

To: Cabinet Members
From: Committee on Teaching
Date: April 3, 2006
RE: BEST Evaluations and Trustees' Award Due Date

06.32

Issue #1: Best Evaluations

The CoT recommends that two global items from BEST must be included by all faculty on their 2006 course evaluations in order to be considered for a Trustees' Teaching Award:

1. Overall, I would rate the quality of this course as outstanding.
2. Overall, I would rate this instructor as outstanding.

Rationale: it is impossible to validly compare course evaluation data when faculty include different item sets, which they do, and which are idiosyncratic among faculty. Therefore, we recommend that the above two items be mandatory for all departments.

Furthermore, these have been two of the most consistently correlated items with student learning achievement. According to a meta-analysis by Cohen (1981) in the Review of Educational research, global items such as these correlated an average of .47 and .43 respectively with measures of student learning achievement in college courses.

See the first result from searching Google Scholar:

<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=course+evaluation+student+achievement+college+university&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&hl=en&btnG=Search>

This is the most frequently cited article on this issue, not only in Google Scholar but also in the Web of Science.

Issue #2: Trustees' Award Deadline

The CoT also recommends that the department chairs inform the nominees for the Trustees' Award by February 20. The Trustees' binders need to be submitted by March 10 in order for the CoT ad hoc to select recipients by April 1 (the Indiana University deadline).

**AGENDA
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

September 20, 2006

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

School of Education

IUB - Room 2140

IUPUI - Room 3138E

- I. Approval of the Minutes from April 26, 2006 Meeting (**07.04M**)
Approval of the Minutes from May 3, 2006 Meeting (**06.46M**)

- II. Announcements and Discussions
Dean's Report

Agenda Committee
Fall Retreat – October 13 – McCormick's Creek State Park
Faculty Meeting- November 17
Notes from Informal Meeting – July 12, 2006 (**07.06**)
Agenda committee report on faculty governance and service fatigue (**07.07**)
Scholastic Book Fair October 9-13 has been approved. Seeking faculty input for future book fairs
Cathy Brown and Cary Buzzelli will have academic administrative reviews this year.

- III. Old Business
 - a. Committee on Teaching recommendation regarding BEST evaluations part of TTA dossier (**06.32**)

- IV. New Business
 - a. Approval of standing committee memberships (**07.02**)
 - b. Approval of Policy Council changes (**07.00R**)
 - c. Open discussion on School of Education needs or issues 2006-07

- V. The following course is open for remonstrance

New Course Request

K420 Assistive technology in Special Education 3 credits IUPUI/Bloomington
Develops a basic understanding of Assistive Technology and its potential impact on the daily lives of individuals with disabilities. Explores the options available for children and youth as well as the legislation that regulates its use.

Justification: used to meet state licensing requirements

**Notes from an Informal Meeting
of Faculty Representatives of Policy Council
with Charles Bonser Regarding Inter-Campus Collaboration**

July 12, 2006
10:00-11:15 A.M.
School of Education
IUB Room 2140
IUPUI Room 3138E

****The following are summaries of speaker contributions****

Members Present: Bichelmeyer, Helfenbein, Korth, Lopez, Rogan. **Alternates:** Hossler. **Dean's Staff Present:** **Staff Representative:** **Student Representatives:** **Visitors:** Bonser

I. Discussion of Multi-Campus Collaboration

The purpose of this meeting was to allow Dr. Bonser the opportunity to discuss multi-campus collaboration between the Indiana University campuses. Bonser shared that the president created a team to evaluate the operations and attitudes toward the multi-campus system. A detailed questionnaire was sent to all deans regarding budgets, promotion and tenure, academic program changes, involvement between campuses, etc. The committee has also met individually with many of the deans involved with the multi-campus system. The committee will be meeting next week in Indianapolis to begin the process of drafting a report. Bonser complemented the School of Education for its excellence in multi-campus collaboration, especially with the creation and work of the Education Council.

