



SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Faculty Meeting
Friday, November 1, 2019
10:00 am – Noon
Auditorium

The following is a summary of events.

Welcome – *Jessica Lester, Faculty Policy Council Chair*

J. Lester introduced herself, welcomed faculty and provided some context for the change in structure for this faculty meeting as compared to prior faculty meetings. The goal is to make these meetings true faculty meetings where issues most relevant to faculty can be shared and discussed.

Department News

Counseling and Education Psychology (CEP)- *Joel Wong*

J. Wong provided information on the work of the CEP department which brings together learning, teaching and human development to understand how experiences impact the person. Through power point slides, J. Wong reviewed enrollment numbers, highlighted the work of faculty and reviewed some of the challenges facing the department as well as future directions.

Curriculum and Instruction (C&I)- *Jeff Anderson*

J. Anderson described the department structure, including the seven program areas that make up C&I. He then reviewed slides outlining some of the department's current outreach work and signature programs, as well as some of the new ventures planned. K. Barton announced a name change for the curriculum studies program, which should aid in student recruitment. The development of several new online programs as well as a reimagining of the PhD program are underway.

Education Leadership and Policy Studies (ELPS)- *Vic Borden*

V. Borden reviewed department news on behalf of D. Danna, department chair. Slides presented outlined the structure of the department, listing the various program areas and their respective coordinators. Current degrees and certificates offered were also described. V. Borden shared recent accolades earned by faculty and other department news.

Instructional Systems Technology (IST)- *Krista Glazewski*

K. Glazewski explained what IST does and reviewed the programs and degrees the department offers. She reviewed some of the books recently published by IST faculty and went over current enrollment numbers. The Ed.D. Program is particularly prominent within the department and draws students from a variety of fields. The department is currently retooling the residential Masters program to be more studio based. K. Glazewski also reviewed some of the grants and state-level initiatives with which the department is involved. Recent awards earned by department faculty and students were shared.

Literacy, Language and Culture Education (LCLE)- *Mary Beth Hines*

M.B. Hines reviewed slides outlining the work of the department faculty. LCLE highly values faculty and student work in the community and in schools. The awards and distinctions earned by department faculty were highlighted, as were the graduate and undergraduate programs the department offers. Faculty research projects and service to editorial boards were also presented. The department recently hosted an international conference, which was very successful. Additional faculty projects were shared as was information on the new online EdD program.

Structure of School of Education Governance and other items- *Ginette Delandshere, Executive Associate Dean*

G. Delandshere discussed the meaning of shared governance and faculty governance, noting that there tends to be a range of interpretations as to the meanings of these terms. The goal of shared governance is maximum participation, acknowledging that faculty do not have ultimate authority. Shared governance is a delicate balance between faculty participation and administrative decision-making. She then reviewed the purpose and structure of the SOE Faculty Policy Council and its various committees. She emphasized that any faculty member can submit a policy proposal directly to the chair of Policy Council. Proposals must be related to the policies under the purview of the Policy Council. G. Delandshere explained that the Agenda Committee reviews proposals to determine if they have the required documentation to be brought to the full Policy Council for discussion and vote. Committees are comprised of members who volunteer, rather than being elected. The current committee structure may not be the best for meeting our current needs. This is something that will likely be reviewed by Policy Council this year. She then reviewed where on the School of Education web site faculty can find policies and Policy Council documents—under the “Faculty” tab. Committee membership lists and annual reports are also here. The strategic plan is on the web site under the tab “About the School”.

G. Delandshere then went over fall enrollment numbers. The number of GAs and AIs supported by the school per department were presented. She went on to review the enrollment numbers by program and emphasized the need to talk about crossing departmental boundaries when thinking about our programs moving forward. These conversations should begin at the department level and then lead to school-wide conversations. A final slide highlighted some of the important topics of conversations that need to be addressed by the faculty in the near future. All of the information presented by G. Delandshere can be found in the Box folder for this meeting.

Discussion

J. Danish asked if there is a way to be more thoughtful about how we look at enrollment numbers and the value of the courses across the school. It seems that important variables are not captured in these enrollment spreadsheets, such as the number of faculty involved in the various programs, the students supported by the teaching of courses, the courses that are required for licensure, and other important factors that should be considered as we examine course and program enrollments. Are there resources that could provide guidance on what data would be important to have on hand when examining our current course and program enrollments? G. Delandshere noted that department and program faculty are much more knowledgeable about this and so these conversations should begin at the program level. It is hard to imagine a way to find centralized information about this. This highlights the importance of conversations and faculty participation in these conversations. K. Wohlwend noted that getting information on the PhD and EdD students that are in programs but no longer taking courses will also be important. V. Borden noted that the bigger underlying issue is defining who is in our program. This could happen through conversations to develop some common understandings about what this data means or represents. G. Delandshere reiterated that the numbers presented here are not precise,

given the limitations of our current data gathering tools, but it does make visible some of the patterns we are experiencing at the program level. G. Gonzalez noted that the data presented is very School of Education focused. Getting centralized data from the University may be more beneficial to capture information on students and student appointments that may be located outside of the School. V. Borden highlighted the difference in perspectives between the Dean's Office and the departments. The Dean's Office is focused on what the School is processing relating to departments and students, while the department is focused on how they can assist their students, which may include assisting with finding appointments outside of the School of Education.

