MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
September 27, 2023
1:00 – 3:00 pm
ED 2140

Members Present: J. Decker; G. Ozogul; H. Ormiston; A. Scribner M. Nyikos; K. Kyungbin; A. Hackenberg
Alternate Members Present: D. Hickey; M. McMullen
Student Members Present: L. Locke; L. Johnson
Staff Member Present: none
Dean's Staff Present: S. Morrone; S. Lubienki; C. Darnell; G. Buck; T.N. Laird; J. Anderson
Guests: D. DeSawal; J. Danish; H. Schertz; C. Hmelo Silver; L. LePeau; C. Kilgo; A. Brannan; P. Andersson

A. Approval of the Minutes from April 26, 2023, Organizational (24.04M) and Policy Council Meeting (24.05M)
   There were no corrections nor discussion, and the minutes were approved as distributed.

B. Announcements
   1. Agenda Committee
      a. The Agenda Committee was informed that the Committee on Teacher Education approved the OCAP Teaching English Learners Licensing Program. The Graduate Studies Committee and the Policy Council already approved.
      b. Two external members were added to the Committee on Teacher Education.
      c. All standing committees have a staff member who has agreed to serve.
      d. The Agenda Committee approved a request made by the Faculty and Budgetary Affairs committee to add a new charge: “Review and revise the policies on P&T and NTT promotion to explicitly consider diversity, equity, and inclusion to address domain 3, goal 3A of the Diversity Plan.”
      e. The Executive Associate Dean’s Office finalized Guidelines for Academic Hiring in consultation with the department chairs. The guidelines have been posted on the School of Education Policy Council website.
      f. The Undergraduate Studies Committee approved changes to the Education Policy Minor in collaboration with the O’Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs. The changes include a course title update and removal of SPEA management courses.

   2. Dean’s Report
   Dean Morrone welcomed everyone to the Policy Council meeting and stated that the campus-funded Center for Human Growth renovation is nearly complete. Dean Morrone reminded Policy Council members that this improvement came from talking with graduate students about their spaces. The graduate students in Counseling Psychology disclosed that the prior area needed attention. The space is now open, and clients are coming in. Dean Morrone indicated that the center will change its name from the Center of Human Growth to the School of Education Counseling and Evaluation Services. The new name is more descriptive, and the name change will represent the two clinics underneath the larger umbrella. Dean Morrone shared that the two clinics are the Counseling and Wellbeing Clinic along with the Learning and Development Evaluation Clinic. The name change is awaiting final approval, but it has been approved at the
Dean Morrone stated that graduate students within other units have been asked to provide feedback on their spaces. The third floor has had updated furniture installed, and there is potential for 4th floor renovations. Dean Morrone indicated that they have spoken with Chairs J. Lester and C. Lochmiller about the needs of graduate students who work on the 4th floor.

Dean Morrone reminded Policy Council members about the Faculty Meeting, All School Meeting, and Elder Watson Diggs Symposium on Friday, September 29, 2023. Dean Morrone noted what would be discussed during the All-School Meeting. The President and Provost plan to discuss the timeline of the dean search and the campuses’ strategic plans. Dean Morrone reminded Policy Council members that M. Croom will facilitate a TEA Talk following the All-School Meeting.

Dean Morrone continued their report, stating that SOE Cares had been launched. As part of SOE Cares initiatives, the School of Education will have an advanced counseling student serve as an embedded counselor. Lastly, Dean Morrone shared that the strategic plans for the School of Education are live and implementation planning has begun.

C. Old Business

1. Update on Committee Restructuring from Ad Hoc Committee (24.07)
   The Policy Council Subcommittee on Committee Restructuring developed a restructuring proposal (document 24.07). The goal of this proposal was to streamline service loads, make service activity more meaningful, address the need to stay nimble to changing conditions and proactively position the School of Education to respond to IU 2030 initiatives. This item came from the Policy Council Subcommittee on Committee Restructuring, and Danielle DeSawal attended to answer any questions.