Bonser asked about the faculty's feelings about the effects of the cross-campus responsibility on the other missions and goals of the school.

Korth described the task force created to reexamine the university's involvement with charter schools. She found that the multi-campus system allowed them to understand how charter schools might affect other campuses. Technology facilities were available at each campus for inter-campus communications.

Bichelmeyer pointed out that the Charter School Task Force was unique due to the number of campuses involved. Generally, the work of the school only includes participants from Bloomington, Indianapolis, and Columbus. Bichelmeyer believes getting input from IUPUI and other campuses is valuable, but sometimes the value is not worth the effort. Committee load for IUPUI may be greater due to the need for IUPUI representation on every shared committee. She also pointed out that it might be more strategic for Indianapolis representation to be limited to major committees and task forces, rather than every standing committee.

Rogan agreed that committee load does sometimes stretch IUPUI faculty members, and many times the agendas are heavily IUB-oriented. However, she also recognized the importance of IUPUI faculty members having a voice on many of the committees.

Bonser asked whether the state licensing requirements would cause a need for a stronger link between the Schools of Education, as opposed to the needs of other schools that have no such requirement.

Hossler described that the needs may be becoming more important due to pressure from the legislature and the Commission for Higher Education for seamless transferability.

Helfenbein said that research collaboration and public policy work are statewide in scope, but competing efforts are not helpful to the mission of the school.

Lopez pointed out that many multi-campus issues vary by program. In his department, there is frequent cross-campus collaboration.

Bonser asked whether there was interest among the Bloomington and Indianapolis faculty in strengthening ties with regional campuses.

Regional campus collaboration depends on demand. Lopez described how there is conversations in Educational Leadership to expand their doctoral programs to IPFW, because there is a demand in that area. They may need to utilize nontraditional teaching methods, such as distance education or online courses, to create such a program.

Bichelmeyer agreed, but elaborated that there is a need to identify where needs are similar and where they are different. For example, IUPUI undergraduate programs tend to be more accessible to nontraditional students, while IUB programs are focused for residential students.

Bonser asked whether campus units in Bloomington and Indianapolis contribute equally to the policy development of the school.

Rogan answered that contributions from IUPUI have improved, partially due to inclusion on committees and the growth in the number of faculty members at IUPUI.

Korth reiterated that the committee work continues to be Bloomington-centered, especially in Policy Council.

Lopez explained that by spending time on both campuses, he has learned that tension regarding this topic often makes it difficult to discuss. Some resentment exists from IUPUI faculty that they are not equal. There is a need to be able to discuss this matter between both faculties.

Rogan explained that Indianapolis has developed their own identity and exemplary programs, along with rigorous research and grant activity. Yet we are still perceived as just a teaching unit.

Bichelmeyer said that we have had representation on all committees without thinking about when representation should be appropriate. She pointed out that the current multi-campus system is IUB-centric.

Korth recalled a tense moment at a meeting where an assumption was made that IUB was a research campus, and IUPUI was not. She discussed that IUB faculty do not know what kind of research is going on at the IUPUI campus.

Bichelmeyer stated that the multi-campus collaboration is administrative and service oriented, but not research oriented. She claimed there was more collaboration in the past, because a bus service existed between the campuses. She used the faculty retreat which normally includes faculty from Bloomington, Indianapolis, and Columbus as an example of an opportunity for interaction among faculties. Last year, however, the meetings were separated due to the need of IUPUI faculty to discuss issues pertaining only to them.

Lopez described past occurrences when faculties from two different IU campuses are competing for the same grants. He believes that there needs to be more conversation about sharing opportunities to work together.

Bonser asked whether there are tangible results from having the core campus connection.

Korth gave the examples of democratic purpose of and having multiple perspectives for issues such as charter schools.

Bonser elaborated by asking what would be lost if the core campus connection was severed.

Lopez responded that the Educational Leadership program would be affected, because the majority of masters students are currently at IUPUI. He also pointed out that many of the issues that they discuss are important to urban education. Bichelmeyer echoed that there would be a lot lost programmatically. Hossler said that severing the core campus connection would lead to competition among the campuses.

