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


B. Dennis asked for everyone’s permission to record the meeting. All gave their permission. She welcomed Executive Vice President John Applegate to the meeting, thanked him for coming, and invited him to speak, first, about the process for naming an interim Dean for the School of Education.

J. Applegate indicated that he is appearing before the Policy Council, in part, as acting Provost in light of Lauren Robel’s recent family emergency. He expects L. Robel to be away from work for the next month, but the exact time is uncertain. J. Applegate considers the interim Dean search to be a top priority, but given his status as the “acting” Provost, he is eager to avoid making the decision to name an interim Dean. The interim Dean will have to work closely with the Provost on a number of issues—including the Blue Ribbon Review Committee (BRRC)—and so L. Robel should make that decision if at all possible. In his communication with L. Robel, they both decided that if she is unable to return to her duties as Provost by the end of May, they will make a decision about how to proceed with the appointment. J. Applegate indicated that the six names put forth as candidates for the interim Dean positions are all excellent, experienced people who are internal to the School, meaning the transition should be much easier, even under a shortened timeline.

B. Dennis asked if there was discussion about the process of selecting an interim Dean—for instance, would the Provost want to interview the candidates?

J. Applegate said that L. Robel might want to talk with the candidates, but he did not anticipate a formal interview process.

B. Levinson asked for clarification about the process through which the list of six candidates was generated.
Outgoing Policy Council members indicated that names were solicited from the faculty and a list was compiled and sent to the Policy Council. The Policy Council discussed the list, shortened it to six names and forwarded those six names to the President’s office. The names were not rank-ordered.

V. Borden asked how the delay in the interim Dean search would affect the search for the Executive Associate Dean.

G. Gonzalez said he is hesitant to appoint an Executive Associate Dean to replace J. Alexander without consulting the interim Dean. J. Alexander is concluding her term on May 31, and G. Gonzalez indicated that he anticipates assuming some of the duties of the Executive Associate Dean as necessary until the position is filled. He reminded everyone that P. Rogan is also concluding her term as Executive Associate Dean at IUPUI on June 30. That selection process will also be delayed until an interim Dean is in place.

G. Gonzalez indicated that he has been reassured in his conversations with J. Applegate and L. Robel that the welfare of the School of Education is one of the university’s top priorities. But he also noted that in these uncertain times, rumors inevitably get started. One rumor he has heard is that there was never any intent to name an interim Dean or a Dean because the goal is to reorganize the School or in some way phase it out. He suggested to J. Applegate that it would be helpful for him—or even the President—to make clear that they are fully supportive of the School of Education.

J. Applegate thanked G. Gonzalez for the opportunity to refute that rumor. He said that any delay in the interim Dean search process is solely the result of the tragic situation in L. Robel’s life. There is absolutely every intention on his part, on the part of the Provost, and on the part of the President to appoint an interim Dean. There is no intention to close the School or to dispense with education as a subject at IU. Quite the contrary, the idea is to make the IU School of Education as strong as it can possibly be for the long term. It has been a hard period for schools of education across the country, and in order to ensure that IU has the strongest possible school of education, the university needs to take a close look at it and figure out how it can thrive in a new era. The university is aiming to strengthen, not weaken or eliminate the School.

S. Paredes Scribner asked if the circumstances around the naming of an interim Dean will impact the timeline for naming an Executive Associate Dean at IUPUI.

G. Gonzalez said he hopes not. He has received some names from the search committee at IUPUI, and the only delay is the knowledge of who the interim Dean will be. After that, we should be in position to make an Executive Associate Dean appointment in time for the July 1 target date. He indicated that he might start some conversations with the candidates to make sure that they understand the role and to address some of their questions. But he will not make an appointment before the interim Dean is in place.

V. Borden asked if the university’s commitment to strengthening the School of Education also signals the possibility of an investment in the School.
J. Applegate answered that this would not necessarily be the case.

