

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
September 22, 2004 1:00-2:59 p.m.
School of Education
IUB Room 2140
IUPUI Room 3138E

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

Members Present: Berghoff, Carspecken, Delandshere, Dilworth, Flinders, McCarty, McClain, Ross, Sutton, Thompson. **Dean's Staff Present:** Brown, Gonzalez, Howard-Hamilton, Kloosterman, Murtadha. **Staff Representative:** Wyatt. **Student Representative:** Adams.
Alternates: Guests:

I. Approval of Minutes

A. Approval of the Minutes from April 28, 2004 Policy Council meeting ([04.48M](#))

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the minutes as written. The minutes for April 28, 2004 were unanimously approved.

B. Approval of the Minutes from April 28, 2004 Policy Council meeting ([05.04M](#))

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the minutes as written. The minutes for April 28, 2004 were unanimously approved.

II. Announcements and Discussions

A. Dean's Report

1. Faculty Retreat and Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate

Dean Gonzalez thanked the committee members who helped organize the school wide Faculty Retreat on Friday, September 17, 2004. Dean Gonzalez commented that it was a successful retreat and that he was pleased with the discussions held regarding the advancement of doctoral education and research within the School of Education. He stated that the School of Education intends to follow-up on the issues that were discussed at the retreat, especially those concerning the School of Education's doctoral programs. In relation to this, Dean Gonzalez briefly discussed Luise McCarty's work with the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate and mentioned that we are off to a good start with the initiative. Further discussion of the initiative will be brought up at the October 29, 2004 faculty meeting.

2. Budget Report

Dean Gonzalez reported on the status of the budget, stating that the administration has known since last year that this year's budget would be tight because this is the biannual year and there will be no increase in state appropriation. In addition, Dean Gonzalez reported that the governor asked public universities to hold tuition increases to no more than 4%. Because of this, The School of Education had planned a deficit budget using available reserves rather than implement drastic cutbacks. The School of Education purposely decided to tap some of those resources to maintain the level of services that have recently been provided, which include awarding faculty raises, not having to freeze hires, supporting graduate student fellowships, etc. In addition to the anticipated budget, the University experienced an enrollment shortfall this year, that resulted in an additional 5.1 million dollars reduction in funds allocated to various academic units. The School of Education's share of this reduction was \$200,000. Dean Gonzalez reported that through professional development initiatives, indirect cost recoveries, and graduate enrollment increases, we might be able to make up some of that, but the School of Education needs to plan for an even tighter budget than originally planned.

3. Commitment to Excellence Funds

Dean Gonzalez commented on a positive development regarding the Commitment to Excellence funding. He stated that the School of Education's proposal was one of eleven invited to submit full proposals under the second round of Commitment to Excellence funding, which the campus is supporting through the implementation of the state or tuition surcharge that previously funded the Learning Sciences Initiative. If the School of Education's proposal is funded, there will be a major influx in dollars in what would otherwise be a difficult budget year.

Dean Gonzalez briefly discussed the President's State of the University Address, in which the President set goals for the University to double the amount of external funding the university receives by the end of the decade. Dean Gonzalez reported that the School of Education has been doing well in this area thanks to the faculty and centers that have aggressively pursued and secured external funding over the last few years, but declared that the School needs to continue encouraging and supporting faculty to compete for external dollars. Not only would this be in line with the priorities of the University, but it would also provide a way for the school to sustain its research performance over the long term. Until the state's budget situation improves and state appropriations change, we will become more dependent on external funds for research and other mission-central activities. Dean Gonzalez reported that overall, however, the state of the school is good, even if we are functioning in a very difficult fiscal environment. He indicated that the administration will do everything it can to keep the faculty informed of

developments, and use all available data to monitor enrollment, increase revenue where possible, and reduce costs. He stated that the administration anticipates that the School has seen the worst of the cutbacks and will be able to make it through the year reasonably healthy.

Sutton asked when decisions will be made regarding hiring next year.

Dean Gonzalez responded that if and when the Commitment to Excellence funds are awarded (the Chancellor will report to the units whether or not they are receiving funding in October), the School will move forward with additional searches. Other than that, the searches so far authorized for next year include a search in Higher Education, a continuation of a search for Inquiry from last year, and a Learning Sciences search.

Kloosterman noted that a couple of things might arise if the school gets money from outside resources, including a possible two to four positions from Commitment to Excellence funds.