   Second: M. McMullen
   Discussion:

   D. DeSawal provided additional context for Policy Council members. D. DeSawal stated that last year's Agenda Committee brought back an old Ad Hoc subcommittee, which looked at restructuring the committees within the School of Education. The new initiative to restructure committees stemmed from the EAD office sending out a survey to recognize service load amongst faculty. The Agenda Committee resurrected the original Ad Hoc committee proposal as a foundation for re-thinking and streamlining service loads and to position the school to be able to respond to the strategic plans that are happening both at the university and campus levels. D. DeSawal stated that it is important to consider service loads in a manner that is not potentially prohibitive to having a voice at the school and campus level. D. DeSawal directed Policy Council members to review the 24.07 document, which outlined the plan to move forward. D. DeSawal reminded Policy Council members that they would be voting on moving forward, and not voting to adopt the proposed plan. D. DeSawal noted that the proposed plan was developed after the Ad Hoc Committee contacted old committee chairs and gained feedback on restructuring. Thus, the proposed plan stems from the original Ad Hoc committee proposal and the feedback from past committee chairs. D. DeSawal addressed the following questions/topics submitted prior to the Policy Council meeting:

   - Seek feedback from current standing committee members to gain a sense of workload.
     D. DeSawal stated that this would be the next step to move forward. Current committee members would be asked to provide feedback on what committee workload should look like.
   - Committee restructuring in relation to strategic planning.
     D. DeSawal stated that the proposal suggests that the four chairs of the four committees and the elected Agenda committee would constitute the Long-Range Planning Committee. The Ad Hoc committee thought this proposed structure made sense due to the four committee chairs serving as
representatives of areas that would likely be discussed. Additionally, the Agenda Committee would have a generalized pulse of what is happening within the SoE policy wise.

- Organize more staff support for essential committee work.
  D. DeSawal stated that during the proposal development process, the current Ad Hoc committee realized that the lifts on some committees were heavy because there was not as much staff support. D. DeSawal stated that it will be important to think about where each committee would fall in relation to specific offices, so the work is not as overwhelming for faculty and staff support is present.

- Streamlining decision making by empowering procedural decisions by the committees and determining the workload for restructuring.
  D. DeSawal stated that any change requires a lot of work on the front end. There would be a lift at the front end to think about what this looks like rather than maintain what the school currently has. This change could lead to streamlining processes to help reduce barriers faculty see when moving academic programs through and implementing new initiatives.

- How to incorporate DEI.
  D. DeSawal stated that this is a topic the committee was concerned about and did not develop an answer for. D. DeSawal stated that the committee recognized the importance of incorporating DEI, but more input is needed to figure out what the incorporation should look like. Collectively, as a faculty, input will be needed to ensure that DEI remains a value for the School of Education, and something at the forefront of everything faculty standing committees do.

M. Nyikos asked what the next steps would be to move forward. D. DeSawal stated that if the Policy Council chooses to approve then the next steps would include following up with integration planning with the existing standing committees. During this process, members would review ways to prioritize existing changes, identifying things that need to be simplified and streamlined—for example, the Grievance Committee could serve as an ad hoc committee. D. DeSawal indicated that they would refer to the current Agenda Committee to decide what the next steps would be.

J. Decker inquired if the current committee considers the workload of the proposed four committee chairs. J. Decker questioned if this is creating more work than less. D. DeSawal responded that there was a recommendation for compensating the elected chairs for the service load. To provide compensation a conversation with the Dean’s Office would have to be had.

M. Nyikos said it will be important to consider power dynamics and the degree to which faculty voice is included. G. Ozogul inquired how this proposal is making the work less. D. DeSawal responded that streamlining committee work, and having current standing committees recognize unnecessary work would eliminate potential workload. D. DeSawal shared that in their previous experience as a member of the Agenda Committee and Policy Council, they realized that committees who did not have standing work, would develop work or the Agenda Committee would provide charges that were unnecessary. If there are fewer committees then there could be a focus on what needs to be done. Also, this would be a chance to incorporate the strategic plan's goals.