Bichelmeyer described that there are several administrative issues at the IU level that discourage cross-campus collaboration. Factors such as accreditation and personalities are lead to cross-campus collaboration, or the lack of.

Bonser asked whether IUPUI faculty felt they had an active involvement in doctoral education. Rogan responded that this is dependent on the department and individual involvement. However, many of the IUPUI faculty members are currently actively involved with doctoral students and desire to increase their involvement in doctoral

education. The School of Education at IUPUI has developed a proposal for an interdisciplinary doctoral program.

Bonser asked how the average faculty member regards their multi-campus responsibilities.

Bichelmeyer stated that Bloomington faculty do not usually have to know whether they are involved in a multi-campus responsibility or not, because meetings take place in Bloomington. IUPUI carries the brunt of the cross-campus responsibility.

Helfenbein described a sense among IUPUI faculty that there is some pressure to be involved, but they would rather be a part of the cross-campus connection, rather than not to have a part at all.

Bonser asked whether there is local support for the multi-campus connection.

Korth stated she believed that the connection may be most important for undergraduates, because the majority of IUB undergraduates get hired in urban school districts.

Rogan described the hard work that IUPUI has done to create strong relations with the Indianapolis Public Schools and township schools. The IPS Superintendent and many administrators and staff feel that IUPUI is “their” campus. We need to ensure that Bloomington involvement in Indianapolis schools is coordinated with us at IUPUI in an open and collaborative fashion.

Bonser asked whether the multi-campus structure impedes efforts at IUPUI.

In response, Rogan stated that when collaboration makes sense, it is worth the time and effort. Helfenbein agreed that he was not aware of impediments, but there may be a sense that there is resistance from Bloomington. Rogan clarified that there has been resistance in regards to doctoral programs.

Helfenbein described a situation where graduate students work on the Indianapolis campus, and students have been encouraged by Bloomington faculty not to go to Indianapolis. In addition, Bichelmeyer described some of the administrative bureaucracy that graduate students must go through when they are getting paid at IUPUI and receiving tuition remission at IUB. Students should be able to work and take classes on different campuses with ease. Rogan also agreed that it is also difficult for Indianapolis students to take classes on the Bloomington campus.

Bonser asked the faculty about the benefits and costs of the multi-campus system, and whether it was worthwhile. The faculty members agreed that it is worthwhile, but that there are improvements that can be made. Helfenbein and Lopez both claimed that the relationship between IUB and IUPUI was part of the reason they chose to work here.

Bonser thanked all faculty members for their input and encouraged further comments to be forwarded to him.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 AM.

AGENDA COMMITTEE REPORT ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE AND SERVICE FATIGUE

Background:

During the 2005-2006 academic year the Agenda Committee began conversations about how to strengthen faculty governance within the SoE. Concerns have ranged from difficulty in finding colleagues willing to serve on various committees to lack of attendance at committee meetings to questions regarding the effectiveness of the SoE's current committee structure (which has been reviewed and modified relatively recently) to the feeling among some colleagues of service overload.

For example, when asked to serve on a standing committee because of his membership on Policy Council, Bradley Levinson wrote to the Dean and the Agenda Committee that we "need to initiate a serious conversation about service overload in the SoE. Time crunch has become a very common lament here—almost a ritual form of greeting. Yet in my conversations with many faculty colleagues around campus, it has become clear to me that the SoE has by far the highest service requirements, and we have no mechanisms to provide faculty with course reduction or other compensation for heavy service loads. We may even have to think about changing the constitution so fewer positions have to be filled by Policy Council people. Because one of the things I also see happening is a rather uneven distribution of service across faculty WITHIN the SoE. The same faculty keep getting elected to Policy Council because they're popular, respected, 'good citizens,' whatever, and about half the rest of the faculty end up with rather few service requirements. Also, some of us are rather involved in campus and community service, and get no respite at the School level in spite of this."

