015 Meeting (**16.22M**)

Result: *approved unanimously*

I. Announcements and Discussions

Dean's Report, Discussion and Questions regarding Structure of School of Education

T. Mason shared information about the current status of the Dean search. Provost has decided to suspend the search for a new Dean. Concerns were that preliminary information from the Blue Ribbon Review Committee (BRRC) identified the need to resolve structural issues between the IUB and IUPUI core campus structure that need to be addressed. She recommended that the search committee be given a new charge to look into the core campus structure and by the end of the semester give a recommendation for how to move forward with the two campuses. There are many implications for the core campus structure that impact the school in many areas (governance, program design, etc.). We've been asked to make a decision about how we, as a school, want to deal with these. Once this is completed, the Dean search will be renewed. T. Mason has agreed to stay on as Interim Dean and many others in current leadership positions have agreed to stay on in their current interim positions, which is very positive for the school. The re-assigned committee met with the provost and the president's office and also with John Applegate, Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs, as well as the chancellor of IUPUI, Nassar Paydar. First step is gathering information (how changes would affect programs, how current collaborations are occurring and could be sustained, etc.) then make a decision about the structure of the school. The Provost has also added the charge to examine each of the regional campuses, and so a committee will be set up for that purpose. This committee will look at enrollment issues at the graduate and undergraduate levels, conduct a holistic evaluation of the regional campus structure and make

recommendations about that. The committee is working on a survey for all academic coordinators on both campuses (IUB and IUPUI) to gauge their perceptions regarding collaboration, joint programs, and to get a sense if there is a sentiment among faculty whether we should remain together or separate. We will compile the information and share it with the committee and also decide what other information needs to be gathered to make an informed decision. The committee will meet next week to begin the process of examining the data. Columbus campus was not a part of the survey originally, but will be included.

Discussion ensued about when/if we will get feedback from the BRRC. T. Mason communicated to the Provost the frustration the faculty was feeling with not getting information from the BRRC report, but the Provost was clear that she does not feel now is the right time to share that information. T. Mason continues to pursue different avenues to gain access to BRRC feedback. It appears that part of the concern is that there was a lack of consensus on the BRRC panel regarding different issues, which made them unable to create a report as a committee. It might be helpful if policy council makes a statement as to their feelings about the withholding of the BRRC report.

Further discussion ensued about why the BRRC report is not being shared. T. Mason shared that the BRRC panel may have had difficulty in coming to consensus on what to include in the report, and that limited their ability to produce a report from the committee as a whole and this concerned the Provost.

T. Mason added that the search committee for a new Dean hired a consulting firm who scouted out potential candidates and feedback from the consulting firm is that the current status of the core campus is a disincentive for potential candidates to look seriously at this position. This also informed the decision to suspend the Dean search. Further questions ensued about the potential for a restructuring of the BRRC. Did the dissenting member leave the committee and could he be replaced? T. Mason replied that the committee was commissioned by the Provost and President's office, and he has little information as to how it might move forward. G. Carter asked that we reflect on the make-up of the hiring committee and how the hiring process can support diversity goals that are an issue here and nationally. T. Mason recommended that if the Policy Council decides to draft a statement for the Provost, this could be included.

F. Pawan stated that some background information about the purpose and goal of core campus would be helpful for filling out the survey. T. Mason replied that it was initially created in the 1970s when there was a desire to have a school of education on the Indianapolis campus, but not enough resources to support an independent school. Bloomington faculty would teach on the Indianapolis campus. Since then, the IUPUI School of Education has matured with its own resources, faculty and staff, programs and student enrollment. There are some programs which continue to operate in a merged fashion. Faculty have done research together, served on dissertation committees together and applied for grants together. The question is, can the meaningful instances of collaboration continue as two separate campuses? J. Scheurich noted that there seems to be a sense that IUPUI wants to separate, but that is not true, the staff has not come to that consensus. T. Mason acknowledged this and is hopeful that the survey will help clarify the perspectives of faculty at both campuses. V. Borden added that the School of Education was once a University school, and these roots continue in the structure of some of our organization. B. Dennis added that when it comes to the survey, though it is sent to an individual, the information desired is at the program level, and so it is helpful to discuss the survey at the program level. T. Mason agreed that the expectation is that program coordinators will consult with their program faculty and staff to inform the survey. J. Danish asked how the Dean situation will impact the process for approving faculty searches for next year. T. Mason said that there will be no change in the current process. The budget will determine how many faculty searches we can run.

B. Dennis proposed that we clarify the process for creating a statement from the Policy Council to share with the provost regarding sharing of the BRC feedback. P. Carspecken suggested that someone draft a statement and then email it to PC members.

Motion: To create a statement from the Policy Council to the Provost regarding the non-delivery of the BRRC report to the School of Education faculty.

