

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
 April 30, 2003 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
 School of Education
 IUB Room 2140
 IUPUI Room 3138E

** The following are summaries of speaker contributions**

Members Present: Alexander, Barman, Bichelmeyer, Boone, Chafel, Harste, Hossler, McCarthy, Ochoa, Rosario, Sutton, Zimmerman **Dean's Staff Present:** Cummings, Gonzalez, Lambdin, Muradha. **Student Representatives:** Morris, Singh **Guest:** Jonathan Plucker, Susan Klein, Pat Stafford, Terry Mason, Trudy Banta, David Mank, Sarah Baumgart

Chafel opened the meeting by welcoming all guests present.

I. Approval of the Minutes from March 26, 2003 Meeting ([03.26M](#))

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the March 26, 2002 minutes as written. The minutes for March 26, 2003 were unanimously approved.

II. Announcements and Discussions

A. Report from Dean Gonzalez

1. State Budget

The state legislature passed the state budget last week and the governor has indicated that he will sign it. In a tight year the budget generously supports both K-12 and higher education. However, there are concerns that the budget is built on deficits which the state may not overcome. Because of this, there is still the prospect that there may be base budget cutbacks mid-cycle, pending the progress of the state's economy.

The Trustees will be meeting next week to finalize tuition and salary policies. These decisions will have implications for all of us. After the Trustees' meeting on May 9, we expect to have planning parameters for the School of Education budget.

2. Commitment to Excellence

The Commitment to Excellence process, which utilizes the special assessment on new students, is moving forward. In Bloomington this investment is guided by the Academic Priorities which were released in January. Proposals were submitted for new initiatives. A proposal by the School of Education is among those that will be forwarded to the trustees. The final decision on funding is expected during the Trustee's May 9 meeting. The proposal calls for a partnership between the School of Education, the Cognitive Sciences Program, and Informatics. An important element of this proposal would be aimed at enhancing the learning sciences in K-16. Thomas Duffy, Sasha Barab, and Jonathan

Plucker, as well as the many others who have been working on this proposal, are to be commended for their work.

There is also a call for proposals in Indianapolis for the use of their Strategic Funds. Murtadha spoke to this stating that the School of Education submitted two proposals in partnership with Liberal Arts and Sciences which look at strengthening the content focus of the teacher education programs and improving community engagement. An additional aspect of the proposals is the projected development of an institute on performance assessment. The deadline for the proposals was April 21, 2003. The recognitions should be named sometime next week.

3. P-16 Initiative

Last year President Brand appointed a University wide committee to make recommendations for creating a P-16 Seamless System of Education in the state. The committee has submitted a final draft report that makes recommendations for enhancing pre-service and in-service teacher preparation, forming intense partnerships with K-12 both within and across the University, and facilitating the transitions from high school to college. Pending the committee's final review, the report will be forwarded to President Bepko. Dean Gonzalez will be facilitating conversations about the proposed recommendations at a policy seminar for the Board of Trustees on P-16 issues next week.

There is also a task force that is working on a response to the Indiana Higher Education Commission's proposal for a comprehensive plan for higher education that includes components of the P-16 initiative. The task force's response has received positive feedback and is now being circulated to the presidents of the other public universities throughout the state. Jonathan Plucker, Edward St. John, and Bill Plater have been instrumental in guiding this discussion.

This year, the General Assembly passed legislation asking that there be a formal process to review articulation between community colleges and main and regional campuses of universities. This is going to require us to review all of our programs and look carefully at how they articulate with courses that students can take at community colleges or other institutions. The intent is not to compromise quality, but to be open-minded and objectively examine how our requirements can be mapped to other IU campuses and to community colleges. All public institutions of higher education have to engage this process as part of the new legislation.

III. Agenda Committee

A. Allocation of Faculty time ([03.22R](#))

Chafel opened by reviewing the discussion on allocation of faculty time that was presented during the March 26, 2003 meeting. A revised policy that addressed issues raised at the March 26th meeting was the basis for the discussion.

Bichelmeyer clarified that this policy would only be pertinent for IUB faculty while having implications for IUPUI. Dean Gonzalez added that the two Core Campuses should not have drastically different policies.

Plucker, chair of the IUB Faculty/Budgetary Affairs Committee reviewed the additional changes that were proposed in the revised policy. The main revision was the change from 5% to 10% for service allocation for tenure probationary faculty. Definitions were also clarified throughout the document, specifically in how the changes relate to promotion and tenure procedures.