J. Decker asked what the four committees look like regarding diffusion of responsibility. If everyone is assigned to a smaller committee, there is a better chance they will contribute, but if there are larger committees, there could be a lack of responsibility. J. Decker inquired if this new proposal is the same structure as the current standing committees but organized in a different way. D. DeSawal responded that the structure could stay the same, however it would be the faculty voice stating that the structure should stay the same. D. DeSawal added that feedback from the current standing committees would assist in painting a picture of what the four committees could look like and provide insight into the diffusion of work.

S. Lubienski inquired that if the proposal is voted to move forward, would another committee need to be appointed. D. DeSawal stated that it does not specifically say in the proposal, so they would defer to the Agenda Committee to decide what the next step would be. The proposal timeline indicates that the next step would be for the standing committees to provide feedback. However, there will need to
be a body in place to guide the process of collecting feedback.

J. Decker commented that with the timeline and the future Dean Search, faculty and staff will have additional upcoming responsibilities. J. Decker expressed concern about both changes occurring at the same time. G. Buck clarified that the vote is to continue this work, and that a delay could be a possibility. M. McMullen stated that the school could halt the continuation of the restructuring process after receiving feedback from the current standing committees. G. Ozogul thanked the Policy Council members for the discussion and requested a vote.

**Motion Passed.** In favor: 8; Opposed: 2; Abstain: 0

D. New Business

1. Consent Agenda
   a. Updating policy language to reflect IST department name change.
      i. 22.22 IUB Annual Performance Review: Overview
      ii. 13.11R Graduate Program Review Process

Policy Council Chair, G. Ozogul informed Policy Council members of the definition of a consent agenda. They stated that a consent agenda allows the board to approve items together without discussion or individual motions. The Instructional Systems Technology (IST) Department name change has been approved. The Executive Associate Dean’s Office has audited policies that use the old department name. This item seeks to change policy language to reflect the new department name.

**Discussion:**

M. McMullen inquired what the new department name is. G. Ozogul responded that the new name is Learning, Design, and Adult Education.

**Motion Passed.** In favor: 10; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0

2. Bulletin Update on Accelerated Undergraduate-Graduate Degree Programs Policy (24.08)
This proposal sought to update the bulletin regarding students in Accelerated Undergraduate/Graduate Degree Programs. This item came as a motion from the Committee on Teacher Education and Paige Andersson attended to answer any questions.

**Second:** M. Nyikos

**Discussion:**

M. Nyikos inquired if accelerated programs were also named 4+1, as they have heard similar language in the College of Arts and Science. J. Anderson noted that accelerated programs have also been named 3+2. J. Anderson inquired if accelerated degree programs had a standing name. S. Lubienski responded that the name for now is AMPS.

**Motion Passed.** In favor: 10; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0
3. Program Change - Elimination of Diversity in U.S. History Course Electives for Secondary Social Studies Education Program (24.09)
This proposal sought to eliminate the Diversity in U.S. course electives for the Secondary Social Studies Education program, and replace the requirement with M483: Teaching Social Studies. This item came as a motion from the Committee on Teacher Education and Paige Andersson attended to answer any questions.

Second: A. Hackenberg
Discussion:

L. Locke inquired about the differences in course content, as the proposal indicated that similar course content would be taught. They asked what the benefits are of removing the course rather than keeping it as an option.

P. Andersson stated that the course would move as an elective and to satisfy the absolute requirement, a new course was created. Additionally, this new course fulfills department needs, as it would be offered consistently and provide students with the content and tools to prepare teaching social studies through a diverse lens. J. Decker stated that the other courses have a specific focus on particular histories. They inquired if the new course has the intent to provide a more generalized exposure. P. Andersson responded that the new course falls under a preexisting course number. The intent is to provide students with a general exposure to multiple histories.