B. Agenda Committee

1. Update on Survey of Electronic Faculty Annual Report

Delandshere reported that the task force committee constituted last May for the Electronic Faculty Annual Report met once, at which time some tasks were divided. Basically, the committee spent time investigating systems used at other universities and how these universities have dealt with the issues that were raised by Indiana University's faculty survey. The committee then conducted the survey and analyzed/summarized the results. Delandshere reported that she researched the Big 10 universities to see who was using similar reporting systems, the issues they have dealt with regarding this reporting tactic, and policy documents that have been formulated with regard to use, purpose, and access of the databases. She reports that hopefully the committee will be able to report its findings to Policy Council sometime this fall. Delandshere mentioned that she is not sure this will offer a quick solution for this year's report, but thinks that the committee will have some suggestions to improve the current system. This will be an item on the agenda in future months.

III. Old Business

A. Recommendations from 2004 Standing Committee Annual Reports [\(04.49\)](#) [\(04.39\)](#)

1. Role of Clinical Faculty

The first issue concerns the reports made by the different Policy Council committees at the last session in April. Apparently, most of those reports were briefly presented to Policy Council at the April 28, 2004, session and most of the recommendations were not addressed as the committees would like for them to be. Delandshere referred to Document [\(04.49\)](#), which was prepared by Peg Sutton as a summary of issues that came from the reports and recommendations made by several of the committees. Delandshere said that policy council should decide which recommendations raise policy issues— what should be done with these recommendations and where should they be forwarded? She noted that the Policy Council members need to remember that they are an elected body whose duty is to establish policy and therefore it does not have to necessarily accept wholesale the recommendations from the committees, but does, however, need to honor the committees' work. She noted that there are several different possibilities: Policy Council can send the recommendations to cabinet so members can decide what is relevant to their work; it can discuss what issues are important; or send the recommendations back to faculty affairs or the different committees, etc. She stated that although a lot of the issues are not policy issues, it is important for Policy Council to discuss the decisions and recommendations made. Overall, the recommendations include three main issues that need to be addressed.

Delandshere reported that the Faculty Affairs Committee is in the process of examining the role of clinical faculty. The current review process for clinical faculty is not terribly adequate and there is a need to revise both what is understood by the clinical faculty role as well as the review process used for this particular group of faculty.

The second recommendation/issue has to do with the Long Range Planning Committee, which investigated the core campus issue. Delandshere reported that Policy Council needs to make decisions about what it would recommend to do with the recommendations made by the Long Range Planning Committee concerning the issue of a core campus.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee members seem to have engaged in the business of rewriting the guidelines for promotion and tenure, which is not their responsibility.

The Partnership and Outreach Ad Hoc Committee made a recommendation to create an office for Partnership and Outreach and to create a Policy Council standing committee for Partnership and Outreach.

In regards to the issue concerning the role of Clinical Faculty, Sutton stated that faculty affairs was asked to look at the framework for annual review of clinical faculty because basically the framework is one for tenure-line faculty minus research. To address this question adequately, Policy Council would

have to broaden the scope of the question and would need to look at the various roles held by clinical faculty.

Murtadha noted that they had addressed this issue at IUPUI. She stated that Chris Leland looked at the review process for clinical faculty and found that for the clinical faculty to advance in status and dollars, a thoughtful merit review that speaks to their role in teaching and the kinds of things they do are very important. A different document needs to be crafted in order to recognize the different roles clinical faculty members play and the kinds of interests they have. For example, the question needs to be asked, “What have they been doing in outstanding ways and the contributions they make in terms of service?”

Carspecken asked how many clinical faculty members there are at IUB/IUPUI in order to get a sense of how large this issue is.

Kloosterman responded that there are 8-10 clinical faculty members at IUB. He noted that this is not a lot of people, but a real issue because their responsibilities are quite different from tenure-track individuals.

An open charge was put forth that the Faculty Affairs Committee do a thorough examination and review of the work clinical faculty are doing with the aim of producing recommendations for review of clinical faculties’ role and to make recommendations regarding the yearly review as well as the fourth year review of clinical faculty.

Sutton motioned to approve this charge as proposed. Flinders seconded the motion.

The charge that faculty affairs committee conduct an examination on the role of clinical faculty was approved with one abstention.

2. Core Campus Concept regarding Promotion and Tenure

Delandshere presented the Long Range Planning Committee’s Examinations [\(04.39\)](#) of the core campus concept, which was presented to Policy Council in order to make recommendations to address areas of difficulty related to the implementation of the core campus idea. In reference to this, Delandshere stated that we need to think about the President’s emphasis on mission differentiation across campuses and whether this is affecting the issue of core campus. The state of the University Graduate School is uncertain. If there is a radical change then both academic units and campuses may have additional responsibilities. Delandshere asked for elaboration on this issue.

Dean Gonzalez explained that a report has gone to the Chancellor to reorganize the Graduate School. The Graduate School has a Dean for graduate studies that reports to the Vice President for Research. The recommendation from the committee was to separate those two offices and have a dean of the Graduate School and an Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs that will report to the Chancellor and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, which is now vested in the Bloomington Chancellor as one position. This may be going to University Faculty Council. Thus, the implication for our graduate studies is not certain.

