MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
December 8, 2010
1:00-3:00 p.m.
IUB – Room 2140
IUPUI – Room 3138E

**What follows is a summary of speaker contributions**

Members Present: G. Delandshere, R. Helfenbein, P. Kloosterman, S. Martinez, T. Ochoa, J. Rosario, A. Teemant, E. Tillema, J. Wong; Alternate Members Present: none; Dean’s Staff Present: J. Cummings, G. Gonzalez, R. Sherwood; Staff Representatives Present: none; Student Members Present: G. Serna; Guests Present: S. Eckes, S. White

I. Welcome & Approval of Minutes
P. Kloosterman put forth a motion to approve the minutes from the November 17, 2010 Policy Council meeting (11.18M), which was seconded by T. Ochoa. The minutes were unanimously approved.

II. Announcements and Discussion

a. Dean’s Report:

With regard to budget, there is no news about any additional cutbacks to come. The state is slowly starting to grow its tax base, and we are hopeful that there will be no further cutbacks in next year’s budget. Last year, the state eliminated the funding allotted to IU for rehabilitation and repair of our infrastructure. As a result, the Provost has announced that 25% of the university’s unbudgeted income will be reserved for rehabilitation and repair, and will be distributed campus-wide, rather than on a unit-by-unit basis.

On the policy front, Governor Daniels will be presenting his education initiatives at an educational round table meeting in Indianapolis today. It is likely that the evaluation of school leaders and teachers will be among those priorities. In keeping with this, Superintendent Tony Bennett will be presenting a growth model approach to teacher evaluation at the round table meeting. Under this model, student achievement data will be gathered and their progress followed over several years; a statistic derived from these data, to indicate student growth in achievement, will be used to evaluate teachers and administrators in schools attended by those students. Another component of the Governor’s agenda is the expansion of school choice. The Governor is a strong supporter of charter schools, and his proposal may also include the advancement of school vouchers.

Rob Helfenbein brought up that there was also been talk about linking growth model data back to teacher preparation; that is, evaluating Schools of Education using student achievement data. These data may also eventually be used for the accreditation of Schools of Education, in that teacher preparation programs may be required to show evidence of the growth produced by their graduates in order to be reaccredited. Dean Gonzalez confirmed that this discussion is taking place, and that the Indiana Department of Education is looking at the model currently in place in Tennessee and Colorado, where similar models are already being implemented. Bob Sherwood stated that the School of Education report card is available on the Tennessee Department of Education website, and uses Value
Added and Achievement score data in reading and math. Discussion on some of the specific findings, merits and drawbacks of the Tennessee report ensued.

Dean Gonzalez also commented on the recent incidents of racial discrimination on the Bloomington campus, including anti-Semitic incidents of vandalism and the attack on a group of Asian students. The Committee on Diversity has drafted a statement to be released to faculty in the coming weeks. The statement will encourage faculty to engage students in discussions about the seriousness of these incidents, as well as how to promote diversity and combat discrimination in our community.

b. Review of Bob Sherwood as Associate Dean of Research:

Bob Sherwood, Associate Dean of Research and Development, is up for review this year. The members of the review committee are Gretchen Butera (chair), Terry Mason, Bobbie Partenheimer, Joshua Smith and Vasti Torres. The committee has prepared a list of questions to address, and may generate additional questions during the review process. A report based on the review is due to the Agenda Committee by April 13, 2011.

c. Update on Guidelines for Long-Term Contracts for Academic Specialists (10.35R):

Last academic year, the Committee on Faculty Affairs was asked to come up with guidelines for long-term contracts for Academic Specialists. The proposed guidelines were approved by Policy Council last year, however, the Committee was asked by central campus to add specific dates to the proposal. This year’s Committee has made the requested changes, and Terri Ochoa brought the proposal back to Policy Council for their review.

Ginette Delandshere asked about the role of the Promotion & Tenure Committee in reviewing academic specialists. It is difficult to review cases for academic specialists because the members of the P&T Committee are not always familiar with the job requirements of faculty with the academic specialist rank. T. Ochoa stated that the directors of the centers where the academic specialists primarily work would be involved in the review process and provide more detail about the specific role of the person being evaluated.

