

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
MARCH 23, 2005, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
School of Education
IUB Room 2140
IUPUI Room 3138E

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

Members Present: Berghoff, Carspecken, Delandshere, Lester, McClain, Stachowski, Thompson. **Dean’s Staff Present:** Brown, Gonzalez, Kloosterman, Lambdin, Murtadha. **Staff Representative:** Wyatt. **Alternates:** Mason, Rosario, Whiston **Visitors** Cummings, Mueller, Osgood.

I. Announcements

Delandshere noted the passing of Kipchoge Kirkland. A minute of silence was offered to his memory.

II Dean’s Report

Dean Gonzalez reported that budget hearings are underway in Indianapolis. There does not appear to be any changes in the discussion, and it appears that the state appropriations for next year will remain the same as this year. The assessment of Tom Healy, the Vice-President of Governmental Affairs, is that any state appropriation increase is unlikely. Budgetary discussions continue this week, so it is possible that things could change, but presently the state budget picture is not encouraging.

Dean Gonzalez reported on the Deans’ Meeting held on March 22, 2005. At the meeting the chair of the Bloomington Faculty Council (BFC) presented a copy of a proposed policy on criminal background checks for faculty that will be considered by the University Faculty Council (UFC) at their meeting on April 12. The Bloomington campus has been operating under the assumption that the law requires criminal background checks on new faculty appointments. Questions were raised during earlier discussions with the trustees as to whether these checks were required by law. The UFC was not able to give an opinion on the legal requirement. Because of the uncertainty regarding the legal imperative of these checks, the BFC drafted the policy distributed to the Policy Council members. The new policy suggests that background checks be conducted only on an as-needed basis, and that schools can have exceptions to the policy when there are reasons to conduct checks. The law requires background checks on people who work with “vulnerable populations,” which is usually

interpreted to include children. Current policy does not assume that all faculty members work with vulnerable populations and leaves options open. Dean Gonzalez wants the Policy Council members to be aware of the policy because there are School of Education faculty members who work with children, while other faculty members may not. The School of Education may need to have a dual policy system where faculty members who work with children will need background checks but those who will not need them. The School of Education could adopt a policy that all faculty members have criminal background checks, but that would put the school out of alignment with what other campus units are doing. According to Ted Miller, the UFC and the BFC have not consulted with the policy committees. The policy looks reasonable, but it may have specific implications for the School of Education. So the Policy Council may want to transmit input to the BFC to give to the UFC, but it will have to happen before the UFC meeting on April 12, when it will be discussed. Dean Gonzalez acknowledged that there are questions about how accurate these background checks are, but the current issue is whether or not they should be required.

Stachowski asked if the policy would apply to graduate students.

Lambdin answered that the School of Education does not require background checks but that the schools they will be working with might. The faculty council has advised using this arrangement so that the School of Education is not in possession of that information. Rather, that information goes directly to the schools.

Dean Gonzalez continued, informing the Council that the Indianapolis campus has interpreted the policy to mean that background checks will be conducted, so they are moving forward with background checks there. Bloomington has asked if this is required by law but has not been able to get a definitive answer. Purdue is not conducting checks. The question to the council is: if the policy is adopted, what implications are there? Do we have faculty who work with children when children are generally considered to be vulnerable populations? If the policy is adopted, then the school will have to decide what to do.

The other issue is that the UFC will be considering a general education requirement for the University. It is expected that any guidelines passed will become recommendations to the campuses to adopt as general education requirements. If adopted they will provide considerable latitude to individual academic units, but they do set some parameters. The Policy Council should consider what is being recommended and transmit any suggestions or concerns to the UFC before their next meeting on April 12. IUPUI has expressed strong objections to these recommended guidelines because they use the principles of undergraduate education as the

framework for general education requirements. They are concerned that the recommended guidelines will override this. If adopted by UFC then all campuses would use this as their basic framework for general education.

Dean Gonzalez expressed surprise that the policy councils have not been consulted in the formulation of these guidelines even though the UFC has said that they want input from the different campuses.