Moved by L. Patton Davis, J. Danish seconded.

Discussion: V. Borden stated that it is important that we took the Provost's charge for the BRRC review very seriously. It was a call to arms from the highest levels and the School of Education faculty took that seriously and supported it. We understand that there may have been issues within the committee, but we deserve a report on the report, if not the report itself. Given our efforts and many people having put in many hours, a non-response is disrespectful of the commitment of our time. The lack of transparency is not consistent with goals of the collaborative process. R. Martinez cautioned that we not load the statement with emotionally-charged wording. Discussion continued regarding the sentiment that the Provost office understand that the lack of information regarding the release of the report solicits anger among colleagues. D. Sawal stated it is important to articulate why we want it. What are the critical pieces that we need to know to do the job that she wants us to do as we try to address the core campus issue? This report may have information that we need to move forward with our school's goals. T. Mason added that the purpose of the committee was to help us chart our path to the future and so our desire for the report should not be limited to the core campus issue. B. Dennis asked if anyone will volunteer to write the first draft. Consensus to start the draft in the Agenda Committee.

Result: *approved unanimously*

II Old Business

Diversity Topic – Ghangis Carter

Update on last month's diversity topic:

B. Dennis is writing up the recommendations for increasing faculty of color that were discussed at the last meeting to give to search committees. She will bring this document to the next Agenda Committee meeting and then the Agenda Committee will send that out to the different departments.

Best practices for increasing the diversity of our student population

G. Carter began by highlighting that the best place to start when it comes to the recruitment of minority students is starting with the end in mind. It is important to bring intentionality into the process. Departments/programs need to state up front that this is what we want to see in a cohort and then make a plan of action that supports that goal. It needs to be a collective effort. When faculty are at professional conferences and connecting with prospective students, take a moment to identify those that reflect the stated goals of the future make-up of the student body. Action is needed for change. Once applications are in, we need to establish a rubric that defines what we are looking for. If the focus criteria is strictly on standardized exams, then it is unlikely that we will get the diversity we are looking for. Think about other factors that are indicators of success in graduate school and are more inclusive. Many programs do individual interviews or provide other mechanisms for uncovering good potential candidates.

Funding is an issue for all students, but can be critical for the students that we want to grow a diverse student body. Early notification of funding is critical to avoid losing talented individuals to peer institutions. Funding packages should be put together and offered as early as possible.

The recruitment initiative, Getting You Into IU, is an event designed to recruit underrepresented students seeking a PhD or MFA. All academic units and departments should have a presence at this University-sponsored event. It brings a large number of minority students to campus for 2.5 days where they can learn about us and then apply the following fall semester. If the faculty doesn't take the time to clear their schedules and reach out to these potential students they will miss an opportunity. Talking with faculty and current graduate students is an important element of this

event that helps prospective students to make the decision to come to IU.

Mentorship and support of faculty from the initial inquiry phase on through is very important. Make sure your bio and web site pictures are up to date. Students use this as a resource when making their decisions. There needs to be a different mindset to successfully go about recruiting students of color. The effort needs to come from the collective and not just G. Carter's office. A recent article in the IDS highlights research being done on the biases in standardized testing, such as the GRE. Students of color are often not successful on the GRE. What implications could this have on how we screen students? What alternatives are there? The scores are also often related to funding opportunities which also impact the ability of students of color to attend IU. Also, the physical make-up of the faculty is important. Students of color want to see faculty of color. Having people of color in positions of power is important for change. If we truly want change, intentionality has to be there in a lot of different areas.

Discussion: G. Crow asked for more information about starting with the end in mind, practical ways this could work. G. Carter replied that if we see that the cohorts have been largely majority students, but we know that there are perspective students of color that have the ability to be successful, we proactively go after those students; recruiting at historically black colleges, add the bells and whistles as we do with athletes. Often bright students are looking at several institutions and what we do for these students when they are here visiting IU matters. Students need to have experiences that foster the idea that they will be supported once they get here, if they chose to come. P. Fawan reiterated that the personal touch does matter and reaching out to individuals at SIGs and other arenas can make a difference. In these venues you can see who is available and make connections. G. Carter added that the faculty role can't be underestimated or underscored.

L. Patton Davis asked if Carter has gotten specific feedback from students regarding interactions with faculty. G. Carter replied that he has gotten great feedback as to the overall experience, but it doesn't sit well when students are coming in hopes of meeting a particular faculty member and that faculty member doesn't make time to meet with the student. IU has a wonderful brand, but that doesn't mean that IU doesn't have to sell itself. Faculty have the ability to create a sustained environment of being supportive of students.