Motion Passed. In favor: 10; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0

4. Program Change- Counseling and Student Services major (24.10)
This proposal sought to make a change to the Counseling and Student Services (CASS) major by moving PSYP155 from a required core course to the category of Major Elective. This item came as a motion from the Undergraduate Studies Committee and Paige Andersson attended to answer any questions.

Second: H. Ormiston
Discussion: No Discussion

Motion Passed. In favor: 10; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0

5. New Track- Child and Adolescent Mental Health (24.11)
This proposal sought to add a new track in Child and Adolescent Mental Health to the Counseling and Student Services (CASS) major which currently has two tracks the Counseling Psychology and Higher Education and Student Services. This item came as a motion from the Undergraduate Studies Committee and Paige Andersson attended to answer any questions.

Second: M. Nyikos
Discussion:
S. Lubienski asked for additional context regarding the expected enrollment, as the Provost is looking to approve new larger programs. P. Andersson responded that the preexisting minor enrollment numbers look very good as it has grown quickly. As of January 2023, there were 48 students enrolled, and as of Fall 2023 there are 75 enrolled students. P. Andersson provided additional enrollment numbers to further contextualize the growth in enrollment numbers and popularity of minors. P. Andersson noted that this proposal, if approved, would take pre-existing courses rather than creating new courses, and develop a track that would generate even more interest. S. Lubienski asked for clarification on whether the new track would incorporate all existing courses or if new courses would be developed. P. Andersson responded that the track would be comprised of existing courses except for the addition of the F203 course, so there will be one new course.

H. Ormiston stated that three of the courses are part of the minor. These courses cumulatively run 8-10 sections per semester, and 95% of the time at full capacity. Thus, there would need to be capacity to provide support if more sections were offered.

The school based mental health class is a course that has already passed through remonstrance, so it is on the books, but it has not been offered yet. The plan is to launch the course as part of the new track. H. Ormiston noted that they are working with Patrick McKamy to administer a survey for students in the minor and in the concentration to gain a better sense of see if there are potential areas of interests and growth.

S. Lubienski inquired if there were any other programs who would lay claim to this new program. H. Ormiston said there were challenges with naming courses, so the names would better reflect the content of the courses. Due to this, there may be potential questions. S. Lubienski stated that it helps to provide letters upfront, so they would appreciate H. Ormiston’s support and assistance.

M. Nyikos inquired about the difference between a track, certificate, and a minor. P. Andersson and S. Lubienski clarified.

M. McMullen asked if the proposed track would include a focus on early years. H. Ormiston stated that they could have a follow-up conversation with M. McMullen but noted that the introductory course has content related to early childhood mental health, but there is not a separate early childhood course. M. McMullen recognized the popularity an early childhood focus could have.

**Motion Passed.** In favor: 10; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0

This proposal seeks to develop a new program, Ed.S. in Higher Education Administration. This new program would serve as a professional development opportunity for higher education administrators not interested in a research career to engage with curriculum. Additionally, the proposal stated that the Ed.S. in higher education would also be a terminal degree for students in the Ed.D. and Ph.D. programs who do not complete a dissertation. This item came as a motion from the Graduate Studies Committee and Vic Borden attended to answer any questions.

**Second:** J. Decker

**Discussion:**
V. Borden stated that the program has been thinking about this for roughly 14 years. The proposal was developed for two reasons. The first is that many part-time students are full-time employees who want to take courses for professional development, rather than commit to completing a dissertation. The second would be to provide students who are timing out from candidacy. V. Borden stated that these students do not benefit from an M.S.Ed. because they already have the degree.