Because these issues of faculty governance and service are so encompassing, the Agenda Committee determined that the most productive first step in addressing them was to request that each standing committee take up faculty governance/service concerns at a meeting, paying particular attention to its own responsibilities and issues. Committees were encouraged to frame this issue in any manner most appropriate to the committee. However, the Agenda Committee suggested the following questions as a possible way to begin the discussion:

Have you had discussions like this at any of your meetings?

Have you had problems with attendance?

Is your committee's mission clear and related to obvious needs and actions that improve the functioning and/or "life" of the SoE?

Do you feel that your committee's activities and work lead to concrete results?

Common Themes from Committee Reports:

Reports addressing the question of service were received from 4 standing committees, including the Graduate Studies Committee, the International Programs Committee, the Long Range Planning Committee, and the Committee on Teacher Education. Please see Appendixes 1-4 for copies of these reports. The following common themes stand out:

1 Service overload is considered a problem.

2 A reasonable standard for service on institutional committees is lacking.

3 Such a standard should be expected, consistent, and clear across all School of Education departments.

4 Lack of fairness in the current distribution of service is considered a problem.

5 Lack of clarity regarding “fair share” of service is a problem..

Determining fair share is important but nearly impossible as there is no common standard for service across the SoE, and there is no clear mechanism for evaluating actual level of service.

Not all committee work is even. There seem to be three levels of work typically associated with committees: short term intense work; regular intense work; and regular not-so-intense work.

A standard for appropriate, fair service will be hard to determine as service beyond committee work varies widely across departments and programs—with different levels of advising and responsibilities for the accreditation of programs and the like.

To develop a standard there is a need to track distribution of service load.

Can faculty governance loads be more evenly distributed, with other forms of service (E.g. dissertation service, outside university service) as a counterbalance?
Can we study service loads? Are there invisible forms of service?

6 Committee restructuring is probably necessary.

We may need to re-evaluate whether existing committees need to be re-structured.

We may need to re-evaluate the need for standing committees to have Policy Council representatives.

7 Valuing Service

Is compensation for exceptional service a possibility—money in research accounts for example?

Can we increase ways to recognize all forms of service?

CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDED NEXT STEPS:

Service overload, itself perceived as a problem, is aggravated by a sense among many faculty members that some/most? colleagues engage in service and others/some? do not or not to the extent that they would meet a “fair share” criterion. Put bluntly, we have X Policy Council standing committees and approximately X faculty who can be appointed to them. It takes faculty serving on X policy council committees to do the work of faculty governance. Without this level of engagement, faculty governance suffers.

1. SoE faculty intuitively have categories of service, but there is no institutional way of measuring these at the moment. The School of Education should work to establish a general expectation (by rank) of distribution of policy council committee participation.
2. In general we should expect less service of pre-tenured faculty, more of full faculty.
3. We suggest a review of how department chairs and others advise un-tenured faculty about service and “fair share.”
4. Department chairs might file letters if a faculty member is to be excused from the expectation of serving on policy council committees. This would be a benefit both to Policy Council and to faculty who will have a better understanding of just what fair share entails. The process would also facilitate evaluation of service load for annual reviews and promotions. Then, other domains of service (which are also unequal) should be counterbalanced at the department level. If a person is serving on a number of external boards, or university-level committees, this should be counter balanced with department-level responsibilities.
5. Committee Restructuring-- A next important step that should be considered is to reduce and restrict policy council committees. This year we began that process by dismantling the retreat planning committee and consolidating retreat planning with the responsibilities of the long range planning committee.

