

02.09M

MINUTES
 Policy Council
 School of Education
 October 24, 2001
 IUB – Room 2140
 IUPUI – 3138G

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

Members Present: Barman, Bichelmeyer, Brantlinger, Buzzelli, Carter, Delandshere, Hossler, Levinson, Odom, Silk, Williamson. **Alternates Present:** Chafel. **Dean's Staff Present:** Brown, Cummings, Gonzalez, Murtadha. **Staff Representative:** Wickemeyer-Hardy.

I. Approval of the minutes for September 26, 2001

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the minutes.

Minutes for September 26, 2001, were unanimously approved.

II. Announcements and Discussions

A. Dean's Report

1. School of Education, Faculty Retreat and the Strategic Plan

Dean Gonzalez reported that the suggestions from the focus group session have been forwarded to the Long Range Planning Committee. The committee will present the Strategic Plan to the Policy Council later this year. Several ideas came out of the retreat that we are currently moving forward with. One idea expressed was the need for a forum for faculty to meet and discuss each other's research. A committee chaired by Susan Klein and Luise McCarty, will look at ways to improve the climate for scholarly discussion within the School of Education. In addition, the Dean's Breakfast with Faculty will be reinstated this year for informal exchange of ideas and interaction.

2. Revision of the Constitution of the School of Education

The Long Range Planning Committee is also working on the revision of the constitution of the School of Education. Some of the concerns that have been brought about have to do with practices that have been instituted within the School of Education that have not been clearly identified as consistent practices in the constitution. The most obvious example is the Teacher Education Council and the question of where the authority of the council comes from and its relationship with the Policy Council.

3. The Budget

Again this year we are ahead in income over expenditures due to recovery of funds through grant efforts. If projections for the spring remain, some of these funds will be turned back to the departments for use at the local level. Half of the funds from recovery will be given back to this Office of Graduate Research for investment in support of infrastructure and investigators. At IUPUI we are also ahead of budget, at least in the areas of graduate enrollment. Funds may also be reinvested back at IUPUI in support of faculty activities.

4. Governor's Round Table Meeting

Dean Gonzalez will attend the Governor's Round Table of education meeting today. This is a group of business people and educators who meet with the governor and the superintendent of education on policy issues. Roger Farr, from the School of Education, will be reporting on data-driven reading assessment. He will also give an update on curriculum frameworks. Our department of CIA has been commissioned by the state to develop curriculum frameworks that will be used in the schools for professional development as well as teacher training to line up the curriculum with the expectations of the State of Indiana. The Dean's Council has also been examining the use of standards in the School of Education. Standards are an important issue both for students and for the School of Education in evaluation. It will be important to identify what types of assessments the School of Education will need. The accreditation visit is a year away and the School of Education will need to start looking at this soon.

5. Indiana Urban Schools Association

The first meeting of the Indiana Urban Schools Association was held today at IUPUI. This group will look at partnerships and ways to confront the issues that are challenging public education today, especially on urban campuses.

B. Agenda Committee

1. Faculty Meeting

The Fall Faculty Meeting is Friday, November 16th, during which there will be a discussion of the long-range plan. The exact time will be clarified through an announcement sent out to all faculty.

2. Replacements Named for Alternates of the Policy Council

Judith Chafel is the alternate for Joanne Peng. Joanne is unable to attend this semester due to a teaching conflict. Sam Odom is replacing Susan Klein. Frank Lester has been appointed as the alternate for Sam Odom.

3. Faculty Affairs Committee Open Meeting

There will be an open meeting of the Faculty Affairs Committee on 10/26/01 from 1-3 pm to discuss the Promotion and Tenure Criteria for the School of Education. The meeting will be held in room 2140 in Bloomington and 3138E at IUPUI. Anyone unable to attend may send comments by email to Judith Chafel, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

III. New Business/IV. Old Business

Because there was no new or old business, Bichelmeyer proposed that the Policy Council discuss reflections on the retreat and issues to come before the Policy council over the next year.

A. Reflections on the Retreat

Dean Gonzalez thanked Bichelmeyer for time and efforts put into the Retreat.

Odom summarized positive impressions from the Retreat. He also asked about what is being done with the data collected from the Retreat in general, and specifically from the focus groups.

Bichelmeyer reported the history of the Long Range Plan and development of the goals and tasks as a result of last year's Retreat. The "stars" are in the process of being counted and will be passed along for review when completed. The summaries of group work have already been passed along to the Long Range Planning Committee.

