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Members Present: Shirley Aamidor, Lora Bailey, Matt Benus, Jim Burg, Sau Chang, Hope Smith Davis, Dan Doerger, Gerardo Gonzalez, Linda Houser, Rob Kunzman, David Lindquist, Marvin Lynn, Luise McCarty, Pat Rogan, Jill Shedd, Terri Swim, Annela Teemant, Chris Walcott

Guest: TJ Rivard

Approval of April 5th, 2013 minutes

Dan moved for approval and Annela seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

IPFW Program Options

Elementary Program – Education Policy Option

Terri described that the faculty were working to address the needs of students who are challenged to meet the basic skills requirements, and provide programming for students interested in education policy and/or agencies, rather than the classroom. The program includes child development, a minor in education policy and an additional academic focus. The program includes two internships, the second one being longer in the agency in which they might be interested.

The degree will be the BS in elementary education with a tract in education policy; it is a non-certificate degree. There was the question whether this represents “substantive” changes and thus would have to go to CHE. IU East has made a similar change, though the option does include some methods courses. Gerardo suggested they may want to double-check with CHE.

Shirley asked about “C-”as the minimum standard. Terri stated that the campus registrar stated that C- had to be the standard; given that C- is the standard for transfer students.

Sau asked what the differences are between elementary and secondary, given that the programs are non-certification. Terri indicated that the faculty was not sure re: the need for the secondary option, but decided to go ahead with it.

Linda asked how many credit hours would be in education, given that education is the major. Jim noted that public policy (SPEA) is a part of the school of education at IPFW; the College of Education and Public Policy. Members raised concerns that the program is not presented clearly; that the “major” is not clear and whether there are enough credit hours in education to be a “major” in education.

Terri noted that given the discussion re: the IU East program in the spring, including methods courses and not being “licensable,” the faculty was very thoughtful about not including any methods courses. Thus, the faculty chose the education policy option.
Hope moved to approve, and Dan seconded. Six voted in favor, and three opposed.

**Secondary Program – Education Policy Option**

Gerardo asked whether there were additional questions re: this option. Chris questioned that this option has 21 elective credits, and Matt noted that these electives could be at the 100- to 400-levels. Hope suggested that the electives include reference to a number of credits at the 300-/400-levels. Gerardo suggested that there be a definition/identification of “core” courses as the “major.” Gerardo felt that it is a stretch to consider this a degree in secondary education. Dan moved to approve the program and Hope seconded. Five voted in favor and five opposed.

Chris suggested a friendly amendment to the proposed, to modify statement 3 on the “second focus options” page; to re-define the Major course work required, including the options of electives. The second focus should be a cohesive set of courses. Six voted in favor of the program with these modifications in definition, and three in opposition.

**Statewide Articulation Pathways**

**Update re: P-12 Special Education Articulation Pathway**

Jill provided a context for the overall process and the work in the fall re: P-12 special education. The articulation pathway effort is in response to legislation that mandated such pathways defined by “learning outcomes,” rather than specific courses to facilitate students’ studying at community colleges and transferring to any state four-year institution. The first statewide meeting was in the fall and included development of an articulation pathway for P-12 special education.

**Review of Proposed IU Elementary Learning Outcomes**

Jill reviewed the documentation presented, noting that it is detailed covering the Indiana academic content standards for elementary education. Given that elementary candidates take most if not all of their academic content in their first two years of study, it seemed appropriate to include the academic content standards as a part of the elementary articulation pathway. TJ noted that the articulation is only for those students who earn an A.S. in education from Ivy Tech. If a candidate earns the A.S. and transfers to a public institution, then the “guarantee” is that the candidates could earn the elementary education degree. This does not take effect until fall 2015, so there will remain a “gap” for current students.

TJ clarified that programs can identify specific content abilities, such that if an A.S. graduate does not meet those abilities, then an institution could require additional content coursework, but the institution could only require 60 credit hours.

