MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
April 26, 2023
1:00-3:00 p.m.
Zoom Online Meeting

Members Present: K. Wohlwend; L. Gilman; A. Pickard; M. Croom; D. DeSawal; R. Kunzman; J. Decker; H. Ormiston; C. Kilgo; B. Levinson; M. Nyikos; C. Christensen
Alternate Members Present:
Student Members Present: C. Turner
Staff Member Present: M. Boots
Dean’s Staff Present: S. Morrone; V. Torres; J. Anderson; G. Buck; A. Cuenca; S. Lubienski; C. Darnell
Guests: A. Brannan, J. Danish, E. Boling, D. Rutkowski, G. Ozogul, M. McMullen, Provost Shrivastav

A. Rahul Shrivastav, Provost and Executive Vice President - Discussion on Dean’s Search
Provost Shrivastav greeted Policy Council members and discussed the Dean search. Provost Shrivastav stated that a typical search is four months, however, there have been faster searches completed within a two-month timeframe. The hope is for the School of Education to identify a search committee in the Fall, so the committee can be charged to begin by late Fall. Following the selection of the search committee, the recruitment phase will begin. A two-phase interview process will occur, which is typical for Dean searches. Provost Shrivastav stated that with this ideal timeline, a new Dean would be selected by the Spring, and will begin the next fiscal year. Provost Shrivastav indicated that there is some flexibility on the timeline given local factors. Given the slight flexibility, the Provost expressed their openness to timeline suggestions from Policy Council members.

Provost Shrivastav stated that shortened timelines work well for specific areas, one’s that are well connected to professional units where suitable candidates can be found. The Provost indicated that larger areas may not be as successful in a faster search process, however in a more narrowed field such as education, a shorter search process could be successful. Provost Shrivastav shared that they prefer a faster search process.

Discussion:
M. Croom inquired if the candidate list that the Provost decides from is ranked or unranked. Provost Shrivastav stated that they typically work with the search committee to identify a dozen candidates for first round interviews. From the first round, the search committee will narrow the pool to three to five candidates. This list of candidates will be unranked because at this stage, all candidates should be acceptable. After the pool is narrowed, two or three are selected for an on-campus interview. Reference calls are also made, including calls that are outside of candidate’s reference list.

B. Levinson asked for the Provost’s thoughts regarding internal versus external candidates. Provost Shrivastav stated that when a unit is fundamentally broken, they are averse to bringing in an internal candidate. However, due to the School of Education not being broken, they are open to an internal candidate, but one that will serve as a change agent. The School of Education and Indiana University Bloomington (IUB) as a whole has a narrow window to fundamentally change operations. If this
change is done well, then IUB will continue to succeed.

Provost Shrivastav stated that search firms have been used in the past, and prior searches have been successful both ways. The Provost noted that search firms can be of value in recruiting talent, but they are expensive, and will not be as valuable if the School of Education has an established strong network within academia. The Provost shared that there has been discussion on allotting the expenses used to hire search firms to hire three positions dedicated to institutional searches. The institution is in the process of developing a talent recruiting pool, and the VP for HR is overseeing the development of this group. The Provost shared that using this group will likely provide the same results as a search firm, but if the School of Education would prefer to use a search firm then the option will be there.

M. Croom inquired what the workflow would look like with or without a search firm in place for the search process. Provost Shrivastav responded that the process would be similar. For an internal search committee, recruitment would involve advertising the opportunity within academic communities, and listservs. After building an applicant pool, the other processes would be identical with or without a search firm. M. Croom asked if the Provost has experienced pushback on the work load required for a school to conduct a search process without a search firm. Provost Shrivastav suggested that stakeholders in the School of Education talk to other schools who have and have not used a search firm to assist in determining the route the school would like to go. Provost Shrivastav stated that it is a time versus money scenario.