APPENDIX 1 Graduate Studies Committee, March 2006

- School of Education faculty members are overburdened by service commitments.
- Many committees overlap. Perhaps more could be done with fewer committees.
- Challenges of committee work as faculty try to balance their scholarly work, their service outside of the school of education, and their advising of students. Suggestions were made to merge some committees and to possibly decrease membership.
- Policy Council standing committees are not the only meetings faculty have to attend. They also have to attend program and department meetings. There are times that it feels like all time is spent in meetings when faculty need to be writing and advising students. Thus, the time in the meeting might not be that productive. Perhaps the necessity of meeting needs to be reconsidered so that there are fewer to attend.
- The number of doctoral committees that faculty members serve on should also be taken into account so that faculty who are serving on many dissertation committees could serve on fewer policy council committees. There is great imbalance in faculty advising: some faculty members serve on many dissertation committees and do not get any teaching release time or service release time. It was mentioned that in many other departments and in other institutions there is a formula for providing faculty release time for serving on dissertation committees.
- Someone mentioned that “there needs to be a balance between equity and democracy.” Sometimes the elections to Policy Council become a type of popularity contest. Maybe we should consider having the membership on these committees (e.g. Policy Council) rotate so that all faculty members would eventually serve.
- Is there a tracking system to note the number of service requirements that faculty members have? It was suggested to have such a system so faculty could list the committees and advising responsibilities that they have. It was noted that at IUB, each faculty member submits a report which does allow faculty to report their advising/dissertation committees and other service activities
- Some committees are more labor intensive than others. This should be taken into account.
- There are also many program and local service projects (e.g. Saturday Art Program) that are not honored in terms of service.
- The School of Education seems to have greater service requirements than other departments/schools across campus.
- We need to restructure committees.
- Some committees (e.g., GSC) would also be more effective if there were a representative from each department – fewer members would also be needed.
- The following questions could be asked of each committee: 1.) Is the committee essential? 2.) If the committee is essential, what is the minimum number of members needed to accomplish the tasks? 3.) How often does the committee need to meet to accomplish the tasks? Could the committee meet less? 4.) How do service requirements in the School of Education compare to service requirements in other departments across campus?

APPENDIX 2 Faculty Governance and Service-- CTE Concerns and Recommendations – April, 2006

At the February 28 and March 23 CTE meetings, we engaged in discussions dealing with faculty governance and service issues. Below is a summary of the concerns and recommendations made by members of the CTE:

-
- The service load in the School of Education is extremely high, mainly due to the fact that the school has a large number of accredited programs requiring periodic review and continual oversight. Thus, service is a requirement for all Education faculty; however, there should be better methods for distributing the load.
 - Perhaps we should revisit the “research, teaching, service” algorithm. Allow faculty to redistribute their merit percentages based on the number of committees they are participating in, and the amount of responsibilities they have on those committees.
 - Is there a way to have “committee member evaluations” similar to teaching evaluations? CTE members noted that there is currently no accountability on faculty/staff annual reports whether members were actually active on the committee. It was suggested that percentages of meetings attended be included in annual reports. The committee chair could report the attendance of faculty members at committee meetings. Members felt this would be an appropriate starting point.
 - We need to address the issues of increased service load for minority faculty – due to the fact that we are encouraged to have diverse representation on committees.
 - Are there methods for providing additional financial compensation to faculty with high service responsibilities?
 - One suggestion was to determine if some existing committees could be combined into one body. For example, members of the elementary and secondary education councils could be appointed to serve as members of the CTE. This would be a double service load for people in those committees, but may ensure members who are more invested in the issues at hand and more informed on the items. The difficulty in this option is that CTE is an independent body which is unique in that it has representation of faculty and staff from outside the School of Education. Members then suggested that meetings of the full council be reduced for program review and UAS assessment, and allow a small representative group from the elementary and secondary education councils to represent other agenda items.
 - Another issue to consider is the distribution of faculty involved in service. Some members serve on multiple committees while others have no service commitments. There are also councils within the School of Education and the

university that are not Policy Council governed organizations (e.g. elementary education, secondary education, academic standards committee); thus policy council may not recognize these commitments and assign faculty and staff to additional service on Policy Council committees. Service on a diverse selection of committees under the university should be recognized and valued by Policy Council.