M. McMullen inquired if a student decides to enroll in the Ed.S. could the student earn the Ed.S. and then decide to complete the requirements for a terminal degree. V. Borden responded that the Graduate Studies Office would provide a better answer, but they would assume that students would have the opportunity to switch from an Ed.S. to a doctoral degree, if the student completes the proper qualifications to earn the doctorate and is not awarded the Ed.S. degree. T. Nelson Laird responded that students cannot earn the degree and then add the dissertation after the fact, other hurdles would be involved. M. McMullen stated that students would need to be counseled on the direction they decide to take. V. Borden agreed with M. McMullen and stated that the goal will be to get to students before they finish the degree.

A. Scribner asked if there was precedent for this at other universities. V. Borden stated that there is precedent for this here at the School of Education, but not in the field of Higher Education, and noted that there are Ed.S. programs in other areas. J. Decker stated that some of the practical reasons for Ed.S. programs are similar to those. V. Borden noted that there was consideration to add a higher education track to the general Ed.S., but they were told that it would not be feasible. M. Nyikos sought clarification on whether students enrolled in the Ed.S. could transfer to solely an Ed.D. program. V. Borden responded that students would have the opportunity to transfer to both Ed.D. or Ph.D. programs. M. Nyikos added that they believed students were not allowed to use any of the courses from the Ed.S. toward a doctoral degree. V. Borden clarified that would be the case if the student was awarded the Ed.S. G. Buck commented that this program has potential to devalue the Ed.S. as it would be seen as a default for students who didn’t make it. V. Borden stated that this program would be very valuable to the students, as there are quite a number in administration and ABD. However, this program would allow these students to earn a credential that they do not have. V. Borden noted that this doesn’t mean students will not just enroll in the Ed.S., as there are higher education professionals who are seeking out professional development. M. McMullen inquired whether a capstone project or research component would be required to complete the Ed.S. in Higher Education. V. Borden confirmed that there would be capstone requirements, and students would have the option to complete an early inquiry paper.

L. Locke inquired about the details of the capstone requirement. V. Borden responded that the requirement is not one thing, but students must complete a comprehensive project of some sort. The program allows for the requirement to be fulfilled in many ways. L. Locke asked if there would be curriculum changes for the Ed.S. if the goal is to be more professional and practice focused. As a Higher Education student, L. Locke noted that most of the current curriculum seems to focus on research. V. Borden stated that the Ed.D. is currently a hybrid, but a lot of practical work is covered in courses.

T. Nelson Laird said this is not the end of the Ed.S. program's development. The presented proposal serves as the first entry of this program becoming official. The proposal has enough flexibility for the capstone requirement and additional elements can be further developed. T. Nelson Laird indicated that there seems to be a market for this program, but they believe it will be of greater use outside the original intent. T. Nelson Laird stated that this program's approval would lead to possible distinction
for the School of Education, as this would be the first Ed.S. in Higher Education program. A. Scribner said they believe the program makes sense, but they are concerned that students will not be aware that when they decided to earn an Ed.S. they cannot simply go back and write a dissertation if they want a doctoral degree. V. Borden stated that students would have to think long and hard about their decision, but the decision would be informed by proper advisement. M. McMullen asked if students would take a qualifying exam to qualify as a doctoral student. V. Borden confirmed that would be the case.

Policy Council Chair G. Ozogul directed Policy Council members towards voting on the original motion. M. McMullen stated that it would be a big attraction. V. Borden reminded Policy Council members that the student population would be professionals in the higher education workforce. G. Ozogul called for a vote.

**Motion Passed.** In favor: 10; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0; Recusal: 1


This item served as a bulletin update for the Ed.S. residency requirement. The proposal outlined new language that is based on updated Ed.D. language. This item came as a motion from the Graduate Studies Committee and Tom Nelson Laird attended to answer any questions.