K. Wohlwend asked for clarification on the Dean search process timeline. Provost Shrivastav stated that by mid to late September the School of Education should provide recommendations of who will serve on the search committee. These recommendations will be compiled with their recommendations, along with recommendations from the Bloomington Faculty Council (BFC). Nominations will be pooled together from the three groups and form the search committee. In addition, the School of Education will have to inform the Provost if a search firm will be used or not. The Provost listed search firms that the institution has worked for in the past, and noted that one is not better than the other. If the School would like to use a different firm and get an RFP, then an additional 4 to 6 weeks will be added to the search process. The Provost stated that they would not recommend that route. Provost Shrivastav recommended that the school also consider who their competition will be, as other schools will be searching for a School of Education Dean.

M. Nyikos inquired if there is a minimum number of search committee members. Provost Shrivastav stated that they think smaller committees are more fluid and flexible. From the Provost’s perspective, the committee would include three to four people, two of which are familiar with the Dean’s role and responsibilities. However, after including staff, student and faculty representation, a practical number of committee members would be 10-12, max. The Provost stated that the way to make the search process representative is to have many members of the School of Education participate in the interview process, as varying perspectives are needed.

The Provost noted that the Law School conducted a successful search without a search committee. Provost Shrivastav thanked Policy Council members for the discussion.
After Provost Shrivastav exited, K. Wohlwend welcomed discussion amongst Policy Council members.

Discussion:
V. Torres stated that they have experienced little difference when working with a search firm in comparison to an internal search committee. Both internal search committees and search firms will ask for recommendations. G. Buck followed V. Torres’ point and noted that past experiences with search firms included non-traditional candidates, such as lawyers, in the candidate pool, which did not lead to a favorable reaction. A. Brannan shared that since becoming Department Chair, they have received requests from search firms to apply for Dean positions. They stated that these requests show that search firms cast a wide net, rather than searching strategically for candidates. Dean Morrone indicated that when working with a search firm for the Kelley Dean Search, the process was long and drawn-out. In addition, the candidate pool was not as expected. Dean Morrone stated that Brandi Host, a member of the Executive Talent Team, is a great resource as they are able to take care of all the logistical needs such as scheduling meetings, and capturing minutes. D. DeSawal echoed previous comments and added that during the Vice President for Student Success search, members of the Executive Talent Team were more helpful than the hired search firm.

Based on the discussion, K. Wohlwend requested a motion to proceed without a search firm for the Dean Search occurring in the Fall.

Motion: M. Croom
Second: M. Nyikos

Discussion:
M. Croom noted that not going with a search firm would assist in preserving the financial picture of the university and School of Education. B. Levinson added that the school could consider using funding to compensate an internal team, such as the Executive Talent Team to intentionally advertise and find suitable candidates for the Dean search. M. Nyikos underscored B. Levinson’s thoughts, recognizing the time-consuming nature of the search process. Policy Council members noted the possibility of advocating for a portion of the funds used to hire the search firm, being distributed as a benefit to the School of Education.

Motion Passed. In favor: 16 ; Opposed: 0 ; Abstain: 0

B. Approval of the Minutes from the March 22, 2023 Meeting (23.41M)
There were no corrections nor discussion and the items were approved as distributed.

Motion Passed. In favor: 14 ; Opposed: 0 ; Abstain: 0

C. Announcements
1. Agenda Committee
   a. The Agenda Committee has reviewed ways to reduce letters for awards
      K. Wohlwend informed Policy Council members that the Agenda Committee is considering ways to reduce letters required for rewards. K. Wohlwend noted that positive ideas for implementation have been presented.
   b. The EAD Office has created guidelines for Administrator Reviews (23.43)
The EAD Office has developed guidelines for Administrator Reviews that FABA and the Agenda Committee has reviewed.

c. Update from the Policy Council restructuring committees group
K. Wohlwend informed Policy Council members that the restructuring committees group is pursuing the Ad Hoc committee’s proposal. The group is consolidating feedback from current and past chairs. The goal is to develop a proposal to present at the September Policy Council meeting.