Zimmerman stressed that “service” should specifically address national/international and state affiliations as well – not just campus and School related service. Cummings supported this assertion because promotion and tenure committees usually critically review the guidelines, word for word, when making determinations for promotion and tenure. If national/international and state service is not stated in the policy, then others may interpret affiliation with these groups as not being necessary or important.

Bichelmeyer moved that the document be accepted with the addition of the sentences: “This policy addresses campus service. It is assumed that state, national, and international service is also important and it is expected that the tenure probationary faculty member would discuss such commitments with the department or program chair and mentor.”

Hossler seconded the motion. The motion was passed with 11 in favor and 2 abstentions.

B. Plagiarism ([03.25](#))

Chafel reviewed the discussion of the last meeting regarding whether or not the School of Education needs a uniform policy on plagiarism. During the last Agenda Committee meeting, it was decided that the issue of plagiarism would be forwarded to the Committee on Teaching for further consideration and subsequent reporting back to the Council. The Committee on Teaching was chosen because of its involvement with both undergraduate and graduate level education and teaching initiatives.

Discussion followed after the announcement that the Agenda Committee decided to forward this item to the Committee on Teaching. Lambdin stressed that the majority of problems dealing with plagiarism that occur within the School are not reported to Dean of Students as was evident in the figures Pam Freeman presented to the council at the last meeting, meaning that faculty are not reporting these incidences as they should. Lambdin stressed that reported students do not get thrown out of school or drastically disciplined. In fact, the faculty member who reports the incident can recommend the course of action that should be taken. The purpose of reporting is to have documentation so if there are multiple incidences of plagiarism then appropriate sanctions can be made.

Harste reiterated that punishment was not the perceived objective of the last meeting’s conversation. Rather, the objective was education about the issue of plagiarism to students as a means of prevention. Harste questioned the purpose of sending this issue to the Committee on Teaching instead of acting on the topic now.

Cummings suggested that the Dean’s Office could send out an email highlighting the topics that have been discussed during the Council meetings and directing faculty to pertinent links for their incorporation in course materials. The message would also

include that the issue on plagiarism was forwarded to the Committee on Teaching for further deliberation.

Lambdin noted that on May 12, 2003, there is going to be a break-out session on plagiarism for all new associate instructors and that all instructors are welcome to attend.

Chafel closed by reiterating the importance of this issue as was evident in the discussion that ensued today as well as during last month's meeting.

IV. New Business

A. Committee Annual Reports (Question & Answers)

Chafel explained that due to time restrictions, the review of committee annual reports would be in the format of a question and answer session.

1. Dean Gonzalez questioned the degree to which the Long Range Planning Committee was able to address the issue of School organization and optimal structural effectiveness for achieving the goals of the School's Strategic Plan; this question being charged to the committee by the Policy Council at the beginning of the year. One component to this question was the consideration of size of departments. Looking at the Committee's report, it appeared as though the driving question became size; however, size was not intended to be the only or even the major component addressed.

David Mank, Long Range Planning Committee chair, responded in that size by itself was not the only source of investigation, but was only one of the considerations in the conversations about organizational structure. The Committee aimed at identifying current strengths, limitations, and associated factors of the current structure that contribute toward obtaining the goals of the School as defined in the Strategic Plan. The committee did not discover a clear-cut need to improve in any specific way. Instead, many anecdotal recommendations were made for general improvement. There are no official recommendations by the Committee at this point.

Dean Gonzalez presented to the Council the question of whether or not this issue should be further discussed. Is the School of Education optimally organized for the future?

Discussion followed supporting the notion that organization and structure need to be evaluated in light of the current state of the economy, recommendations made by the NCATE Review, and the potential addition of new faculty lines. McCarthy emphasized that the structure and organization of the School mediates how everyone functions. Lambdin additionally stressed that departmental structure is complex and can minimize or maximize effectiveness.

The need for data collection and analysis on the current structure was emphasized in the conversations. Alexander suggested looking at psychometric characteristics of department organization by asking the departments questions like "Who do you work with frequently?" and "Who do you rarely work with?" Alexander and Bichelmeyer also suggested looking at other schools' organizational structures and effectiveness for

recommendations. Bichelmeyer further proposed looking at schools that have recently undergone major re-organization and seeing how they went about such change and to what degree the changes were of benefit. McCarthy recommended gathering data from departments to see what they are currently accomplishing and with what resources to determine if resources are being fairly and equitably distributed.