Dean Gonzalez confirmed this process. He stated that the listing of the goals have already been reorganized based on the numbers of stars for each goal. All the comments and notes from the groups have been compiled and organized and forwarded as a separate document to the Long Range Planning Committee. The work of the Long Range Planning Committee will be to take all of the information from the Retreat and incorporate them.

Hossler voiced appreciation of the opportunity for the Columbus faculty to participate in the Retreat. Bichelmeyer stressed the importance of participation and input from all three campuses of faculty and staff.

Murtadha discussed the different needs for different groups of faculty and felt that there was a need to have an IUPUI Retreat to meet the needs of those faculty. Barman and Silk agreed that there should be a process in the all-faculty Retreat to have programs that meet the needs of all and that all can participate in.

Cummings reported that one of the suggestions that came out of the Retreat was to increase the focus on research to find out what our colleagues are doing. Several people had suggested the possibility of an overnight associated with the Retreat that would permit more time to focus on research and have people do presentations. This would also allow time for programs to meet. To do this next year, arrangements need to be made now.

Gonzalez stressed the need to remember that we are one School of Education. It is important for all faculty to meet together to interact and exchange information and points of view. We need to consider issues that cut across areas and interests that have importance for the entire school.

Buzzelli brought up the issue of the timing of the Retreat. He asked if moving the time up would increase participation and availability of sites. Cummings reported that in the past there had been negative feedback from having the Retreat early in the semester. Levinson stated that this may have been from having the Retreat the week before classes start when faculty are the busiest. He asked if moving the Retreat to the second week of classes would be better. Cummings responded that availability of sites for meeting sometimes decides the scheduling.

Bichelmeyer asked members for impressions on the substance of the discussions at the Retreat.

Wickemeyer-Hardy stated that it is difficult to follow everything that is going on in the School of Education, but that having some of the information on the School of Education web site will enhance this. Bichelmeyer agreed that this was an important point. She discussed the possibility of getting input from ongoing committees more frequently and dispersing this information to keep everyone informed.

Brown said that this is consistent with feedback she had received after the Retreat and that it indicates a need for better ways to increase awareness of what is going on in the school. There needs to be a specific mechanism for getting information out.

Hossler discussed the role of Columbus in the School of Education. She presented information regarding the different type of students at Columbus and the different role of the School of Education at Columbus. She agreed with the need for faculty, staff and

students at Columbus to be more aware of what is going on with other campuses.

B. Open discussion of issues to come before the Policy Council

Bichelmeyer opened the discussion with the suggesting that the council take the perspective using the ideas systemic initiatives, communication and interrelationships and inter-linkages between the campuses as starting points to talk about what kinds of issues the Policy Council would like to consider this year.

Cummings stressed that this is a unique opportunity since Policy Council is typically agenda-driven. There isn't usually the opportunity to discuss what types of issues should be dealt with by Policy Council.

Delandshere brought up the issue of educating educational researchers and what the School of Education role will be. There are issues coming up related to research, who are the inquiry faculty, what courses should be included. She voiced concerns with the School of Education being out of sync with the questions that are being asked in the research community such as research literacy in different epistemologies and being able to function across paradigms. Educating graduate students in this way brings up inconsistencies in styles of teaching and what is being taught in other programs in the School of Education, and in the requirements for Teacher Education in general. How does the Policy Council begin thinking about these types of issues and decide what role to take?

Murtadha agreed that this is an especially important and timely issue. As the School of Education is pushed into the discussion of standards, which is consistent with a particular way of thinking, it is important that the School of Education seriously engage in this debate. It is a taken for granted assumption that this is the way we will move. So it is critical that we engage in the conversations around this debate. She also stressed the need to be involved internationally and keeping this in mind in our role as researchers.

Delandshere pointed out recent research indicating the impact of standards. She states that there are reports of the negative impact of standards in education. The School of Education needs to think about involvement in this issue.

Bichelmeyer supported the inclusion of these issues in discussions by the Policy Council. She asked for more suggestions from council members.

Buzzelli suggested looking at the relationship between the goals for the School of Education and the criteria for Promotion and Tenure—two current issues being discussed that seem to have divergent foci. He questioned if there is some way for Policy Council to look at linking these two, as they aren't separate issues.

Brown asked information regarding the status of the constitution review by the Long Range Planning Committee. She felt that there are inconsistencies between what the School of Education does and what it says it is doing.