2. Dean’s Report
The Dean’s Report occurred prior to the discussion with the Provost.
Dean Morrone announced Sarah Lubienski as the new Executive Associate Dean. Dean Morrone expressed their excitement that Sarah accepted the invitation to serve in the role. With the Executive Associate Dean’s position filled an expedited search will occur for the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. In addition, two Department Chair positions are vacating, and the school is in the process of conducting Chair searches. Dean Morrone stated that they hope to make new leadership announcements in the coming weeks. Dean Morrone shared their interest in the forthcoming discussion regarding the two revised strategic plans. Dean Morrone opened for discussion.

Discussion:
K. Wohlwend inquired if there are particular things Policy Council members should be thinking about in relation to the newly revised Diversity and Long Range Plan when listening to the Provost’s discussion on the upcoming Dean Search. Dean Morrone stated that they do not believe there is anything specific, however Dean Morrone articulated that there will be additional work to do in order for the plans to be published online.

D. Old Business

E. New Business

1. Personal Wellness Distinction program proposal (23.44)
This proposal sought to move forward with the creation or a personal wellness program for undergraduate students. The proposal included the following three components:
(1) Adding to the work students do in Self Care for New Teachers by creating EDUC-F 203 Mind, Body and Skills Groups
(2) Developing a Career Connections Personal Wellness Distinction Program
(3) Serving the greater campus community and alumni
The proposal came as a motion from the Committee on Teacher Education.
Second: L. Gilman
Discussion:
J. Anderson stated that this item began with work first initiated by former Dean Watson, as undergraduate students were offered sets of workshops and one credit courses that could be added to their graduation. J. Anderson stated that the proposal aligns with Dean Morrone’s Culture of Care vision. M. Nyikos expressed concerns that the proposal does not directly address student needs for counseling services. J. Anderson clarified that this proposal addresses students’ experiences with wellness, rather than directly responding to concerns about students needing support for wellness. L.
Gilman stated that the School of Education needs a systematic approach to student wellness, and direct counseling is a component of that. However, it is not possible to provide direct counseling to all students. L. Gilman shared their support of the proposal as it will provide students with the necessary skills to cope and work through stress.

B. Levinson asked for clarification on what the Policy Council was voting on, as the documentation was unclear. J. Anderson clarified stating that the proposal seeks approval to move forward with the development of the program, including the F203 workshop, a one credit mindfulness, and body skills group.

C. Kilgo inquired if there has been any discussion on creating a similar program for graduate students. K. Wohlwend responded that their question should be well considered by the Graduate Studies Committee (GSC).

**Motion Passed.** In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0

2. Combine Elementary (TAL) and Secondary (COT) Special Education Courses (23.45)
This proposal sought to combine Elementary (TAL) and Secondary (COT) Special Education courses. The proposed changes would have undergraduate special education licensure students take all special education courses (that are required for their programs) together. The proposal also sought to add a course to each of the programs. This item came as a motion from the Committee on Teacher Education.
**Second:** M. Nyikos

**Discussion:**
A. Brannan stated that this proposal would allow secondary education students to develop a greater connection with the School of Education community. Currently this student population is taking a lot of courses with master’s students, so this proposal would allow more collaboration with undergraduate students. Dean Morrone added that this proposal aligns well with what students are asking for. A Brannan stated that the needs of teacher candidates are taken seriously.

**Motion Passed.** In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0

This proposal sought to enumerate the broad processes applicable to the search, appointment/reappointment, review, and removal of academic administrators in the School of Education. This item came as a motion from the Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee.
**Second:** D. DeSawal

**Discussion:**
E. Boling stated that FABA was charged with consolidating information regarding activities involving the School of Education administrators. E Boling noted that while developing the proposed policy the committee reflected on how administrators find out what are the SoE’s declared policies and processes. E. Boling addressed a Policy Council member’s question submitted via the Qualtrics survey, noting that the policy 22.42 would be sunsetted as this new policy would streamline and consolidate the processes outlined in policy 22.42. E. Boling addressed an additional question submitted via Qualtrics, stating that a standard appointment is defined as not being an interim appointment. The proposed policy states that the Dean is not going to make internal appointments into standard appointments without conferring with the
faculty in the form of the Policy Council.