APPENDIX 3--Summary of International Programs Committee Discussion on Service, April 28, 2006

- 1) There is a general agreement that service overload is a problem and is perceived to be a problem by many.
- 2) How skewed is the distribution of service workload? Some feel that less than 10% of the faculty do 100% of the work. There is a need for a detailed analysis of service but who should do this? At the committee level? At the program level? At the department level?
- 3) One IPC member's suggestion: People who are on committees but not working should be asked to resign so they cannot claim service that is actually not being performed. This will make room for considering new members who will contribute. In other words, make sure rosters of committee membership are true to what is really happening within committees.
- 4) One factor that may dampen enthusiasm for committee work is when committees do the work that should really be done by an office. This has been seen to be true of the IPC. It attempts to resolve issues, but really has no authority. There should be an office of international studies with some budget and power.
- 5) Compensation for service is indeed a serious issue. Relying on good will can only get us so far.
- 6) There needs to be a review of how new faculty are advised to understand the place of and participate in service-related work. There is a strong sense among members of the committee that un-tenured faculty are protected from service overload and that as a general rule the rule for responding to significant service requests of un-tenured faculty should be "no." What is the chair's responsibility in this regard?

APPENDIX 4--Response to question about faculty service load in SOE from the Long Range Planning Committee

The members of the LRPC discussed the email sent by Heidi Ross requesting responses to the question about faculty service load in the SOE. Together, we decided that we want to share the following points with the Agenda Committee:

- 1) Yes, we clearly agree with the view of Brad Levinson and others that faculty service load in the SOE is entirely too heavy for some and much too light for others.
- 2) We want to pull "our fair share" of the load, but don't know what that is because there is no clear standard for what a normal load is or what is expected. We would like to see a statement like that from the leaders of the school.
- 3) When determining what a "fair share" looks like, there should be consideration and explanation of the integration of that load between department, school, university, profession, state, national and international activities.
- 4) We especially think it is important to determine what a "fair share" is for pre-tenured faculty, while recognizing this is important to know for post-tenured faculty as well because too much service leads to burn-out.
- 5) There should be a re-consideration of the current committee structure in the SOE to determine if all the existing committees are needed.
- 6) When new committees are formed, there should be some consideration and acknowledgment of the economics of forming the committee, such as how many person-hours will be used for the work of the committee and the dollar cost of those hours to the school, in order to determine if the committee is worth the return on investment.
- 7) There should be consideration of differing expectations regarding service by different departments. For example, faculty in counseling psych have a greater service load due to advising than faculty in other departments.

**MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

September 20, 2006

1:00 P.M.

School of Education

IUB Room 2140

IUPUI Room 3138E

The following are summaries of speaker contributions

Members Present: Bichelmeyer, Cummings, Dilworth, Eckes, Helfenbein, Levinson, Lewison, Lopez. **Alternates Present:** Blackwell, Torres. **Dean's Staff Present:** Lambdin, McMullen, Murtadha. **Staff Representative:** Wittmer **Student Representatives:** Foltz, Smith **Visitors:**

I. a. Approval of the Minutes from the April 26, 2006 Meeting (07.04M)

A motion was made by Torres and seconded by Bichelmeyer to approve the minutes as written for the April 26, 2006 Policy Council Meeting. The motion was unanimously approved.

b. Approval of the Minutes from the May 3, 2006 Meeting (06.46M)

A motion was made by Dilworth and seconded by Eckes to approve the minutes as written for the May 3, 2006 Policy Council Meeting. The motion was unanimously approved.

II. Announcements and Discussions

a. Dean's Report

Murtadha praised campus approval of a new center dedicated to the advancement of science and mathematics education on the IUPUI campus. The center will support the hiring of three new faculty members in the areas of science and mathematics education. She further discussed a collaborative initiative between colleagues from throughout Indiana to create pathways for underrepresented populations to advance in critical literacy, mathematics, and science at the university level.

b. Agenda Committee Announcements

The School of Education will hold its Fall Retreat on October 13, 2006, at McCormick's Creek State Park.