The proposed guidelines are only applicable to IUB, as IUPUI does not use the faculty rank of Academic Specialist in the same way that IUB does. Academic Specialists at IUPUI are typically hired as part of grant-funded projects with specific start and end dates; therefore, the issue of long-term contracts does not arise in these positions. Rob Helfenbein confirmed this with Cliff Robinson, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at IUPUI.

Result: The proposal will be changed to state that the candidate, and not the mentor-guide, prepares the dossier, and will be forwarded to central campus for their reconsideration.

III. Old Business

a. Diversity Topic

Gabriel Serna, one of the graduate student representatives on Policy Council, was asked by G. Delandshere to speak to graduate students regarding their perspective on issues of diversity in the School of Education. G. Serna presented the results to Policy Council. The questions and issues raised
by graduate students, and the discussion among the members of Policy Council on these issues, are summarized below:

**What is the School of Education doing already?** Students were particularly interested to know whether there are any active recruitment measures in place for students from diverse backgrounds, such as visiting other universities. There is currently a recruitment model in place in SPEA where a representative travels to other schools that would potentially send Master’s students to the program. Students felt that if the School of Education wanted to focus on increasing diversity in the student population, we would need to direct our efforts towards potential students from Indianapolis or from outside of the state. T. Ochoa reminded faculty of the opportunity to be a part of the discussion session with the speaker from the University of Louisville. The session will consist of brainstorming and discussing ideas for active recruitment for underrepresented students.

**How does the School of Education define diversity?** Who do we include in our definition of “diverse” students? We should consider whether our definition includes students from Hispanic/Latino, Native American, Asian and other cultural/ethnic backgrounds, as well as LGBT students. T. Ochoa also mentioned that our broadened definition of diversity should also include students with disabilities. We should also consider whether we are accessing students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds who might not have the ability to be a part of the IU community without direct efforts to facilitate their inclusion at IUB. We should think about what we can do to cultivate relationships with lower income students in the Bloomington area. Annela Teemant suggested that one way to target recruitment efforts towards lower-income students may be to hold a college career day similar to what has previously been done at IUPUI. Students from the local feeder high school, George Washington Community, and other schools were recruited to attend the career day. Pat Rogan and Mary Cole were among the faculty who were involved in this event.

**How can we address diversity in our curriculum?** G. Serna also asked graduate students whether they felt their curricula were diverse in their approach, and if there are efforts to incorporate diverse points of view in the course content. Students varied in their responses to these questions, and raised the issue of where and how to add more diverse content to the curriculum. One idea may be to broaden the definition of diversity within existing courses on working with diverse students. It was noted that there are currently no courses offered that cover sexual orientation and gender diversification. Additionally, we do not frequently discuss differences that exist within and between ethnic and cultural groups. G. Delandshere mentioned that we still do not seem to clearly understand what is meant by ‘diversity in the curriculum,’ and that this concept will look different from one course to another.

Jose Rosario stated that although we often talk about increasing diversity in our student population and opening our doors to students from differing backgrounds, we rarely talk about changing the content and perspectives represented in our coursework. Students have shared with him that they are not able to relate to the perspectives represented in coursework, even when topics of diversity are included in classes. G. Delandshere mentioned that the idea of including diverse perspectives in our coursework is particularly relevant for our international students. A. Teemant stated that we as a program should take seriously the principles we teach our students about serving diverse student groups (such as contextualizing instruction and integrating knowledge from the home, school and community) and model them in our practice as faculty. We should aim to teach by example.

T. Ochoa mentioned that in addition to issues around recruitment, we also need to look at the retention of diverse students in School of Education programs. After students are accepted here, do they remain
here, and what barriers exist that prohibit some students from staying once they arrive? Students who do not come from families who are familiar with the college environment and strategies for success may only remain in school for a short period of time. Opportunities to acquire funding to pay for tuition or to cover attendance at conferences may be one issue to further examine as it relates to student retention. Although we have funding for first-generation undergraduate students in the School of Education, it is unclear whether we have similar funding for first-generation graduate students.