J. Decker asked for clarification regarding the tenure of a standard appointment. E. Boling stated that the tenure of a standard appointment is clarified within the policy. A standard appointment for all administrative positions are three years on initial appointed, followed by subsequent appointments of up to three years when the individual is up for reappointment. J. Decker expressed their concern regarding the process of selecting Department Chairs. E. Boling responded that the committee thought of the process differently, as they accounted for a scarcity in potential candidates. For larger departments, it is likely that there would be a larger ballot. Overall, FABA considered the challenges in candidate pools for Department Chair. V. Torres added that the school needs to ensure that people who are tenure and full professors are engaging in service. They added that everyone is eligible to serve, and nominations cannot be declined. However, once offered, the position can be declined. Policy Council members discussed modes of communication during the Department Chair selection process. C. Kilgo resonated with J. Decker’s sentiments, as they expressed frustration when voting, as they are unsure if faculty members will accept the nomination. G. Buck echoed C. Kilgo’s statement.

M. Nyikos welcomed an amendment that would require candidates to have either a written or oral statement before voting takes place. This would provide additional context for candidates who are not as well known. E. Boling stated that the goal of the departmental process is to give the Dean a sense of the faculty which would then inform the Dean’s decision. E. Boling summarized the thoughts of Policy Council members stating that based on the discussion, people would like to know more about their colleagues, and more about their disposition in order to make an informed rank order of candidates. M. Nyikos confirmed accuracy of the summary. E. Boling reiterated that this proposal stemmed from the committee’s experience with not being able to find nominees for position. E. Boling stated that if the Policy Council disagrees with the policy, and the processes that have been in place this past year, then members should vote against the proposal.

V. Torres stated that FABA closely examined all of the topics brought up by the Policy Council. B. Levinson stated concerns with certain sections of the proposal including the Chair search process. They noted that due to Chair searches about to commence, they are willing to approve the proposal, but would be open to proposing friendly amendments for specific sections. E. Boling stated that Chair searches have already begun under the old process established by policy 22.42.

**Motion Defeated.** In favor: 5; Opposed: 9; Abstain: 0

4. Sunsetting Policy 22.42 Streamline process for selecting Department Chairs and Policy 03.28R IU Bloomington Review Procedures for School of Education Academic Administrators

This item was in relation to the Search, Appointment, Review and Removal Process for School of Education Academic Administrators (23.45) as the new policy would sunset policies 22.42 Streamline process for Selecting Department Chairs and Policy 03.28R IU Bloomington Review Procedures for School of Education Academic Administrators. This proposal came as a motion from the Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee. 

**Given that the prior item did not pass, this proposal was no longer considered.**
5. Bulletin update general requirements for master’s program to allow AMPs (23.47)

This proposal was a bulletin update for the General Requirements for master’s programs to allow Accelerated Master’s Programs (AMPs). This item came as a motion from the Graduate Studies Committee.

Second: D. DeSawal

Discussion:

M. Boots stated that Graduate Studies has been working across campus to increase accelerated master’s programs. If passed, the proposal would allow students to double count up to 12 graduate credit hours from their undergraduate degree to their graduate degree. M. Boots stated that currently there is no policy allowing this double counting, so this proposal places parameters on the possibility and creates flexibility within programs. M Boots noted that this proposal is applicable to the accelerated master’s programs, specifically.

Motion Passed. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0

6. Bulletin update EdS Policies to reduce required hours from 65 to 60 (23.48)

This proposal sought to reduce the number of EdS required hours from 65 to 60. This item came as a motion from Graduate Studies Committee.

Second: L. Gilman

Discussion:

M. Boots stated that last month the Policy Council approved the Ed Leadership degree to be reduced from 65 to 60 hours. This proposal codifies that into the overall EdS. If approved this would not directly impact any other EdS, unless a change is brought forth to reduce hours.

Motion Passed. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0

7. Consent Agenda

The following items were related, so for the sake of time, the Agenda Committee determined these items could be approved together without individual motions.