Sutton asked Murtadha how the current structure affects the two campuses, particularly IUPUI, concerning the idea of IUPUI having its own reviewing committee for promotion and tenure.

Murtadha noted that there is a great deal of variability as suggested in document [\(04.49\)](#), not just within IUPUI, but between the committees that are in Bloomington. In Bloomington, each departmental program seems to work very differently. IUPUI then tries to connect with each department at IUB and the senior faculty member for each of the programs. She noted that the vote will be disproportionate because it will be a full committee vote at IUB, whereas there will only be one or two people vote at IUPUI. Thus, when faculty at IUPUI goes up for promotion and tenure, the unit vote plays itself out in very different ways across each department, due to the differentiation of the promotion and tenure committee.

Dean Gonzalez addressed this idea, maintaining that there needs to be an in-depth exploration of the report and committee's recommendations before any action is taken on any of the proposed recommendations.

Murtadha noted that other policy issues regarding the issue of core campus include challenges faced by doctoral students across both campuses. These issues include challenges dealing with faculty affairs, technology and library issues. These challenges cause the graduate students to be confronted with barriers that make it difficult for them to access information and work with faculty. For example, graduate students who enroll at IUPUI but take classes at IUB are not permitted access to e-reserves through the library. This is a policy issue in regards to the ways we administer information and allow our students to have access to such information. This is not a faculty affairs issue, however. Another issue concerning the differentiation between IUPUI and IUB is the discrepancy in salary of faculty members who teach across both campuses. These faculty members are restricted to budgetary issues. This highlights another discrepancy in policy between the two campuses. Murtadha noted that there is a recommendation that there be an appointed person or persons who is familiar with both IUPUI and IUB to help address these issues because there needs to be consistency across both campuses

Sutton responded that charging a committee or a person to take on a task should not be a service requirement, but a professional requirement. The notion of tenure is clearly a faculty governance issue.

Delandshere asked if the Policy Council committee should make recommendations to endorse the recommendation in document [\(04.49\)](#).

Sutton noted that the process of creating a charge to a committee takes three steps: 1.) Send a message to the Long Range Planning Committee in appreciation of their commitment to these issues; 2.) Create an ad hoc committee to look at or begin to look at the perspectives of the promotion and tenure process on both campuses; and 3.) Charge Graduate Programs Committee to bring out from this report the issues that are related to cross-campus graduate studies and make recommendations as appropriate.

Sutton motioned to create an ad hoc committee to examine the promotion and tenure process for IUPUI faculty with representation from both campuses' Faculty Affairs Committees and former Promotion and Tenure committee members, including an ex-officio member, that begins to examine the difficulties in the promotion and tenure process across departments and campuses and make recommendations to the Policy Council to revise the promotion and tenure process for IUPUI faculty. With regard to promotion and tenure, they should also include a recommendation as to whether they are in support of or not in support of the core campus arrangement based on their findings.

The proposal was approved unanimously.

Sutton motioned to forward the Long Range Planning Committee's report [\(04.39\)](#) about the core campus issue to the Graduate Studies Committee with the charge to examine the report and to select issues relevant to their graduate studies mission or responsibility and to comment on the core campus idea.

The charge to forward the Long Range Planning Committee's report to the Graduate Studies Committee was approved unanimously.

3. Partnership and Outreach [\(final report available here\)](#)

Delandshere noted that the Partnership and Outreach Ad Hoc Committee made some recommendations for creating a Policy Council Standing Committee for Partnership and Outreach. She asked the council to think about whether this should be done or not.

Carspecken suggested that the Policy Council needs more information on this issue.

Kloosterman asked what policies this committee would deal with. He suggested that perhaps issues related to the Partnership and Outreach Ad Hoc Committee are more administrative in nature.

Sutton noted that more information is needed. Creating a standing committee is a constitutional issue. More systematic input is needed in order to do this.

Delandshere proposed to postpone the discussion regarding this issue until the next Policy Council meeting.

IV. New Business

A. Approval of Standing Committee Members [\(05.02R\)](#)

Delandshere asked if the Policy Council could approve the Standing Committee membership and noted that the Council needs to designate a student representative for Policy Council.

Thompson made a motion to approve the Standing Committee membership.

The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

B. Five year review of Dean Gonzalez [\(05.06\)](#)

Discussion was held regarding the five year review of Dean Gonzalez.

Delandshere suggested that the Policy Council form a subcommittee to formulate questions for the survey and to make recommendations for who should be surveyed. Suggestions for the survey need to be returned to the Policy Council for review before the final document is sent to the survey center.

Nominations were made to form a subgroup for the five year review survey of Dean Gonzalez. These individuals include Sutton, Carspecken, Flinders, and Morrone.

Nominations were approved and accepted.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:59 p.m.