Levinson questioned if the review is looking at the general committee structure with a view toward possible consolidation or possible expansion. There should be more collaboration and discussion between graduate education and teacher education. Research is one opportunity to do this. Graduate students could be more involved in research for or about Teacher Education. Students in all of the departments could benefit from a more systematic reflection-collaboration. This could provide benefits both to graduate students and to Teacher Education.

Bichelmeyer pointed out that many of the issues raised come from change initiatives—either dictated by the Dean of Faculties or because we are still in the transition period from an old dean to a new dean-- changes in standards and imposed criteria on our programs. What can we facilitate as a Policy Council that looks further at change initiatives, educational reform initiatives and what are the key change initiatives that are impacting the school at campus level, state level or coming from other places. All of these issues impact each other. Facilitating an understanding of all of the forces of change that are impacting us would be helpful regardless of the format we select to do so.

Delandshere questioned the charge of the Long Range Planning Committee in regards to what the constitution is being revised for, is it just to revise the constitution or is it more specific than that?

Cummings responded that the revision came out of a procedural question in Teacher Education Council. When the constitution was reviewed, it was found that the Teacher Education Council was not in the constitution. As a result, the charge was to look at the constitution relative to what exists and what should exist. The feeling was that the committee needed to reflect on what possibilities could exist.

Bichelmeyer stated that other factors included that both the constitution and the long-range plan had not been revised in a number of years. The long-range plan had not been revised in 7 or 8 years and the constitution is from the late 1980s.

Cummings stated that the driving issue behind revisions is that the School of Education is out of sync with what the constitution says. There are multiple committees that exist now that are not listed in the constitution. 10-12 years ago, efforts were made to reduce and consolidate committees too about 8. The Policy Council made this decision. What happened is that some of the committees broke into different sections of “sub committees”.

Bichelmeyer stated that this brings up the point of the relationship of the committees to the Policy Council. She has requested that the Long Range Planning Committee be ready to present information and suggestions to the Policy Council by the end of January. This also introduces the idea of possibly having updates from the various committees by semester—interim reports. How the Policy Council links up and interrelates with the committees is another issue that needs to be addressed.

Brown added that another linkage is the number of centers in the School of Education that have been sanctioned if not created by the Policy Council. At some point in history there was a requirement that each of those centers submit a report, and that has not been happening. A way of getting a sense of some of the research and development activity in the School of Education is through reports from those centers as much of the activity goes on through that structure. She stated that there is also some confusion about what centers the School of Education has and what they do. Some of the centers are named as such because of funding that was given that stipulated their naming and are not really centers. It would be good to charge someone—like Brown’s office—with getting an idea of what is going on with the centers.

Bichelmeyer summarized that one of the things the Policy Council wants to look at is its own structure and purpose and relationship with committees and centers—rethinking what the Policy Council is supposed to be about. It is supposed to be in some way the faculty voice of the School of Education. We need to look at what the best ways to be faculty voice are and decide where it is important for faculty voice to be heard. What is the Dean’s Office accountable for? Where is their responsibility for making decisions? Where does faculty voice come in? How do we get faculty voice? These might be timely points in light of all of the initiatives we are trying to address.

Carter brought up the point of the constitution and the relationship of the Policy Council to committees and the relationship of the Policy Council to IUPUI. She suggested that this may also be an issue that needs to be clarified. Committee membership by faculty from IUPUI also is of concern.

Cummings responded that this is definitely an area that needs specification.

Bichelmeyer stated that as a core campus, our goal is supposed to be to recognize the similarities and to recognize those shared initiatives and address those. The reality is that there are some differences and some of these differences legitimately need to be addressed to come up with a good working solution. We sometimes try so hard to be a core and focus on the similarities that we don't do justice to the differences that are legitimate and appropriate. We need to take advantage of the fact that Columbus has a great rural population, IUPUI has a great urban population and IUB has a traditional population and recognize the differences and work with them.

Delandshere affirmed the need for representation from all campuses while recognizing that the number of committees and committee membership can overwhelm the campuses with fewer faculty.