- Program update Ph.D. in Learning and Developmental Science-Specialization in Learning Sciences (23.49)
- Program update M.S. Ed in Learning and Development Sciences – Learning Sciences Track (23.50)
- Program update Certificate in Learning Sciences, Media, and Technology (Online) (23.51)
- Program update PhD Minor in Learning Sciences (23.52)
- Program update EdD Minor in Learning Sciences (23.53)

The Learning Sciences program has moved departments from CEP to IST. As part of this process the program is aiming to move all of their courses from a P to I designation. This process includes replacing program requirements, and implementing minor revisions intended to better align with current practice and with IST. The following items came as a motion from the Graduate Studies Committee.

Second: C. Kilgo

Discussion:

J. Danish stated that the proposal outlines the renaming of courses, which is being considered to make processes more consistent with IST. M. Nyikos inquired if any friction has been caused due to overlap in courses with IST. J. Danish responded that they were not aware of any friction, but
they have created copies of courses with the I letter so that there can be a divergence in the courses. J. Danish stated that the IST department voted unanimously to support the courses. M. Nyikos stated that it would be difficult for faculty who serve as advisors to remember which courses were P-courses. J. Danish indicated that there is documentation in the memo of understanding with the CEP department identifying which courses will continue as P-courses and be managed by CEP and IST.

**Motion Passed.** In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0

8. IST Department Name Change (23.54)
The Department of Instructional Systems Technology (IST) has approved a name change to Learning, Design, and Adult Education (LDAE) as a result of organizational changes within the SOE. This item came as a motion from the IST.

*Second:* R. Kunzman

**Discussion:**
M. Nyikos asked how the name change impacts the I-courses, as they associated I-courses with IST. E. Boling stated that people have assumed that IST and Learning Sciences were merging as programs, which is not the case. IST as a department will include three programs. M. Boots added that Adult Ed has their own letter coding different from IST.

**Motion Passed.** In favor: 13; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0

9. Long Range Plan Review (23.55)
The Long Range Plan was reviewed by the Policy Council. The item came as a motion from the Long Range Planning Committee.

*Second:* M. Nyikos

**Discussion:**
J. Decker thanked D. Rutkowski and the LRP Committee for their work. They then inquired how much of the plan changed following the feedback from the faculty retreat, and asked if Policy Council had additional changes how would those be recognized in the final plan. D. Rutkowski stated the Policy Council is the democratic elected body, so it is in Council’s purview. Following the faculty retreat, the committee incorporated feedback from faculty as best as possible and made necessary adjustments, so that the plan aligned with the goals of the university.

A. Pickard indicated that the new DEI plan changed language from historically underrepresented to historically excluded. A. Pickard inquired if language should be consistent across both plans. D. Rutkowski stated that the Policy Council can propose the change. The Long Range Planning Committee consulted James Wimbush on language. J. Danish stated that the language in the DEI plan aligned with campus-wide messaging, as it was suggested that historically excluded be used as the preferred language in diversity statements.

C. Kilgo shared that the Diversity Committee had a lot of conversation about language use. They agreed with A. Pickard that the language between the two plans should be consistent. M. Nyikos asked for clarification regarding the use of the term interdisciplinary in Goal Two. D. Rutkowski responded that the term referenced collaboration outside the scope of education.

B. Levinson proposed a friendly amendment.

**Friendly Amendment:** Change historically underrepresented language to historically excluded.

*Second:* J. Decker
Amendment Passed. In favor: 12; Opposed: 1; Abstain: 0

Discussion:
Following up on the interdisciplinary discussion, G. Buck stated that the plan reads for a 50% increase of interdisciplinary grant applications in 10 years. G. Buck reported that majority of grant application are interdisciplinary. J. Decker inquired about next steps for implementing the Long Range Plan. Policy Council members indicated that they do not remember the process from previous years. K. Wohlwend, shared appreciation for J. Decker’s question and indicated that next steps can be determined next year.

M. Croom asked if this plan aligns with the goals of the Provost, guiding the School of Education towards change, rather than maintain the status quo. D. Rutkowski stated that the Long Range Planning committee tried to align the Long Range Plan with the University’s plan, but also ensure that the voices of the School of Education faculty are included. Additionally, the goal of the committee was to create a plan that sets a direction for the new Dean. G. Buck noted that the plan states to increase received funding by 50% over a ten year period. The plan should read five years, as it is a five year plan.