Lambdin, who serves on the committee that is drafting the guidelines, commented that the guidelines are still changing. There is still much debate in the committee about different aspects of the guidelines. Additionally, there is wording in the guidelines that allows schools to reject them. It is unclear how much further the guidelines will change before they go forward, and it is uncertain how much flexibility the guidelines allow. Lambdin said that the guidelines are being developed for three reasons: 1) to establish a university-wide identity for what students get from a college education; 2) to specify what a broad, liberal education is; and 3) to facilitate transfer between campuses and identify courses that would be offered on all campuses. Lambdin pointed out that many problems would still remain fulfilling requirements for different programs.

Dean Gonzalez mentioned that President Herbert has said that an IU degree should reflect a broad general education and charged the UFC to look into what that might be. He suggested that comments about the guidelines could be directed to Lambdin, and she agreed to take them to the committee.

Mason said that the guidelines were given their first reading at the BFC meeting on March 22 and have not had widespread discussion.

Dean Gonzalez asked if the UFC would be ready to act on the guidelines on April 12. Mason said that they would not.

II. Approval of Minutes

A. Approval of the Minutes from February 16, 2005 ([05.30](#)), Policy Council meeting

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the minutes as written. The minutes for February 16, 2005, were unanimously approved.

- B. Delandshere announced that the spring faculty meeting would be April 8, 2005 at 11:15. She also announced the search for the Armstrong and Jacobs chairs for next year. Kloosterman said that the final composition of the search committee is not set, but he hoped that the process will be completed and the chairs decided by the third week of April.

III. Old Business

- A. Draft Statement: Regarding appointment to Graduate Faculty Status and Endorsement to Direct and/or Chair Dissertations. ([05.32](#))

Osgood reported that a draft statement was prepared by a subcommittee, presented to the committee and revised to reflect the comments of the committee. The key issue is ensuring the protection of junior faculty member time to engage in the research needed to earn promotion and tenure. The policy developed respects that chairing dissertation committees can offer opportunities to junior faculty members and that differences exist between programs and departments. Osgood summarized the proposed policy as: junior faculty members before their third year review should be exempt from chairing and directing dissertations, and upon completion of the third year review a person could be considered for endorsement to chair and direct dissertations if it is agreeable to the faculty member, the department chair and the majority of the department faculty. However, under extraordinary situations endorsements can be given earlier if all parties agree. Osgood commented that the statement leaves as much decision-making as possible within the departments. He suggested one wording change in line five of point three of the document: “In either case,” to “Normally, however,”.

Further discussion pointed out that the statement does not address junior faculty chairing advisory committees. Osgood answered that the sense of the committee was that junior faculty should not, in most cases, but that departments could define “extraordinary circumstances.”

There was discussion about chairing program committees. Currently, all tenure-track faculty members can chair program committees but an endorsement is needed to chair or direct a dissertation. It was suggested that wording be included to distinguish between program and dissertation committees.

There was a suggestion to include wording to define the procedure by which departments develop their endorsement policies and those department policies are reviewed. It was suggested that a fifth item be added to the policy stating that departmental policies would be reviewed by the Graduate School and sent to the Policy Council for approval.

It was pointed out that only Ph.D. dissertations were addressed by the policy and suggested that language be added to include Ed.D. dissertations.

A motion was put forth and seconded to accept the draft statement with the recommendation to include additional language including Ed.D. dissertations in the policy and defining the departmental approval process.

The motion passed unanimously.

B. Responses to Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Promotion and Tenure Procedures ([05.33](#))

Delandshere informed the council that the report had been sent to the ELPS, CEP and C&I departments for comments and those comments were included in this document ([05.33](#)). She pointed out that there were three areas of disagreement in the responses: composition of committee of five faculty including representation from both campuses; the participation of committee members in conversations and discussions with regard to cases in the department; whether to vote in all three areas or have an overall rating.

Murtadha informed the council that the report will be reviewed at the IUPUI School of Education faculty meeting and that their comments will be sent to the Ad Hoc Committee. After discussion it was decided that the responses to the report should be sent back to the Ad Hoc Committee for consideration and synthesis into a set of final recommendations.