Murtadha agreed that not only is the number of committees potentially burdensome, but that it is important to include issues important to all faculty and not just those dealing with the Bloomington Campus. At times it is of crucial interest that IUPUI and Columbus faculty be involved and at other times the issues are of no interest. There are also times when the campuses share programs and a discussion of the shared programs and their impact comes to the Policy Council as well. Some programs get closed down at IUPUI for various reasons and the impact on graduate programs has been significant. There are many issues of interest to IUPUI that are not of as much importance to IUB. All of these concerns need to be factored in to discussions of the constitution and what makes sense for everyone.

Cummings pointed out that it isn't always fair for IUPUI on committee representation because IUPUI faculty also have committees up there in the school and on the campus. We need to use common sense in working through the constitution. While the promotion and tenure criteria are being revised, it is very important to have representation of faculty on all three campuses. There may be other times when it isn't as important to have representation, and may not be a good use of their time. Another issue that Cummings has seen come up is that of placing a moratorium or ending a program. This is also a constitutional issue that isn't clear.

Brantlinger stated that this is an item on the TEC agenda. The report from this in regard to undergraduate programs will be coming to the Policy Council from TEC.

Delandshere stated that the main issue is that who has the responsibility to terminate a course? Many faculty believe that this is a faculty prerogative and not an executive decision.

Williamson stated that the Long Range Planning Committee has been looking very carefully at the constitution and that it is pretty clear that making decisions on curriculum is a faculty role.

Delandshere replied that this is an area of controversy with TEC as TEC is being composed of people other than faculty. Due to the scheduling, for the regular sessions of TEC, there is a majority of non-faculty on TEC. Many of the curricular decisions taken by TEC are taken by non-faculty, which is objectionable.

Bichelmeyer summarized that several issues seem to be coming out of this discussion. One is the idea of curriculum and curriculum program decisions. Another is the issue of staffing decisions and how staffing relates to programmatic possibilities. Maybe the role of Policy Council is to recommunicate some things. The idea of how staffing relates to the strategic goals and the programs we emphasize is worthy of exploration as some point.

Murtadha said that this ties into IUPUI as well. Staffing is a key issue in programs. Having a discussion about faculty authority in regards to programs and staffing; a discussion about what it means to be able to afford a program. These are real issues that are not going to go away. We have to talk about these issues. Administrators sometimes have to make calls based on what they see as numbers. Our role as faculty says that we have particular ways of thinking about what is important and work that needs to get done. We need to have those difficult discussions.

Bichelmeyer stated that this is an issue of not only faculty voice but of faculty authority and relationships between executive and faculty voice and authority and where those come out.

Levinson reported that this was issue that came up particularly in light of this years' authorization of faculty searches. This was obviously a contentious process this year. One of the questions here is, is there a charge at all for Policy Council to look at the structure of how these decisions take place with the Chairs' Council?

Cummings responded that the plan for the Spring is to identify a 3-5 year plan looking at programs. Historically it has been one year at a time and this has limited the ability of departments and campuses to plan the budget. Policy Council is not the place to "redebate" all of the issues that the Chairs deal with. There isn't a lot of padding in the position requests. For every one that receives funding, there are 1-2 others that could have.

Brantlinger questioned the issue of different courses being capped at different levels. There is a wide variation in these numbers. Why are some of the same courses capped at different numbers?

Cummings responded that some of this is due to room size.

Brantlinger didn't feel that this was always the deciding factor. She stated that sometimes it is a decision by the Chairs to offer a course even if there are only 4 students, while other courses may be cancelled if there are 10. The issue is equity and who is making the decisions and how the decisions are being made. Another issue is that of "uncompensated work" by faculty. There seems to be an uneven balance of who is doing these things. These are equity issues across the school that need to be monitored.

Cummings stated that faculty workload policy was considered last year by Policy Council.

Levinson said that some changes were made, but again this was left to the discretion of the Chairs. It was not coordinated at the School of Education level.

Bichelmeyer reported that this was a very contentious issue.

Cummings said that prior to the passing of the policy, the decision was left up to the Dean's Office. At that time, the workload was set based on number of courses taught and other factors were not even considered. There was no release from the standard teaching load. Some departments had implemented this and some didn't. The faculty workload policy passed last year moved the decision away from the Dean's Office to the department level. The Chairs are more likely to know which faculty are contributing in which ways and know

who needs release time.

Bichelmeyer stated that even when given release time, faculty are sometimes held accountable for this time when it comes to promotion and tenure. At times the release time wasn't figured in to the merit review.