Dean Morrone followed up on J. Decker’s question regarding implementation. They stated that the discussion during the Policy Council meeting would inform next steps. From the conversation, Dean Morrone stated that there would be a need to begin working on implementation in the summer, as potential implementation plans would need to be created. Those who would be creating these implementation plans would be compensated, as the goal would be to apply for Deans discretionary funds to assist.

G. Buck proposed a friendly amendment.
Friendly Amendment: In relation to increase received funding, change ten years to five, in alignment with the five year plan.
Second: M. Nyikos
Amendment Passed. In favor: 11; Opposed: 1; Recusal: 1

Motion to approve the Long Range Plan with two friendly amendments.
Motion Passed. In favor: 12; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 1

10. Diversity Plan Review (23.56) and Sunset of Previous Diversity Plan (17.42)
The Diversity Plan was reviewed by the Policy Council. The item came as a motion from the Diversity Committee.
Second: R. Kunzman
Discussion:
A. Pickard stated that they previously read that the plan included body size in the list of historically excluded identities. They inquired why it was not included in the iteration presented to the Policy Council. J. Danish indicated that the removal of body size was a mistake, and should be included in the plan.

A. Pickard proposed a friendly amendment.
Friendly Amendment: Include body size in the list of historically excluded identities, and correct additional typos throughout the Diversity Plan

Second: L. Gilman

Amendment Passed. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0

J. Decker indicated two additional corrections. The first, that job title is listed as a characteristic on page 8 but is not consistently included throughout the document. The second included the word perceived in parentheses in a footnote. J. Decker stated that the footnote was not clear, and wondered if it should read as actual. J. Danish stated that they welcome both changes, but the job title language was included for that particular point, and was not to be used consistently throughout the document. In addition, A. Pickard noted that the term hyperraced was used inconsistently throughout the document. All corrections were recognized and would be accepted under the prior friendly amendment.

R. Kunzman inquired how an independent budget would be similar or different from other units within the School of Education. J. Danish stated that the information was pulled from the previous Diversity Plan. C. Darnell stated that there is a separate DEI sub account, as the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (ODEI) has its own money. D. Ferguson added that ODEI has a separate account, with sub accounts to track various projects. V. Torres suggested the term independent be removed, as all entities in the School of Education are dependent on the overall budget.

A. Pickard proposed an additional edit regarding the structured mentoring program. They stated that the original language reads contradictory, as the languages states it is specific to all, but particular to one group. Discussion ensued regarding the language that would be adopted to address the change.

Similar to the discussion about the Long Range Plan, M. Croom asked if the Diversity plan aligns with the goals of the Provost, guiding the School of Education towards change, rather than maintain the status quo. J. Danish stated that it allows for change if the School of Education can deliver. J. Danish added that a concern of the Diversity Committee was that there are particular definitions of excellence that do not acknowledge the ways in which diversity represents excellence, and the structural barriers that challenge historically excluded faculty or diversity work. J. Danish concluded that they think if the school can meet the deliverables outlined in the plan, and if the money and effort is there, then there is the possibility to see a much more diverse school.

M. Croom called attention to a chat conversation that discussed the correct usage of pronouns. Policy Council members discussed and recognized the importance of using pronouns correctly.

Motion to approve the Diversity Plan with one friendly amendment.

Motion Passed. In favor: 13; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 1

Discussion
1. Proposed Policy for Inclusion of a DEI Plan in Future SoE Faculty Hiring Initiatives (23.57)

Due to time, this item was not discussed, but will be included on the agenda of the September Policy Council meeting.

G. New Course/Course Changes
The following new course or course change proposals have been reviewed and approved by the Graduate Studies Committee, the Committee on Teacher Education, or the Undergraduate Studies Committee. These course proposals will be forwarded to the next level of approval unless a remonstrance is received within 30 days.