J. Wong reported that he had previously spoken with Russ Skiba about the Policy Council’s discussion on diversity. R. Skiba suggested that in conjunction with issues of recruitment and retention, we should also examine the broader issues of the climate and curriculum offered by the School of Education. We should look at the extent to which diverse students feel that they are welcome and successful in the IU School of Education, and whether there are mentoring programs in place for diverse students. It is important that all of the Policy Council committees are devoted to addressing issues of diversity, and not just the Diversity Committee. This sentiment was echoed by Dean Gonzalez, who stated that prioritizing diversity cannot be mandated, but that faculty have to embrace a commitment to diversity and work on addressing it one step at a time. G. Delandshere suggested that perhaps it is not a lack of will, but a lack of understanding of how to incorporate diversity into coursework that presents a challenge for faculty. In response, G. Serna stated that perhaps addressing diversity may mean creating a safe place within classes where open conversations about diversity can take place, and where students can be allowed to share their experiences.

Next steps: The Agenda Committee will discuss how to proceed with the diversity topic in January, and G. Delanshere will see if R. Skiba can attend a Policy Council meeting in the New Year. G. Serna will periodically update the Policy Council on issues raised in his conversations with graduate students, particularly with regard to how well we are supporting our current students. J. Wong and G. Serna will follow up with graduate student representatives who may be invited to share their perspectives at Policy Council meetings.

IV. New Business

a. Substituting A308 into Elementary program

Suzanne Eckes presented a proposal to combine the law course for elementary teachers (E310) and the law course for secondary teachers (A308) into one legal issues course (A308 Legal and Ethical for Teachers). There is currently no distinction between the content of the two separate courses. However, there are significant complications with the rosters for the courses. Currently, there are 12 separate sections for the courses, and students have considerable difficulty with registration, entering grades and giving students credit for the proper course. This course is offered only at IUB.

Result: A motion to approve the proposed course change was put forth by T. Ochoa, and was seconded by P. Kloosterman. The motion was unanimously approved.

b. Graduate Certificate in Learning Sciences, Media and Technology (11.15)

Kylie Peppler was not in attendance to present the certificate proposal to Policy Council. However, discussion ensued and questions were raised. Specifically, G. Delandshere raised questions about the intended audience for the certificate program, and P. Kloosterman inquired about the rationale behind the minimum admission GPA of 3.0 (rather than 2.5 as in most other graduate certificate programs). It
was decided that although the Policy Council had a few unanswered questions about the certificate proposal, they were relatively minor and could be easily addressed, and therefore, it would not be necessary to have these questions answered and further delay the approval process for the certificate.

Result: The certificate proposal was unanimously approved.

The questions raised were subsequently forwarded to K. Peppler, and were answered as follows via email:

Who is the audience for the certificate?
There are a few key audiences: The first would be in-service teachers or other informal educators looking to know more about learning, new media, and schooling systems. We think that the target market would be Indiana in-service teachers looking to renew their credentials and are looking for effective ways to reach them now. Second, we are targeting potential residential applicants that may want to try out a few courses before committing to a residential program (particularly international students, etc.). Third, our online courses will offer some variety for existing IUB online programs like the new IST online Ed.D. program (students could minor in LS with our courses) as well as some of the online MS students in Curriculum and Instruction that are seeking to learn more learning in new media.

Why is the minimum admission GPA set at 3.0? Could an exception be made based on other evidence?
Yes, we would make exceptions to the GPA minimum. We want to establish the reputation of our program and distinguish it from other existing programs by having faculty taught courses with high quality applicants. In truth, we make regular exceptions already for outstanding students that otherwise don't meet GPA or GRE requirements for the school and have been very pleased with the results. This requirement was actually based on the existing requirements for the IST online programs and under the advisement of Elizabeth Boling who suggested that if we establish a 3.0 minimum we will get students asking for exceptions with 2.5 GPAs but at 2.5 we'll probably get students with a 2.0 or less asking for exceptions to policy. We are not wedded to the exact minimum GPA and would be willing to be flexible on this issue.

V. New Courses/Course Changes

The following courses were announced as being open for a 30-day remonstrance period:

Course Changes:

A308 Legal and Ethical Issues for Teachers

**G. Delandshere adjourned the meeting at 2:40pm**