**Second:** A. Hackenberg

**Discussion:** No Discussion

**Motion Passed.** In favor: 10; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 1

E. Discussion

1. Dean’s Search Timeline (24.14)

The Agenda Committee requested that the Policy Council approve one of the following timelines to be recommended to the Provost. Only Policy Council members could vote as faculty governance representatives, but all faculty members were asked to give feedback on the timeline(s). This item came as a motion from the Agenda Committee. G. Ozogul opened up discussion for non-voting faculty.

**Second:** M. Nyikos

**Discussion:**

G. Ozogul stated that the Agenda Committee received an email from a faculty member who could not attend the Policy Council meeting. The email inquired why timelines are just now being discussed for the dean search and noted that it is late to begin the process this Fall. The email also inquired what were the reasons for the delay in the search and asked if the Policy Council could discuss if the Provost is prioritizing the SoE dean search amongst other search searches currently occurring or have occurred recently. G. Ozogul opened the floor for discussion. A. Brannan asked if the questions posed in the email could be answered. G. Ozogul stated that they were unsure if the Agenda Committee could respond. D. DeSawal referred Policy Council members and the attending faculty to the minutes from the April 27, 2023, Policy Council meeting, as they answer the questions posed. D. DeSawal stated that when the Provost met with the Policy Council in April, the discussion surrounded the
School of Education identifying a search committee in the Fall, so the committee could be charged to begin by late Fall. D. DeSawal continued, stating that following the selection of the search committee, the recruitment phase would begin, following a two-phase interview process, and a new Dean selected by the Spring, and begin the next fiscal year. D. DeSawal stated that the Provost expressed a flexibility within the timeline, and openness to timeline suggestions from the Policy Council. Faculty and Policy Council members discussed the pros and cons regarding the proposed timelines. What is to follow is a summary of the discussion.

- Faculty and Policy Council members expressed a desire for the School of Education to have stability and a long-term vision. However, some faculty recognized that the brief timeline may leave the school with a long-standing dean who is not a good fit.
- Faculty members inquired about the origins of the two timelines and the Agenda Committee clarified the development of the proposed timeline. Faculty and Policy council members expressed frustration for possibly delaying the dean search once again and inquired if the Provost is fully behind trying to make the search successful. Discussion also ensued regarding the advantages and disadvantages of posting the position now and having a start date of Fall 2025 as this plan would allow for the dean search to begin without being rushed to find a suitable candidate. The Policy Council Chair encouraged faculty and Policy Council members to present their questions during the faculty meeting and ask for the Provost to address how the approach to long or short searches.
- Faculty and Policy Council members reminded each other that during the April Policy Council meeting members voted to approve the use of an internal search firm. In addition, during this discussion, it was noted that the Provost does not believe the school is behind if the dean search begins now. Further, it was stated that with the use of an internal search firm the school would have some agency in the recruitment process for a new dean. Additionally, faculty and policy council members recognized the workload associated with using an internal search firm, as advertising and recruiting for the position would be the responsibility of the school.
- Policy Council and faculty members discussed whether the school should consider an internal candidate due to the shorter timeline. The Policy Council Chair noted that the school was promised a national search. The configuration of the search committee was discussed, and the process was outlined for meeting attendees. Policy Council members noted that dean searches occur year-round, and institutions currently have calls out.
- The discussion continued as a Policy Council member inquired about stakeholder input. Faculty and Policy Council members stated that the Long-Range Plan and Diversity plan would assist in outlining what the school is looking for in a dean. Further it was recognized that key stakeholders worked on the development of both plans so they could be used to guide the search process.
- Faculty and Policy Council members discussed the logistics of the dean search including the job description. It was noted that the updated job description would have to be approved at the campus, but the approval would be in tandem with the formation of the search committee. It was stated that search committees could be formed within four weeks and that job descriptions are generic since the dean is a campus-based position.
- The discussion concluded with faculty and policy council members expressing concern for the school to be seen as wavering by delaying the search once again. Additional concern was expressed regarding language, as a Policy Council member expressed that they did not want to hear the school endured another failed search, but rather that the position for the dean is still open until the appropriate candidate is found. A faculty member called for Policy Council and faculty members to think about the individual who sits in the position. If the Policy Council votes to begin the dean search now, then a retirement date of the position would be set. While the position would be extended till filled, the school would have an interim dean. The school should not rely
on or expect someone to remain in a role until the search is successful. The Policy Council Chair outlined the two proposed timelines once again and called for a written vote.