**New Courses**

**BL EDUC-I 507**  
Course title: Assessment and Learning

*Description:* This introductory course is for educators, administrators, designers, and other learning professionals. Topics include assessment practices (e.g., objectives, formats, performance and portfolio assessment, and platforms), assessment principles (e.g., reliability, bias, validity, formative assessment, and evaluating and improving instruction), and assessment policies (e.g., standardized testing, test preparation, improving assessments, and grading/credentialing).

*Justification:* The Learning Sciences Program has moved departments from CEP to IST and so this is in fact an existing course (P-507) that is being moved to the new letter with some minor updates to content.

**BL EDUC-I 540**  
Course title: Learning and Cognition in Education

*Description:* This course examines modern cognitive and contemporary sociocultural theories of knowing, learning, and transfer and their implications for teaching, motivating, and assessing learning. It will also briefly consider how those theories and implications are different from other perspectives.

*Justification:* The Learning Sciences Program has moved departments from CEP to IST and so this is in fact an existing course (P-540) that is being moved to the new letter with minor content updates to reflect the state of the field.

**BL EDUC-I 544**  
Course title: Applied Cognition and Learning Strategies

*Description:* Survey of applied cognitive psychology including: information processing; schema theory; cognitive and metacognitive learning strategies; reading comprehension; mnemonic devices and other study skills; expert-novice research; technology-related learning supports; process and protocol analysis; problem representation and problem solving in math; and new assessment tools and measures.

*Justification:* The Learning Sciences Program has moved departments from CEP to IST and so this is in fact an existing course (P-544) that is being moved to the new letter.

**BL EDUC-I 545**  
Course title: Motivation in Learning Contexts
**Description:** This course examines motivation as a theoretical construct, as a research topic, and applications to educational contexts.

**Justification:** We have moved departments from CEP to IST. This course will mirror the prior course (p545).

**BL EDUC-I 572**

*Course title:* Introduction to the Learning Sciences

*Description:* The course is a review of the major philosophies, methodologies, and conceptual systems that shape the learning sciences.

*Justification:* The Learning Sciences Program has moved departments from CEP to IST and so this is in fact an existing course (P-572) that is being moved to the new letter.

**BL EDUC-I 573**

*Course title:* Learning Science Apprenticeship

*Description:* The course places students into a research apprenticeship within an active research laboratory in each of the first 6 semesters of doctoral work where they will engage in the research practices of the laboratory. All apprentices will meet as a group to reflect, discuss, and collaborate with the apprenticeship coordinator.

*Justification:* The Learning Sciences Program has moved departments from CEP to IST and so this is in fact an existing course (P-573) that is being moved to the new letter.

**BL EDUC-I 574**

*Course title:* Topical Seminar in Learning Sciences

*Description:* Topical seminar for doctoral students in Learning Sciences. Possible topics include online instruction, computers in education, activity theory, problem based learning, embodied cognition, gaming/simulation, AI in Education, computational thinking and problem solving to name a few. We allow repetition so long as each section is a different topic.

*Justification:* The Learning Sciences Program has moved departments from CEP to IST and so this is in fact an existing course (P-574) that is being moved to the new letter.

**BL EDUC-I 590**

*Course title:* Independent Study or Research in Learning Sciences

*Description:* Individual research or study with a Learning Sciences faculty member, arranged in advance of registration. A one or two page written proposal should be submitted to the instructor during the first week of the term specifying the scope of the project, project activities, meeting times, completion date, and student product(s).

*Justification:* The Learning Sciences Program has moved departments from CEP to IST and so this is in fact an existing course (P-590) that is being moved to the new letter with a title change.

**BL EDUC-I 631**

*Course title:* Theorizing Learning in Context

*Course title:* Theorizing Learning in Context
Description: This is an advanced seminar in the learning sciences, focused on exploring a specific theory of learning (e.g., Activity Theory), or a general class of learning theories (e.g., Sociocultural Theory). Each specific seminar will have its own focus.

Justification: The Learning Sciences Program has moved departments from CEP to IST and so this is in fact an existing course (P-631) that is being moved to the new letter.

