

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
November 11, 2015
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, Joshua Danish, Phil Carspecken, Danielle DeSawal, Rebecca Martinez, Lori Patton-Davis, Samantha Scribner, Dionne Danns, Bradley Levinson

Alternate Members Present: Cary Buzzelli

Student Members Present: Michael Kesalov, Courtney Wesson

Staff Member Present: Mary Hardesty

Dean's Staff Present: Gary Crow

Guests: T. Nguyen

Approval of Minutes from October 21, 2015 (16.12M)

R. Martinez made the motion, J. Danish second

Result: *Approved, 1 abstention*

I. Announcements and Discussions

B. Dennis reminded members that the motion regarding adding a new committee to the constitution was tabled at the last meeting. It is staying on the table because of the strict rules governing the number of days that can pass between when a constitutional change is passed at a Policy Council meeting before being presented at a full faculty meeting and then the number of days between a full faculty meeting and a vote. We won't be able to meet these time frame requirements with the upcoming holiday breaks. This also gives us a chance to fix some typos and other errors in the constitution that need to be corrected. The Long Range Planning Committee also has some feedback to add as does IUPUI, who have encountered some complications in establishing their position regarding the proposed committee. We will bring the proposal back up for discussion in January, after the holiday breaks.

Diversity Moment:

B. Dennis stated that in December we will be focusing the diversity topic on what we can do during the current faculty recruitment interview process, specifically in how we can be more inclusive and mindful of diversity issues in the interview process. Tom Nelson Laird will come to talk to members about strategies and approaches. There will be a two page document uploaded for Policy Council members to review in advance. He will talk for about 10 minutes and we can discuss what actions or recommendations, if anything, we may want to put forward for the process. We will begin the practice of naming topics for the Diversity moment well in advance. To ensure the diversity committee is appropriately involved, they will be informed of the topic-theme in advance of each month and will bring

their thoughts on the topic to the agenda committee. December's topic will focus on faculty of color recruitment related to the interview process. In January we will look at diverse ways to consider student applications to our program to make sure that we are not defaulting to an approach that is more successful for white, middle class students, for example. February's theme has not been decided yet.

BFC document regarding Faculty Governance (16.16):

B. Dennis stated that there has been interest in forging a stronger connection between school policy bodies and the campus policy body. These are recommendations for enhancing shared governance through making stronger connections between these bodies. One meeting was held that included policy council chairs. The next stage is that they would like us to weigh in on these suggestions and then feed them back to the BFC regarding what we think might help to strengthen that relationship. B. Levinson added that this is an excerpt from a really long set of recommended actions. It came out of a Faculty Affairs Committee subcommittee on shared governance. This is the part of the list of recommended actions related to strengthening ties between unit level policy bodies, such as the Policy Council, and the BFC. We should be thinking about ways to turn these recommendations into potentially enforceable policy where we think it would be appropriate. D. Danna asked about section D, when they talk about school administration, are they specifically talking about just the Dean? Faculty and Budgetary Affairs (FABA) works closely with the Executive Associate Dean, and they are the one informed about the information the committee is making decisions about. This recommendation seems counterproductive. B. Dennis stated she also wondered about this. Should the emphasis be on the word "insistence"? For example our Executive Associate Dean is an ex-officio member who doesn't vote, but he can bring agenda items to the meeting. B. Levinson agreed that "insistence" and also "autonomous" are terms that are important. The wording may require clarification. He thinks the idea is an attempt to not put too much pressure on a representative of the administration to ensure certain outcomes of the deliberations. He also noted that recommendations are simply advisory anyway. We are in a position where the Dean and Executive Associate Dean take very seriously Faculty Affairs Committee recommendations, but that is not always the case. B. Dennis wonders if, in a situation where faculty members begin to feel like their input doesn't matter, words like "autonomous" and "insistence" might get more scrutiny. B. Levinson stated that he appreciates feedback on wording because, as this moves to becoming a binding document, the wording is more important than when it is simply a recommendation. F. Pawan asked, regarding part A, being responsible for the school to be following campus policy, will there be provisions for a unit who has certain needs? B. Dennis clarified that the question is regarding if there are moments stipulated when we can deviate from campus policy? C. Buzzelli pointed out that departments aren't always aware when there are breaches. B. Levinson explained that all of the policies were put in one searchable web spot, if you know the right place to look on the Vice President for Academic Affairs website, there is a link to policies. He also stated he didn't know if units are free to go against campus policy when campus policy is intended to cover everyone and noted that enforcement is another issue. B. Levinson also noted that the spirit of point A is meant to embolden faculty in certain units where faculty governance is relatively weak. Wielding the authority of faculty governance is a responsibility that units should not be avoiding or relinquishing. C. Buzzelli stated that school policy committees do have the responsibility, but in this wording it seems that they carry sole responsibility to act if there is a breach. Shouldn't the provost or some other authority be involved to adjudicate positions? B. Dennis pointed out that another issue is that our Policy Council is a core council, and so we have two different campus level situations to consider. Are we both accountable to both campuses' sets of policies? G. Crow said, yes. B. Dennis thanked members for their input and encouraged anyone to contact B. Levinson or B. Dennis if other thoughts come up.

Dean's Report

G. Crow provided the report on behalf of T. Mason. The Blue Ribbon Panel report is due this month. We have no other information on it. The search for a new Dean is underway. Stakeholder meetings have happened and he believes they were well attended. L. Patton-Davis, search committee member, added that if you have recommendations for a candidate, please send them in. You can send recommendation to Austin Parrish and he will send them to the search committee. D. DeSawal added that they could also be sent to Laurie or herself and they could forward names to Austin Parrish.

II. Old Business

No old business

III New Business

Selection of Associate Dean- IUPUI (16.14)- Comes as a motion from the FAB committee at IUPUI: T. Nguyen

T. Nguyen presented that this proposal was taken up last spring and that is when we had anticipated getting it onto the policy council agenda. The SOE IUPUI faculty have seen it and desired that this move forward to policy council because we wanted to ensure a more clear and transparent appointment and reappointment process for the EAD here that comports with university policies. We wanted to strengthen shared administrative and faculty governance and thirdly it attends to particular institutional values of IUPUI related to diversity, so it lays out language around search and screen, review and appointment/reappointment.

B. Dennis noted that this comes to us as a motion. B. Levinson asked, how has the EAD been chosen to this point? Has the position been appointed by the Dean? T. Nguyen answered, yes, with the exception of R. Hughes' appointment. G. Galindo saw this proposal last spring and agreed to use this process. B. Levinson noted that here in Bloomington it has been the prerogative of the Dean to choose his own Executive Associate Dean. If a new Dean doesn't have the discretion to make their own appointment, would it discourage perspective candidates? T. Nguyen stated she felt clarity of the process would be appreciated by a new Dean. She also noted that this is also in response to a directive from the President's office in regards to having a written appointment process for the non-resident Executive Associate Dean for IUPUI. B. Levinson asked about the wording "non-resident". T. Nguyen clarified it is language that is used in the 2008 directive from President McRobbie's office, an EAD that is on a campus that is different from the campus from where the Dean resides. B. Levinson asked if the intent of this resolution would be binding upon any Dean or is it a recommendation? Would the process be similar to any faculty search process where the faculty provides input and recommendations but the Dean has the ultimate decision making power? T. Nguyen, answered that it would follow the regular search and screen process of any faculty. G. Crow stated this doesn't change the process of who gets the ultimate choice, it just adds another layer of faculty governance to inform the process. T. Nguyen agreed, it clarifies the process and adds a shared governance emphasis.

Result: *Passed unanimously*

Adjunct Teaching of Graduate Courses (16.15): T. Nguyen

B. Dennis asked if T. Nguyen had any feedback on Adjunct teaching of grad courses policy? T. Nguyen stated that what has occurred is that we found that the policy is highly restrictive and it has become problematic to staff our graduate program and so we are looking for more flexibility and it would look more like what is on the books at IUB. B Dennis thanked T. Nguyen for this information and noted that this was opposite the information that the Policy Council Agenda Committee had received.

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 Proposals

L621: The Teaching of College Composition to Nonnative Speakers of English 3 hours BL

A seminar and practicum dedicated to theory and practice underlying the teaching of collegiate writing to first year nonnative speakers of English. **Justification:** No such course is offered on the IUB campus; it prepares instructors to teach elementary composition to nonnative speakers, which are attending US universities in increasing numbers.

B Dennis stated that a faculty member emailed a grammar correction, “composition to non-native speakers which (should be who)”. P. Fawan suggested that “of English” should be added after non-native speakers.

J645: Dialogue and Difference: Ethics, Religion, and Democracy 3 hours BL

Educational implications of pervasive moral and ethical disagreements in democratic societies.

Justification: 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 Proposals

M130: Child Art: Understanding Children's Artistic Worlds 3 hours BL

Introduction to the nature, meanings and development of children’s visual/artistic expressions and aesthetic responses, from childhood through adolescence, across culture and time. Students will analyze children’s artworks and reactions to images through readings, case studies, and field experiences, and consider implications for promoting artistic and aesthetic growth. Open to all. **Justification:** Previously this course was intended for those considering an Art Education major and a career as an art specialist teacher in schools. It will continue to serve that purpose. The scope of the course is now being broadened to make it more interesting and relevant for a wider audience, including art specialists or non-specialists interested in teaching in formal or non-formal settings, or anyone interested in children's artistic development. It is our hope that this might ultimately be approved as fulfilling a General Education requirement in Arts and Humanities. If so, this will allow Elementary Majors might use this course to

fulfill both an Arts and Humanities course and the requirement for a Visual Art Education Methods Course.

Adjourned 1:58 PM