Zimmerman and Hossler offered the idea that perhaps now is not a good time to further investigate this issue because there was a sense that energy was low among faculty after the NCATE Review and revising the constitution tasks for the Strategic Goals. Singh suggested that perhaps the Faculty Retreat in the fall would be a good forum to continue this discussion.

McCarthy made a motion that the Council examine the issue of appropriate structure and organization of the School, and that the issue be referred to the Agenda Committee to identify the group who would conduct the review.

Bichelmeyer seconded the motion. The motion was passed with 5 in favor, 3 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

Trudy Banta suggested that there be at some point a progress report on the Strategic Plan, and that from this progress report a plan for re-organization may come.

Zimmerman stressed that the recommendations by the Long Range Planning Committee be further considered and that it be determined if the implications of these recommendations point toward future reorganization of the School. She emphasized that the Committee's recommendations not be thrown out.

2. Bichelmeyer also reminded the Council that last year an ad hoc committee was charged with looking at Core Campus issues and that this committee did not submit an annual report. She further recommended that there be a follow-up on this committee.

Chafel noted that this issue should be addressed at the following meeting and that a representative of that committee would be asked to be present at the meeting.

B. Revisions of Annual Performance Review Policies ([03.29](#))

Jonathan Plucker introduced this item for discussion. He explained that the Faculty Affairs Committee is in the process of revising policies at the request of the Dean of Faculties Office. Last year the Committee updated Promotion and Tenure Criteria. This year, the Committee has revised the Merit Review and Allocation of Faculty Time policies. Questions addressing policies that lead to inequity were discussed, keeping in mind that many of the policies cannot be separated because they impact each other. Most of this year was spent gathering input.

The results of the data gathering yielded some surprising results. First it is required by the state to differentiate on merit. Additionally, this year, as it has been the last two years, it is expected that the Trustees are going to recommend another category of the top 10% of exemplary. This decision has not been made by the faculty in the past; it has been made by the Dean's Office in consultation with the department chairs. The Committee decided

to look at this issue in light of ethical responsibilities, public accountability, and faculty participation. There is a lack of consistency on documentation required for faculty review each year. The Committee discussed what the minimum, basic information that a faculty committee would need to make educated determinations about merit categories. The document provided to the Council outlined these major changes in this system.

One major change is to formalize the top 10% “Outstanding” category to make sure that faculty have a voice in determining who that 10% should be. Another change is for the “Satisfactory” category to be changed from the current 2 to 5% to 10%. This has been recommended so that those marginally in the “Meritorious” category do not continuously be bumped up as is usually the case.

New faculty members automatically get the meritorious rating. This may not be fair and may be penalizing new faculty in some ways because they are new. The recommended change is to state that Meritorious be the minimum rating for new faculty members.

Plucker concluded that changes to the old document were necessary and overdue. The proposed document more closely matches practices compared to the current document without proposing radical changes.

Alexander pointed out that another major change is that all departments will be required to use the faculty review committee. In practice, most departments do this already. Cummings added that it is important to take the secrecy out of the process and for new faculty to participate in the review of their peers so that they see the range of work and can develop appreciations. Murtadha supported this idea, stating that IUPUI does this and the faculty have found it to be a very valuable experience.

Chafel and Cummings reflected on the range of possibilities that departments have for comprising the committees. Cummings noted that one department actually asks individuals from outside of the department to sit on the committee.

Alexander motioned to accept the document as proposed. Boone seconded the motion.

Dean Gonzalez questioned the need for faculty members to have publications in order to receive a satisfactory rating because it assumes that everyone has a research assignment which is not always the case. There may be faculty who are assigned 100% to teaching.

Plucker agreed that this consideration was not accounted for in the document and that a revision would be made.

Sutton strongly objected to the numerical suggestion for how rankings should be distributed.

Plucker replied that Committee members raised similar concerns with the percentages when drafting the document. However, in practice the percentages are needed to provide consistent guidelines to all of the departments. Otherwise, each department would have different definitions for each of the categories and would allow the possibility for departments to rate everyone as exemplary based on their department’s definitions.

Sutton motioned to postpone the motion due to time limitations. Zimmerman seconded. The motion was passed with 7 in favor and 1 opposed.

* Another meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, May 7, 2003 at 1:00pm to continue with the agenda items that were not discussed at this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00pm.