**BL EDUC-I 632**  
Course title: Designing for Learning in Context

Description: This is an advanced seminar in the learning sciences, focused on exploring approach to designing for learning (e.g., Design of Learning Activities). Each specific seminar will have its own focus.

Justification: The Learning Sciences Program has moved departments from CEP to IST and so this is in fact an existing course (P-632) that is being moved to the new letter.

**BL EDUC-I 633**  
Course title: Designing for Learning in Context

Description: This is an advanced seminar in the learning sciences, focused on exploring a particular methodology or set of methods for studying learning in context. Each version will have different topics, readings, and assignments. A recent example is Video Analysis of Learning.

Justification: The Learning Sciences Program has moved departments from CEP to IST and so this is in fact an existing course (P-633) that is being moved to the new letter.

**BL EDUC-I 640**  
Course title: Thinking and Learning in Social Contexts

Description: This course will examine contemporary social theories of knowing, learning, and transfer and their implications for teaching and learning, engagement, motivation, design, and assessment as we also consider the important role of context in learning.

Justification: The Learning Sciences Program has moved departments from CEP to IST and so this is in fact an existing course (P-640) that is being moved to the new letter.

**BL EDUC-I 674**  
Course title: Advanced Topical Seminar in Learning Sciences

Description: Topical seminar for doctoral students in Learning Sciences. Possible topics include online instruction, computers in education, activity theory, problem based learning, embodied cognition, gaming/simulation, AI in Education, computational thinking and problem solving to name a few. We allow repetition so long as each section is a different topic.

Justification: The Learning Sciences Program has moved departments from CEP to IST and so this is in fact an existing course (P-674) that is being moved to the new letter.

**BL EDUC-I 690**  
Course title: Independent Study or Research in Learning Sciences

Var 1-3
Description: Reading and/or research directed by a Learning Sciences faculty member.

Justification: The Learning Sciences Program has moved departments from CEP to IST and so this is in fact an existing course (P-690) that is being moved to the new letter.

**BL EDUC-I 695**  
*Course title: Topical Inquiry Seminar in Learning Sciences*  
*Cr 3*

Description: This is a research seminar that Learning Sciences students will be expected to take as they progress through their program, giving them opportunities to develop a dossier and work on their research skills.

Justification: As the Learning Sciences program moves from CEP to Instructional Systems Technology, we are planning to transition to a similar sequence of courses, and this would allow students in the Learning Sciences to enroll in a similar sequence as the IST students.

**BL EDUC-I 711**  
*Course title: Current Readings in the Learning Sciences*  
*Cr 3*

Description: This course will allow us to stay abreast on current literature in the learning sciences. Articles may be around a theme, or selected by the students to match their interests. We will engage in critical reading and discussion as we explore the relations between the research, methods, results, and contribution.

Justification: This course was previously offered successfully as a special topics course. Now that we are moving into a new department, we are creating a parallel course to the IST Readings Course (711) which mirrors that offering and reflects our prior LS version as well.

**BL EDUC-I 795**  
*Course title: Dissertation Proposal Prep*  
*Var 1-3*

Description: Dissertation proposal preparation for Learning Sciences PhD students.

Justification: Dissertation proposal preparation for Learning Sciences PhD students now that LS has moved to a new department (IST) and new course letter (I instead of P).

**BL EDUC-I 799**  
*Course title: Doctoral Thesis in Learning Sciences*  
*Var 1-15*

Description: This course is to be taken while completing a dissertation in Learning Sciences.

Justification: This is being created to replicate EDUC-P 799 as the Learning Sciences moves to a new department (IST) and new letter (I).

**BL EDUC-J 502**  
*Course title: Assessment and Evaluation*  
*Cr 3*

Description: An introductory course for education professionals. Topics of study include principles of assessment, formal/informal assessment instruments and methods, formative & summative assessment,
interpretation/use of standardized test results, social/political issues in assessment, and analysis of data. Evaluation topics include determining eligibility for special ed, evaluation of programs, and instructional approaches.

Justification: This course is a required course for all students in the online collaborative M.S.Ed. in Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum. We thought the Bloomington version had already been created but learned it wasn't when trying to schedule it for the fall.