IV. New Business

A. Social Studies Development Center (SSDC) re-designation and name change ([05.35](#))

Mason summarized the reasons for the proposed name change: changes in funding necessitate expanding the focus of the center in order to open up new funding opportunities; the desire to continue to focus on social studies; the lack of a single contact point dedicated to international activities within the School of Education. Mason proposes changing the name to the Center for Social Studies and Transnational Education to reflect a transnational perspective. Any name change will eventually have to go to both the Board of Trustees and the policy council of the SSDC for approval. The name change and shift in focus has the support of the International Programs Office.

A motion was made and seconded to support the re-designation and name change. The motion passed unanimously.

- B. Degree name change from Educational Psychology to Learning and Developmental Sciences ([05.36](#)), and Proposal for a Ph.D. in School Psychology ([05.37](#))

Delandshere reported that with the addition of Learning Sciences to the Educational Psychology Department it has been necessary to rename one of the programs from Educational Psychology to Learning and Developmental Sciences. However, the name change has created a need to offer a Ph.D degree in School Psychology. Delandshere pointed out that the new program is the same as the former Educational Psychology program.

Mueller explained the new program arrangement. There would be three degree programs under the new system compared to two before.

Cummings mentioned that it is important to have the word “psychology” in the degree name because some state certification boards require a doctoral degree in psychology for certification or licensure.

Mueller pointed out that the name change is contingent upon the new degree program being approved.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Ph.D. program in School Psychology. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the name change of Educational Psychology to Learning and Developmental Sciences. The motion passed unanimously.

Dean Gonzalez suggested that the department create a document that outlines the programs and the various tracks to present to the Board of Trustees and to the Indiana Higher Education Commission as they approach those boards to gain approval for the changes. He also asked which degree the students currently enrolled in Educational Psychology would receive upon graduation. Mueller answered that these students would be able to choose which degree they receive since the degrees are identical. Cummings suggested that that arrangement be included in future written proposals as approval for the changes is pursued.

- C. Professional Leave for Clinical Faculty ([05.38](#))

Kloosterman informed the council that the professional leave policy was based on the sabbatical policy for tenure-track faculty and is essentially similar. Applications for professional leave would be made within the

School of Education. Recommendations would be made by a school committee and would be approved by the Dean or by the Executive Associate Dean based on the committee recommendation. There is language in the document about the types of research that is supported, and the actual application form is slightly different to reflect the fact that clinical faculty members are not involved in full-time teaching research.

Stachowski, a clinical faculty member, voiced her support for the policy.

Murtadha reported that IUPUI also supported the policy.

Kloosterman pointed out that the policy was developed because there is no policy currently in place for clinical faculty. Although no clinical faculty members are eligible for professional leave at the present, in a few years some will be. Professional leave would be funded from the School of Education budget the same way that sabbaticals are funded.

Delandshere expressed reservations about voting on the new policy without having more discussion within the departments. She pointed out that other schools have not instituted such a policy, and she would like to have a strong endorsement from the faculty before voting.

It was moved and seconded to send the Professional Leave for Clinical Faculty document ([05.38](#)) to each department for comment. The motion passed with one abstention.

D. Policy Recommendation for Faculty Salary Equity Reviews. ([05.39](#))

Stachowski noted that salary inequities can occur relatively quickly and that a formal review process is needed. She reported that the proposed policy called for a limited review during the 2004-2005 academic year and another limited review in 6 years. There will be an extensive review during 2007-2008. The result is that every three years there will be some kind of review, either limited or extensive.

Dean Gonzalez pointed out that the meaning of salary equity is potentially confusing and gave examples where differences in salary should not be considered inequitable. He contrasted these examples with inequitable situations such as systemic gender or racial discrimination. He also suggested that merit performances or counter-offers can lead to unequal salaries but not necessarily systematic inequity, and hoped that very clear guidelines will be written into the review process.

Stachowski answered that issues like merit reviews and counter-offers are considered in the reviews, but that the committee did not want to take on the responsibility of developing those guidelines. She suggested that the

guidelines could be written by the committee that conducts the extensive review in 2007-2008.

Dean Gonzalez informed the council that the review was initiated by the Faculty Affairs Committee and that the committee decided on its own to propose a formal review policy and schedule. He suggested that the policy recommendation be sent to the departments for discussion.

It was decided that the policy be sent to the departments for discussion and that feedback be sent to the Policy Council and then back to the Faculty Affairs Committee if necessary.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 P.M.