The full faculty meeting will take place on November 17, 2006, at 1:00 PM.

Levinson pointed out that the Policy Council members received notes from an informal meeting of faculty representatives of the Policy Council with Dr. Charles Bonser on July 12, 2006 (07.06). The purpose of the meeting was to solicit input from faculty on issues regarding multi-campus collaboration. Dr. Bonser included information from the meeting in his report to the President on multi-campus collaboration.

The Agenda Committee reviewed a Report on Faculty Governance and Service Fatigue (07.07) that was written by the 2005-2006 Agenda Committee. The report addressed concerns about service fatigue and equity in the School. The Agenda Committee has referred this issue to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Levinson discussed that in recent years, a Scholastic Books fair has been held in the School of Education Atrium sponsored by the Kappa Delta Pi student organization. Following last year's fair, Levinson and other faculty members expressed concerns about the amount of space that the fair utilized and the nature of the activity. Executive Associate Dean Pete Kloosterman registered these concerns and sought input from the Agenda Committee for this year's Book Fair. The Agenda Committee determined that no official procedure is in place to handle questions of facility use on this scale. Provisional approval was given by the Agenda Committee to conduct the fair this semester with a recommendation to the group's advisor to try to use less space. Levinson asked Policy Council members to seek opinions from colleagues about the fair.

McMullen pointed out that many options exist about how book fairs could be setup. She has witnessed similar fairs that have taken place on a much smaller scale.

Levinson suggested that when future discussion occurs at Policy Council meetings about the book fair, it might be good to have the Kappa Delta Pi advisor or members attend. He further suggested that perhaps the Agenda Committee should consult with the Dean's Office whether creation of a policy for facility use would assist in making such decisions. Levinson said that it is not obvious to which committee such issues should be referred.

Lambdin asked whether IUPUI has a policy for facility use. Murtadha explained that no policy exists, but administrative assistants reserve space as requested. Lambdin said a similar precedent exists at IUB, but that there must be a sponsoring group, such as a department or student organization.

One of the issues associated with this book fair is that it is a for-profit venture by a national corporation. Lopez stated that a number of for-profit activities take place in the Atrium, and that if we create a policy, we must consider the implications for smaller events held in the Atrium. Wittmer agreed that a

number of activities use the Atrium on a large scale, so if a policy is implemented, we must determine where to draw the line. This can be a difficult decision to make.

Cummings argued against having a specific policy, because it could potentially restrict legitimate uses of the area. He believes that the natural course of events should be allowed to happen. If problems exist, then perhaps the Agenda Committee should be consulted.

Levinson said that following this semester's fair, a decision can be reached by the Agenda Committee about whether further discussion is necessary.

Levinson announced that Cathy Brown and Cary Buzelli will be having academic administrative reviews this year. The Agenda Committee will be formulating recommendations for the review committees.

III. Old Business

- a. Committee on Teaching Recommendation Regarding BEST evaluations as part of the IUB Trustees' Teaching Award Dossier (06.32)

Levinson referred to the recommendations of the Committee on Teaching regarding the IUB Trustees' Teaching Award (06.32). The Agenda Committee has previously determined that Issue #2 regarding the Trustees' Teaching Award deadlines should be referred back to the committee for action.

Eckes discussed that in the past, it has been a difficult job to compare professors for the award, because currently, there are different evaluation questions used. It is not the case that all faculty members would be required to use these two criteria, but it would be necessary if a faculty member was interested in applying for the Trustees' Teaching Award. Three of the five departments in the school have already adopted a policy that requires similar evaluation items to be used. McMullen added that there are multiple items used to evaluate faculty members for the award.

Levinson discussed that he believes that evaluating and comparing the data for the teaching awards should be a difficult task. Qualitative data should be used, as well as quantitative data. He said that by making such a requirement, the importance of this item may be unconsciously elevated in the decision process.

Eckes stated that it would only be fair to start the process with the 2007 evaluations.