**Timeline A Passed.** In favor of Timeline A: 9; In favor of Timeline B: 2

F. 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-J 597**
*Course title:* Teaching, Learning & Curriculum Capstone

*Description:* This is a final capstone course for students enrolled in the M.S.Ed. in Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum (Online Collaborative). In this course students will synthesize their learning across courses in their master’s track through an individualized capstone project under the direction of a faculty member.

*Justification:* This course is the final capstone for the M.S.Ed. in Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum (Online Collaborative). This course is a necessary component for the online collaborative degree.

**BL EDUC-L 522**
*Course title:* Pedagogical Foundations for Teaching English as a New Language

*Description:* This methods course provides a solidifying experience in how teachers translate their knowledge of language and literacy, culture, and equity-mindedness into responsive and sustaining pedagogical practices that assist, assess, and differentiate instruction to advance multilingual students’ Learning.

*Justification:* A new IU Online ENL Program course was required to focus on pedagogy, differentiation, and assessment as an instructional methods course using critical sociocultural theory and practices. No current course meets this need.

**BL EDUC-L 571**
*Course title:* Practicum in ENL Assessment

*Description:* This practicum will expand your assessment literacy and antibiased and anti-racist (ABAR) teaching and assessment practices. You will identify characteristics of assessments that make assessments useful, meaningful, and equitable for multilingual learners.

*Justification:* The IU Online English as a New Language graduate certificate is a new program, requiring a fully online practicum to accompany L503 Assessment Literacy for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students. This link between L503 and the practicum solely in assessment does not currently exist in our offerings.

**BL EDUC-L 572**
*Course title:* Practicum in ENL Pedagogy

*Description:* This practicum provides a solidifying experience in how teachers translate their knowledge of language and literacy, culture, and equity-mindedness into responsive and sustaining pedagogical
practices that assist, assess, and differentiate instruction to advance multilingual students’ learning.

*Justification:* We developed a new pedagogy course (EDUC L522), requiring an associated and appropriately aligned practicum.

---

**Course Changes**

**BL EDUC-A 308**  
*Course Title:* Legal and Ethical Issues for Teachers  
*Change of Course Title:* Legal and Ethical Issues in Education

*Current Course Description:* Focuses primarily on legal concerns affecting teachers in public elementary and secondary schools. Topics include tort liability, church/state relations, expression rights, children with disabilities, conditions of employment, discrimination, and harassment, student testing, collective bargaining, teacher lifestyle choices, copyright concerns, teacher contracts and dismissal, record-keeping practices, and student discipline.

*Change Course Description to:* Students examine legal and ethical issues in schools by (1) identifying various legal and ethical dilemmas in order to articulate and defend solutions; (2) applying constitutional, statutory, and case law; (3) increasing legal literacy including “preventative law;” and (4) discussing social justice (e.g., SES, race, nationality, religion, gender, LGBTQ+, disability).

*Justification:* To reflect current content of course.

**BL EDUC-Y 435**  
*Course Title:* Program Evaluation for Applied Educational Professions

*Course Description:* This undergraduate capstone inquiry course engages students in conducting a small-scale evaluation by consulting with a relevant organization or business. Students will begin with a simulated evaluation study organized according to thread. By the second half of the semester, students will be involved in group-conducted local evaluations.

*Change:* Removing prerequisite EDUC-Y 402

*Justification:* The prerequisite is not required per the faculty member overseeing the course. It was originally added because the graduate class in evaluation has a statistics prerequisite but it is not needed for the undergraduate class.

Adjourned at 3:04 pm