Structure of School of Education Budget-

Jeff Buszkiewicz, Assistant Dean of Finance and Administration

J. Buszkiewicz explained how the budget process works. In doing so he reviewed responsibility centered management (RCM), meaning the units are responsible for managing their revenue and expenditures. He described the reality of IUs approach to RCM, which is more of a hybrid model, and reviewed what the general fund is and how it is developed. Relating to tuition, the campus looks at a three-year average of credit hours at a fixed tuition rate (not a blended rate of in-state and out-of-state rates). Graduate school and summer school tuition is different in that all tuition revenue goes directly to the school. While our enrollments have decreased over the past few years, our state appropriation has increased as a percent of total revenue. In addition, while we have experienced a decrease in overall revenue, the assessments charged to the School by the University are growing, which is problematic. The School of Education has had a reduction in overall head count and credit hours, which are two of the three variables that affect assessments over the past 5 years, and so we have not been as impacted by the increase in assessment rates as much as other units have. It is difficult to determine the cost of instruction when we are in an unstable environment. The various instructor resources (AI, GA, faculty, adjunct) also complicates our ability to determine a per course cost. Department budgets are allocated based on faculty head count. 95% of our School budget is related to compensation—fee remissions, financial aid and salaries. We are currently operating at a deficit. Our goal is to continue to find areas for cost-savings to bring us closer to a break-even point for the year.

Discussion

K. Glazewski asked what part of this process is most critical for faculty to understand. J. Buszkiewicz replied that it is important to understand that we have a lot of fixed expenses. As a result, we have deep conversations whenever there is a vacancy- staff or faculty. Also, the lack of stability in enrollments makes budgeting very difficult. Discussion ensued regarding how the Foundation account fits in to this budgeting process. These funds are restricted by donor intent and largely dedicated to fellowships. Further discussion ensued about the difficulty of determining the cost of credit hours at the graduate and undergraduate level. D. Nord asked what impact the faculty have as far as generating extra dollars through research funding and funding students. Funding that can support students eases pressure from the general fund around fee remission and compensation for GAships, which is a benefit.

Dean's Discussion- Lemuel Watson

Dean Watson noted some of the upcoming important dates where critical conversations will take place. It is important to have discussions as a faculty as a whole. Please hold January 10 as a day for faculty discussion. Dean Watson thanked faculty for their comments throughout the morning and reiterated the importance of data—gathering data to make informed decisions. Governance is an issue we need to address here. The structure of our committees may be problematic for our

work moving forward. Some points of concern include that we don't seem to have a true curriculum committee. Also, there are no elections for committee membership. People express concerns that committees are busy work. Do we have mechanisms in place to address the needs of the school moving forward, such as the development of interdisciplinary programs? Merging programs and merging departments are things we need to talk about. Perhaps we need to have monthly meetings of the faculty to have these important conversations. A dean can provide examples, can guide, but the faculty need to make the decisions. How can we develop a merit review system that reflects our values and helps to build faculty up? The faculty needs to make decisions about how to get organized to get work done. This is something our committee structure should do for us. If it is not, that is a sign that we are not organized in the right way and the committee structure may need to be changed. It is important that the faculty communicate to Dean Watson where they want to go as a School moving forward.

Discussion

There was a brief discussion about how a curriculum committee would benefit the School. Dean Watson explained that a department has a curriculum committee to make sure that any course or program proposals meet all needs and are well aligned. The program would then go to a school-wide curriculum committee, which would have representation from the department and who would be knowledgeable about the other courses and programs in the School. Here potential duplications of courses or programs or other issues would be flagged before sending it on to the University level. Discussion ensued about how to change faculty governance structures without going through the mechanisms of existing faculty governance structures. Dean Watson proposed monthly meetings of the faculty where restructuring conversations could take place. Further faculty discussion addressed the importance of having multiple perspectives and voices represented and the how this might be achieved more effectively through our current Policy Council governance structure versus in a series of faculty meetings. There was a brief discussion of the process for proposing changes to Policy Council. Several faculty suggested that communication might be a needed focus area moving forward, noting that we need multiple input opportunities and enhanced communication without instituting a series of additional meetings of the full faculty. Dean Watson suggested that Policy Council take up this communication issue and develop an agenda for the January 10 all-faculty meeting that focuses on this issue. Faculty pointed out that a lot of input and documentation of needs and interests took place during the process of splitting with IUPUI. Perhaps we could look to that work to inform us moving forward without needing to go through a similar input process again. A comment was made that current efforts by the Graduate Studies Office to bring together faculty involved in EdD programs across the School have been very successful and generated new ideas. This approach of making connections across departments at the program level—more of a bottom-up approach to change—may be more successful than relying on Policy Council to develop top-down change ideas. Dean Watson agreed. The meeting closed with Dean Watson thanking faculty for their attendance and their work.

Meeting adjourned at 12:02 PM

Dates to hold for Spring 2020:

- Faculty Meeting- Talk, Reflect & Reception – Friday, January 10, noon to 4:30 pm
- Spring 2020 Faculty Meeting – Friday, March 27, 10:00 am – noon – SoE Auditorium

- All School Meeting – Friday, May 1, 10:00 am – noon – SoE Auditorium