B. Levinson asked how committed the President’s office is to pursuing the six recommended candidates. If none are willing to serve, would the Provost consider going beyond those six? Would she, in that case, consult again with the Policy Council or act on her own? Should the six candidates be contacted in order to determine their interest in the position?

J. Applegate indicated that he was under the impression that the Policy Council already determined the availability and willingness of the six candidates to serve.

P. Carspecken said that the willingness factor is unclear. The Policy Council had hoped that the President’s office would reach out to the candidates to gauge their interest and, if necessary, persuade them to serve.

J. Applegate said he would do so. He reiterated that six names should be enough and that they are all, from his point of view, strong candidates. He does not anticipate needing more names, but if that does become a need, there would be communication with B. Dennis as the new Policy Council chair.

B. Dennis asked J. Applegate also to address the BRRC process.

J. Applegate noted the difficulty in getting the committee members together for a first meeting. He rejected the possibility of the committee making a campus visit in the summer, noting that such a visit would not make sense for the committee, the university, or the School. He also took the opportunity to re-emphasize that this is not anything like an accreditation group. Their work is not evaluative in nature. The university knows the School is excellent. The committee is trying to help us navigate the challenges facing schools of education right now so that the School can continue to thrive going forward. The hope is to set up a campus visit for the BRRC in the early part of the fall 2015 semester.

J. Applegate also addressed the request to increase the size of the committee by adding two scholars of color. Initially, that request was rejected for two reasons. First, the committee was intended to be small. He stressed again that this is not an evaluative or decision-making group; it is an “ideas group.” Second, there was a need to get things moving. Because of the unavoidable delay in the process and because of the strength of the view that adding a faculty member of color would be valuable, he indicated that one person would now be added. Names have already been submitted by the Policy Council, and he invited additional names. He acknowledged that the initial request was for two additional members, but that only one would be added.

B. Maxcy asked what names had already been submitted and how additional names of scholars of color should be submitted.

J. Applegate said that he prefers additional names be submitted through B. Dennis in her capacity as the Policy Council chair.
B. Dennis read the four names that have been submitted: Diana Daniels, Linda Tillman, Hardin Coleman, and Angela Valenzuela.

B. Maxcy clarified that those names are rank-ordered.

P. Carspecken confirmed and added that the first two names have informally agreed to serve if asked.

B. Dennis thanked J. Applegate for agreeing to add an additional member.

J. Damico asked about the timeline for the BRRC. Since the work will happen in the fall, will the interim Dean be in place for two years?

J. Applegate said that initially the idea was for the BRRC’s work to inform the search. So he saw no problem with the BRRC completing their work in the fall and still being able to inform the search. He noted that it would be unusual for a Dean’s search to be finished in the fall semester. So he does not anticipate requiring a two-year interim Dean. He added that he also does not anticipate any delay in naming a committee to conduct the Dean’s search or in posting the position. The BRRC is intended to inform the search, not make decisions.

B. Dennis asked for clarification. Her understanding was that the BRRC would complete its work prior to the Dean’s search, but she interpreted J. Applegate as saying that the Dean’s search process will go ahead while the BRRC is doing its work.

J. Applegate said that was correct—the Dean’s search would proceed while the BRRC was doing its work.

J. Scheurich indicated that the faculty at IUPUI want to have “major” presence—not a “minor” presence—on the Dean’s selection committee. He noted that the decision has significant implications for IUPUI.

G. Gonzalez suggested that the Policy Council discuss at some point the difference between a “major” and a “minor” presence. And he indicated that he has always felt that the interests of both campuses were taken into account in previous searches, including the process that resulted in his own appointment as Dean.

V. Borden asked if the BRRC would be offering advice or suggestions on the organizational structure of the School across all of the campuses.

J. Applegate responded that the questions presented to the BRRC were intentionally general and he did not think the BRRC would be able, in a short time period, to make suggestions specific to things like organizational structure.

In closing, B. Dennis noted that the new dates for the Policy Council and some committee adjustments would be sent around to the 2015-2016 Policy Council members.
**The meeting was adjourned at 12:35pm.**