Bichelmeyer moved to accept the Committee on Teaching's recommendation (06.32) regarding Issue #1 to require the two global items from BEST

evaluations to begin with the 2008 Trustees' Teaching Award, based on 2007 evaluations. The motion was seconded by Torres.

Cummings pointed out that under the current system, course evaluations could be created that do not necessarily evaluate the instructor. Faculty members of departments that choose not to use these evaluations could be at a disadvantage.

McMullen elaborated that standard evaluation items would allow committee members to fairly review faculty outside of their given fields.

The motion passed with one dissention.

IV. New Business

a. Approval of Standing Committee Memberships (07.02)

A motion was made by Cummings and seconded by Torres to approve the committees as proposed.

Lambdin pointed out that under the IUB Committee on Teacher Education, Catherine Gray was listed as Ex Officio, but Lambdin believes that she does not wish to be an Ex Officio member. It was decided that if the position is not constitutionally required, then Catherine Gray's name would be removed from the Committee on Teacher Education.

The motion was approved unanimously.

b. Approval of Policy Council Changes (07.00R)

Levinson noted that there is still one alternate position and one student position to be filled on the Policy Council. He recommended that the Policy Council provisionally approve the list of members. The Agenda Committee will bring forth individuals to fill these positions at the next Policy Council meeting. The Agenda Committee will distribute a message to department chairs and IUPUI to ask for recommendations of graduate students that could fill the student position.

A motion was made by Torres and seconded by Eckes to provisionally accept the list of Policy Council members and alternates. The motion passed unanimously.

c. Open Discussion on School of Education Needs or Issues 2006-07

Levinson opened a discussion for input from members about issues and concerns within the School of Education that the Agenda Committee needs to address.

Lambdin discussed two items of information. First, she discussed the campus-wide initiative to identify a common general education core. While the creation of this proposal has been a long-term process, the initiative is now on a fast-track toward approval. The University's Educational Policies Committee has been working on designing a set of requirements that would be a set of general education guidelines. The Bloomington Faculty Council recently heard a first reading of the policy. This policy will be particularly problematic for the elementary education program.

A second effort is attempting to align the lower division courses of the elementary education program at all eight IU campuses. Each of the campuses will need to change their current requirements slightly. The Committee on Teacher Education and the Elementary Education Council will be reviewing the draft proposal of the University-wide Education Council. Concerns from the various campuses will be discussed at the October meeting of the Education Council. This proposal will hopefully lead to an articulation agreement with the community colleges throughout the state.

Blackwell asked whether it was IUB's understanding that the general education requirements would be University-wide, rather than campus-specific. This process also has great implications for the university's relationship with Ivy Tech.

Lambdin pointed out that some of the regional campuses have already established articulation agreements with local Ivy Tech campuses. While Lambdin agreed it was her understanding that the Trustees intended that there would be articulation on all the campuses, the work she has witnessed is mostly a Bloomington campus effort. All campuses are going to have to work together quickly to determine this set of general education requirements.

Lambdin described that one of the difficulties for the School of Education will be that the elementary education program specifies courses. For example, the university proposal will require six credits of social and historical coursework. Most students may select from a long list of possible courses, but the elementary education majors must select one American history course, one world history course, and one elective.

In regards to the second effort that is specific to education, one concern is that if the IU campuses take too long to agree on general education requirements, then the state might mandate a specific set of requirements. Ivy Tech already has an articulation approved with Indiana State. It is important for IU to determine our own requirements.

Levinson mentioned that Lynne Boyle-Baise and Terry Mason are serving as School of Education representatives to the Bloomington Faculty Council. Issues regarding campus concerns may be directed to them.

V. New Course Request

The following course is open for remonstrance:

K420 Assistive Technology in Special Education 3 credits
IUPUI/Bloomington

Develops a basic understanding of Assistive Technology and its potential impact on the daily lives of individuals with disabilities. Explores the options available for children and youth as well as the legislation that regulates its use.
Justification: used to meet state licensing requirements

Levinson adjourned the meeting at 2:25 PM.