B. Dennis asked about network strategizing. How can we maximize our connections to find potential students? G. Carter replied that those who have come here and had a successful experience are our best advocates in referring prospective students. HESSA has some rock star alumni who have sent some of their undergrad students to IU for their graduate studies. It is always helpful to engage those alumni. B. Dennis asked if we have a system for staying connected with former students in order to reach out to them later in their careers when they may be interested in returning to graduate school. G. Carter stated that we do have access to the University Alumni Association information, but not sure if the School of Ed has a system. V. Borden provided some statistics about the racial make-up of HESSA graduate program, which is currently about 50% white 50% non-white. G. Carter cited this as an example of how the HESSA alumni network is supporting the development of diversity of that program.

T. Mason asked if we have any direct connections with HBCUs where we could use that as a recruitment base. G. Carter replied that many of the HBCUs within a drivable distance will have graduate recruitment fairs, typically in the fall of each year, and my office often participates. Many HBCU students are also McNair scholars and there are regional and national events for them as well, with Wisconsin being the national center. B. Dennis added that through the McNair program there are some funds available to students to visit potential schools. T. Mason added that the idea of being proactive could be setting up partnerships with some HBCUs, bringing student to campus for summer programs where they interact with faculty and get a feel for what their academic life might be like as a student. We could invest some resources into something like that to do something unique and targeted. G. Carter mentioned Tennessee State, Kentucky State, Central State and Wilber Force are 4 HBCUs which are close enough geographically that they could be potential partners for that sort of project. There is a model that exists called SROP (Summer Research Opportunity Program) where HBCU students are coming to campus. Perhaps it could be done during the academic year. A

hybrid online/on campus experience could be developed.

G. Crow added that most of the ideas discussed have focused on graduate students, but what about undergrads? Balfour, or something like that, could be a powerful tool. G. Carter responded that the data coming out of the Balfour Scholars Program can inform us. To the extent that monies can sustain that, they can be valuable. Right now the Balfour program is not explicitly encouraging students to apply to IU, it is more experientially focused.

R. Martinez suggested we talk with students who are graduates of HBCUs to get feedback and ideas from those closer to the student experience. She has a group called Students of Color and Allies that she meets with regularly and who are interested and willing to come and talk to the Policy Council. P. Carspecken asked if the group could be expanded to include students beyond the School Psych Program. L. Patton Davis asked if we could reposition how we think about recruitment of students of color, looking at what enables us to recruit or retain white students and then think about how we can ensure that students of color are equally supported in those critical recruitment/retainment areas. What attracts white students or faculty to IU? Are black students having the same experience? If not, why not and can we do anything about that? The environment and level of comfort in the environment is different for a white student and a black student. Everything from the curriculum that reflects a white experience to the demographics of the faculty, we are not grappling with the overall whiteness of IU. V. Borden spoke of the disconnect between our espoused values, and the endemic incentive structures in place for learning and success which reflects the dominant culture. We need to look at this systematically and intentionally. L. Patton Davis provided suggestions for action which included addressing the biases and issues with standardized tests, which are a barrier for students of color. Larger issues around the curriculum regarding requirements, how can diverse perspectives be infused into classes so that all students get diverse and critical experiences in all courses whether required or elective. We should tap into our history of educating current HBCU leadership, and also develop programs that will allow students to get a doctorate from IU but not be required to live in the area full time.

B. Dennis asked how the council would like to move forward. P. Carspecken would like to hear from the students in R. Martinez's minority student group. G. Carter emphasized that this is a topic of conversation that needs to be ongoing and there are structural issues that need to be addressed. We need to champion our faculty of color, have events in conspicuous places and visually support faculty of color so that students see them and know they are here.

III. New Business

IV. New Course/Course Changes

The following course changes have been reviewed and approved by the Graduate Studies Committee or the Committee on Teacher Education. These course proposals will be forwarded to the next level of approval unless a remonstrance is received within 30 days.

New Course Proposal

J645: Dialogue and Difference: Ethics, Religion, and Democracy in Education *3 hrs* BL
Educational implications of pervasive moral and ethical disagreements in democratic societies. This course will be an option within the major field of studies for doctoral students in Curriculum Studies, and will also be available as a minor course or elective for other students in the School of Education. The course has been offered as a special topics course on 5 occasions and has typically had full enrollment. It addresses an important area with Curriculum Studies and education generally, and the content is not systematically covered in any other seminars.

Course Change Proposal

Q610: Developing As Teacher Educators for Science or Mathematics

3 hrs BL

Seminar on concepts, issues, and research-based practices associated with learning to teach elementary preservice teachers how to teach science and/or mathematics to children. This new course was developed to meet the needs of doctoral students in the science and mathematics education programs. The previous number course listed as Q610 was not longer being used, so this new title and course structure will simply replace the previous course content.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM