

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
March 22, 2017

1:00-3:00pm
IUB—Room 2140
IUPUI—Room 3138B
IUPUC—Room 155E

Members Present: J. Anderson; C. Medina; A. Maltese; J. Danish; B. Edmonds; T. Jackson; V. Borden; B. Dennis

Alternate Members Present: C. Wiley; A. Hackenberg;

Student Members Present: A. Hollet

Staff Member Present: M. Boots

Dean's Staff Present: K. Barton, T. Mason; G. Crow

Guests: S. Daley; B. Chung

Approval of the Minutes from February 22, 2017 Meeting (**17.32M**)

K. Barton provided a correction to information that was given at the February 22, 2017 meeting regarding the literature requirement for the proposed Language Arts Concentration Revision. The revised program would reduce the number of literature courses required of students pursuing this concentration from two courses to one.

Motion made by: J. Danish

Second: B. Edmonds

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

I. Announcements and Discussions

Agenda Committee

Policy Council Chair, C. Medina, noted a change in the Agenda Items, the Research Scientist Promotion Criteria is removed. G. Crow informed Council members that the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs noted concerns regarding the composition of the center promotion advisory committee and also with service being taken out as a category. Because of the potential for significant changes, we will bring the revised criteria to the next Policy Council meeting.

- SOE Core Campus Faculty Meeting April 21, 2017 at 10:00 AM
- IUB Faculty Retreat March 24, 2017
- Celebration of Teaching April 21, 2017 at 1:30 PM
- Policy Council April 26 meeting rescheduled to May 3, 2017

G. Crow informed Council members about an initiative to update the transcript to be a more useful document. This is a growing trend among universities. The new initiative will enhance the content of the transcript and may include items such as dissertation topics, license additions and certifications. We will be presenting a proposal to the Campus Curriculum Committee to move forward with an enriched transcript that will include the addition of licenses. M. Boots noted that there is also discussion to include the dissertation title on the transcript, with the option of opting out of having this information included.

Graduate Teacher Education Program Procedures (17.36) (Information Only from IUB CoTE) Keith Barton

This comes from the Office of Graduate Studies, Office of Teacher Education and the 4th floor. The goal is to clarify the procedures related to graduate student licensure, including license additions. We propose that applications will come through Graduate Studies, but the management of the process will be through the Office of Teacher Education. B. Edmonds asked about the practical application. K. Barton explained that for most faculty, there will not be an impact, it simply clarifies administrative processes for all of those involved. B. Dennis asked if this applies to music education. K. Barton clarified that this is for graduate students only and would apply to any present or future graduate program regarding licensure.

Dean's Report

Dean Mason informed members that we have undertaken an assessment of the space in the School of Education building as well as the education space in Eigenmann Hall. We engaged the Space Planning Office at the University to conduct a space efficiency assessment and we have a Space Utilization Committee which has reviewed the results. We will be meeting again to make some recommendations about next steps. There does appear to be underutilized space which we will be looking at carefully. There are opportunities to use our space in more productive ways that are more in line with how universities are organizing themselves today. At the faculty meeting on April 21st we will get some discussions going with faculty about this. Also the 10th and 11th floors of Eigenmann Hall need to be vacated as these floors will be reconfigured back into dormitory space to accommodate a very large incoming freshman class.

Dean Mason met with the new State Superintendent, Jennifer McCormick, at a meeting with the education Deans of Indiana State, Purdue and Ball State. Ms. McCormick is very interested in working with the universities and stated that she will be seeking input from us on policy issues regarding teacher education, higher education, etc. She appears to be very in tune with what is going on in schools. It was a very good meeting. She will be here on April 7 to participate in a panel discussion. I encourage you all to attend. A good showing on the part of the school would demonstrate our commitment to what we do. I am optimistic that we will have a good working relationship.

CAEP review site visit will be April 8-10. The Core Campus Committee has been working diligently. The ad hoc committee is preparing a report that will go to the President, the Provost, the Chairs of the BFC, IFC, and UFC and the Chancellor. B. Dennis provided the following update: The structure of the report includes a brief preamble where we explain why we are doing what we are doing, and sections where each school has identified how it plans to move forward and what it thinks it needs. Then there will be a closing statement. We are working on finalizing the details and anticipate sending this to the Dean's offices for feedback by Friday. One challenge facing the committee is that most committee members do not feel that we need to take a faculty vote, because the faculty have been involved in this process from the beginning and we have discussed this thoroughly at the faculty level. Those outside of the schools feel a faculty vote is important for faculty buy-in. We are concerned about how another vote would impact the timeline for completion, and are exploring ways to address the issue in a timely fashion. In terms of details, we are looking at the financial ramifications of the movement of HESA faculty to the IUB campus and tuition costs, as well as rebranding programs. T. Mason reiterated the concern about the timeline. The initial goal was to have this to the Trustees by their April meeting. This would enable us to have it approved in time for a Dean's search by late spring or early summer. B. Dennis noted that outside members of the ad hoc committee are not familiar with all of the work that has gone into this and the transparency along the way. The co-chairs of the ad hoc committee are exploring ways to document the faculty involvement. While a vote is not required, it is encouraged. B. Dennis noted that, while there was consensus among

the ad hoc committee that wrote the restructuring report, our faculty vote was not unanimous. Committee members want to ensure that this is captured. B. Chung noted that framing feedback as a vote when it is not required could cause issues for moving forward if the vote does not turn out as anticipated. Dean Mason reminded members that the most recent vote was an electronic vote in the fall after the core campus faculty meeting. J. Danish asked if it would be helpful for the Policy Council to make a motion noting that Council members, as faculty representatives, feel that the issue of faculty feedback on the separation has been addressed. Consensus was reached that the ad-hoc committee's report should go out to Policy Council members to review and take an electronic vote ASAP.

The national board of visitors meeting will take place March 30-31st. We will be getting some input from that board on what is going on at the school, which should be very helpful.

II Old Business

Diversity Topic: Mentoring of Faculty

S. Daley informed members about the work being done in the Faculty Development Committee regarding a proposed mentoring program that would support faculty throughout their career. A broad-reaching mentoring program is in the works. This would address the needs of early career faculty members, and also the needs of faculty at different stages in their careers. We are exploring methods for matching mentors and mentees, as well as proposing that the program include regular, structured mentor/mentee meetings, and strategies for helping faculty develop a portfolio of mentors.

Discussion:

J. Danish asked if there has been talk about processes for evaluating mentors. S. Daley noted that there have been discussion regarding mechanisms for monitoring mentoring relationships including monitoring by department chairs, providing yearly assessments for mentors and mentees, and also providing minimum expectations around the role of the mentor. These clarified expectations, along with training materials and supported structured meetings should help to make the program successful. Our model for the supported, structured meetings is the writing group program, which we are using as a template for thinking through this. C. Medina noted that the president has created an office for supporting mentoring of underrepresented students. There are a lot of resources available through this office that may be worth exploring. S. Daley noted that J. Lester, Chair of the Diversity Committee, as well as J. Nieto Phillips, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity, have attended a meeting to listen to the ideas of the Faculty Development Committee and provide input on how this mentoring program might impact and support those of underrepresented groups. A. Maltese noted the importance of not overburdening faculty mentors from underrepresented groups; perhaps supporting the mentors and mentees with opportunities for a group to get-together regularly. This would allow for individual mentoring relationships, but also opportunities to connect with others, and ensure no one falls through the cracks. S. Daley noted that this idea fits in with the committee's desire to help people understand the concept of having a constellation of mentors, and then build that constellation. The committee is also considering making a conversation about the mentor experience a part of faculty member's annual meeting with department chairs. G. Crow noted that the idea of a constellation of mentors is not the traditional view, but research shows that peer mentors and also having multiple mentors, are effective. It is critical that we be intentional about the mentoring program, paying attention to the critical variables of selection and training. C. Medina noted that if we can have explicit exercises regarding reflecting

on mentoring in our lives at mentor training sessions, it could help us to create a broader sense for what the relationship could be like. B. Chung noted that it may be important to coach people in the area of finding appropriate mentors, emphasizing that it is important to think about a personalized mentoring plan that may include finding a variety of mentors both inside and outside of the School of Education.

III New Business

Academic Probation Proposal (17.35) Keith Barton

K. Barton noted that this refers to the policy on academic probation and dismissal that is part of the undergraduate bulletin. The current policy is very long, complex, and worded in a very negative way. It also involves unnecessary components, such as office procedures that do not need to be in the bulletin. This revised policy is an attempt to be more simple, more direct, and more student-friendly in language. This has been through the Coordinator's Council and Committee on Teacher Education.

Discussion:

M. Boots asked if it would apply to any graduate students. K. Barton clarified that it would only apply to undergrads. V. Borden asked how this would apply to a future non-teacher education undergraduate program. K. Barton noted that there are many policies that may have to be revised in that case, and this would likely be one of them. V. Borden asked if there is anything related to the exams that have to be taken that relates to probation. K. Barton explained that this is a parallel system. A. Maltese asked about situations where it is impossible for a student to achieve the goal to avoid dismissal. K. Barton clarified that this would be addressed in the individual plan developed by the student and advisor. J. Anderson asked about the monitoring process. K. Barton noted that the Office of Teacher Ed can generate a list of students that fall below the 2.5 GPA and then share that list with the advisors. J. Anderson noted that the advisee-student relationship is really critical to this policy, particularly in preventing students from being in this situation. K. Barton agreed and informed members that the number of students who find themselves in this situation is very low.

Motion made by: J. Anderson

Second: V. Borden

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

IUPUI Elementary Education Proposal (17.37) Erik Tillema

E. Tillema informed members that the largest change made to the program is the three course sequence including a foundations and two multicultural education courses. Further changes were made to support this course sequence. The rationale for this is that the foundations course is typically an early course and supports the issues that we want to work on in the other courses. We also wanted to support our urban focus. We've found our interns often need substantial time to work through these issues that are raised in these courses, the new sequence supports this. Another change is to move student teaching to a full, single semester. The main rationale for that was to support a higher quality clinical experience. This new format results in fewer placements at a single time and gives students a longer period of time to interact with a smaller number of students. It also eliminates issues instructors faced where they could not cover content in the depth desired within the six-week course format that we were using. Other changes reflect the reorganization of courses to support these two primary changes. E. Tillema also noted that the splitting of

the 6 credit literacy course into two 3 credit courses addresses some of the logistical challenges faced with the former 6 credit course format.

Discussion:

B. Dennis and C. Medina noted that the new sequence and courses look like they will have a powerful positive impact on students and the program.

Motion made by: J. Danish

Second: A. Hackenberg

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

IUPUI Grow Your Own Proposal (17.38) Erik Tillema

E. Tillema noted that the goal of this program is to work with districts who have identified staff who are already at the schools that administrators would like to have move towards certification and teaching. Districts are requesting this type of model. The employees most likely to enroll in the program are paraprofessionals. Participants will need to have an undergraduate degree. We are not proposing this as a certificate as it stands now, just a licensure. Moving forward we may look to having this as a graduate certificate or master's degree program. The curriculum has similarities to current T2T program. The new elements are the "T" courses. This program addresses some of the logistical issues districts face regarding releasing employees from their responsibilities to complete different requirements of the course. The logistics of student teaching will likely be addressed with individual districts in a manner that complies with state licensure requirements. Passing the core exam is required for secondary education students to be admitted. The elementary students we will admit without having passed the final content exam. This reflects current policies in the T2T program.

Discussion:

Dean Mason expressed strong support for this program and asked if there had been thought given to working with employees who do not have a bachelor's degree. Are there sufficient numbers among those with a bachelor's degree to have adequate cohort sizes? E. Tillema noted that in one district about 35 potential participants were identified, and so it appears there are sufficient numbers among people with a prior degree. C. Wiley noted that districts appear to have more interest in support licensure for those with a degree, though there is likely a need, particularly in the Indianapolis Public Schools (IPS), for providing a path to licensure for those without a bachelor's degree. A bachelor's degree program would be more complex, and while there has been some thought of this, the first step is to get this current proposal off the ground.

Motion made by: V. Borden

Second: J. Danish

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

Proposal for Transfer Hours for a Certificate (17.39) Barry Chung

B. Chung informed members that this policy relates to the number of hours we allow students to transfer into a certificate. In the past, the decision was made by the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. For the sake of consistency, we would like to have a policy. This proposed policy was discussed and approved by Graduate Studies. Six credits would represent half of the hours for a certificate.

Discussion:

V. Borden agreed that departments have had different unwritten policies in the past. B. Edmonds asked for clarification about upper and lower limits. B. Chung clarified that this would be an upper limit. Departments could set lower limits.

Motion made by: B. Edmonds

Second: B. Dennis

Result: *Approved Unanimously*

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.

*Proposed New Courses:***P610 Clinical Supervision BL-Bloomington Cr: Var 2-3**

The seminar is designed to address theoretical frameworks for the clinical supervision of school psychologists. Interpersonal and multicultural competencies for effective supervision will be explored, as will legal and ethical issues in clinical supervision. Evaluation strategies for judging supervision outcomes will be examined.

Justification: The school psychology program is APA accredited. The newly revised APA Standards for Accreditation require coverage of clinical supervision. We have included coverage of clinical supervision in P697 (Advanced Practicum in School Psychology) for over a decade. In order to expand our coverage of clinical supervision we wish to create it as a stand-alone seminar.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:12 PM