TJ noted the legislation does include language re: the assessment of students who take the articulation pathway.

Members raised a number of questions. One question related to “tracks” within the A.S. Education degree. Should the candidate change her/his mind (special education into elementary education), does the articulation agreement stand? TJ recommended that we ensure that such language (language re: potential changes in majors) is in the agreement, for presently, the legislation and current understanding refer only to one education articulation pathway. It was recommended that we clarify that there should be three education pathways – special education, elementary and secondary.
As a practical matter, faculty may need to consider requiring the Pearson Elementary CORE assessment for admission into teacher education.

Members were asked to review the documentation and advise Jill and/or TJ of changes to take to the statewide meeting this spring.

**IUPUC Elementary Program Revision**

Chris noted that the campus brought the program to the Education Council in the spring, and the Council asked that the campus revise the programs. The spring program allowed for dual certification in 120 credit hours. The revision being presented is that field experiences now are credit bearing, and candidates who choose dual certification, instead of a concentration, would have a 126 credit hour program. Members approved unanimously the dual certification programs.

**IUK Change to Education Program Revisions**

During last meeting, the Council objected to the use of all W505 courses, suggested the inclusion of a basic skills requirement, and specific content methods. The proposal for this meeting took these suggestions into account. Pat questioned the lack of a general methods education course. Shirley suggested that the J500 and S503 courses cover many of those topics. Shirley is happy to go back to the course inventory to identify a secondary methods course. This proposal was tabled and an additional course will be identified for inclusion in the program.

**IUB Education Studies Minor Revision**

This is not a change to the requirements of the minor, but more of a marketing change. This is, in some respects, simply an advising tool. Shirley motioned for approval, and Luise seconded. The revision was approved unanimously.

**IUSB MS in Educational Leadership Proposal**

The program was approved in 2009, but ICHE had questions about the proposal. It was tabled on the campus, and now the faculty is hoping to move it forward. This master’s is the only option in the region with a focus on educational leadership. The revisions from what the Council approved in 2009 address the issues raised by the CHE.

There are two courses in remonstrance as matching courses for the South Bend campus.

Currently, candidates at South Bend are only able to get leadership certification through the existing elementary and secondary master’s, but those master’s programs have been revised. Candidates have suggested that these pathways do not meet their needs, thus the faculty are pursuing the new master’s degree.

Shirley moved to approve the proposal and Luise second. The proposal was approved unanimously.
Discussion re: On-line Education Courses – Courses with/without field experiences and Methods Courses

Sau mentioned this issue with respect to F200. At IUS, the course requires elementary and secondary school experiences, but the on-line course only requires community service hours; which are fewer and not necessarily in schools. Lora suggested that the issue could be resolved through communications between the individual campuses. Matt gave another example of concern. H340 as an intensive writing course, and he wondered if the on-line course includes the intensive writing requirements.

Linda noted the policy on all campuses that the last 30 credit hours need to be taken on the campus awarding the degree. This could cover many of the methods courses. David similarly noted that there always has been the expectation that methods are taken on the home campus. He did question who is supervising field experiences of on-line courses.

Gerardo noted that with a master course inventory individual campuses cannot offer unique versions of courses in the inventory. Gerardo noted that this is an advising issue; if the on-line course does not meet the campus requirement, the advisor should talk with the candidates.

Chris noted an accreditation issue, given that many key assessments are associated with methods courses. Hope noted a similar issue; key artifacts at specific benchmarks. Annela suggested that issues re: on-line courses be added to advising sheets.

Marvin proposed that the Council have discussions about the on-line education course offerings, and come to some shared understandings.

There was discussion about the offering of graduate on-line degree programs. The current policy of only one IU campus can offer a degree on-line is an IU President policy not just the School of Education. The university administration is trying to address the revenue-sharing issues. Members noted that there are equity issues across the campuses, and they are real issues.

The meeting adjourned at 12:45p.m.
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