Cummings said that his concern has been looking at who is falling below the standard teaching load and that the maximums haven't been looked at. There are situations that on the surface appear one way, but when you check you find that the course is cross-listed with another one so that the actual number of students is higher. In addition, some faculty with lower class loads/numbers of students in one semester may be asked to teach an additional class the following semester.

Hossler voiced concern that faculty who have extra loads outside of the classroom, such as developing programs and putting programs together, will be judged by other faculty as not having carried a full load. She stated also that this program development, which is done for the benefit of the university, might not be taken into account for tenure and promotion purposes.

Buzzelli said that this speaks to the broader concern of faculty on all campuses "being stretched too thin". While there is an increase in the amount of work expected from all faculty there are still expectations for programs and output. Policy Council may be a place for discussions about this to take place.

Levinson brought back the issue of decisions made about faculty searches and the relationship of this to the current structure. Is this process/structure delineated in the constitution? Many faculty are interested in a more participatory approach to the process and to the decision-making rather than it being made through the council of department chairs.

Cummings stated that this could be taken to the Long Range Planning Committee to be considered. He did feel that the process is currently participatory within the departments. Chairs represent these discussions from the departments. He thought that having all faculty involved in the entire process would only add to their current workload, as this is a time-consuming process.

Levinson suggested that there might at least be a summary of what types of data were considered and how the final decisions were made. This would avoid "forceful personalities" from overly impacting the process. Is there a ranking vote by the chairs that is considered by the Dean? Or is it an advisement that is taken into consideration?

Bichelmeyer stated that this is possibly a particular instance of something that might need to be brought to Policy Council. Perhaps there needs to be a clearly designed process that is used over time so that faculty know what the process is, how it works that the decisions are made and how this may or may not be refined through the Long Range Planning Committee or through the Policy council or through some other mechanism. It sounds like there is lack of awareness of what the process is, if that process is standard, and who has what authority or accountability in that.

Murtadha said that one of the things that happened this year that hasn't happened in the past is that there was at least some data that was generated. It is to the Dean's credit that he did ask the group to go back and get data and there was a presentation of a number of different forms of data that the group had to come back with in order to make a case. We still are far from having a process that is perfect. There was much more discussion based on data that has not been presented in the past. We as a faculty need to work much more toward that end

in looking at the types of information needed.

Cummings stated that the difference between previous discussions and the most recent one is that a uniform set of data came in for all the departments. In the past each department chair gave the best argument with the best data they could supply and presented their set of data. This was based partly on familiarity and trust of data. The difference this time was that there was one table that listed all doctoral students in each department and how many graduated last year. Data are provided to initiate the discussion. It isn't formulized or just based on numbers.

Odom brought up the question of how positions are authorized. Does the School of Education propose the number of positions?

Cummings responded that the School of Education makes that decision based on the budget and based on the resources available. The School of Education does propose the number of positions. The budget director (Director of Administrative and Academic Support) reviews the potential retirements and attrition from faculty to account for potential positions. It is also dependent on stability of enrollments, graduate income and other factors.

Bichelmeyer summarized that this topic seemed to have enough interest to be added to the list of issues to be dealt with by Policy Council over the next year.

In this meeting, so far, we have identified about 15 issues that are relevant for consideration by the Policy Council through the year. We still need to determine what the priority of the issues might be or how we would want to pursue discussion of these issues—open discussion; subcommittee work, commissioning a committee.

Brantlinger said that it isn't just a discussion of the issues. It is whether these issues will be acted upon. There isn't much point in spending time discussing issues that have been discussed before if there is no action. So, if any of these issues are going to be action issues, that would be one way to prioritize what the Policy Council will work on. The other issues might be brought up in an open session to give feedback to the Dean.

Odom suggested that the non-action issues might be discussed at Fall or Spring Faculty meetings.

Bichelmeyer proposed that she put together a list of what these issues are and what the priorities might be based on which issues are just for discussion and which issues are for action. The list would then be sent out to Policy Council members via email or campus mail. At the next meeting Policy Council can decide what issues will be chosen for action or sent other places.

Levinson asked that these be sent out earlier than a few days before the meeting. He suggested that it also may be timely to have Teacher Education Council present information on their structure and programs.

Bichelmeyer pointed out that since the Fall Faculty Meeting occurs before the next meeting of the Policy Council, it might be appropriate to forward the topics on the list to those planning the meeting.

Delandshere voiced concern with having detailed prescriptive items related to the issues incorporated into the constitution. She thought it would not be a good idea to include this level of detail in the constitution.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 pm.