

MINUTES

School of Education Policy Council

September 20, 2000

IUB – Room 2140

IUPUI – 3138G

****The following are summaries of speaker contributions****

Members Present: Bichelmeyer, Burkhart, Buzzelli, Carter, Klein, Lambdin, Levinson, McCarthy, Manset, Osgood, Rosario, St. John, Silk, Singh, Sutton, Wickemeyer-Hardy. Deans Present: Gonzalez, Cummings, Brown, Wilcox. Guest: Professor Dan Mueller.

I. Approval of the minutes for April 28, 2000 (00.31M)

Minutes for April 28, 2000, were unanimously approved.

II. Announcements and Discussions

a. Dean Gerardo Gonzalez

Dean Gonzalez presented the Policy Council with three issues; the first having to do with a desire for the faculty retreat to have a theme based on agreed upon goals. The Dean articulated specific goals that he would like to present to the faculty of the School of Education. They related to 5 important areas, including:

1. Quality teacher education
2. Outreach to public schools and community
3. Leadership and technology
4. Enhanced doctoral education and research
5. Increased diversity

Dean Gonzalez will present these goals formally to the faculty this Friday and invite a meaningful discussion, to reflect on what might be a framework for the future of the School of Education. There are things that may not be articulated in the goals that the faculty may want to include. Ultimately, he believes that the goals that are decided on will become a framework by which decisions about priorities are made.

The second issue related to the budget. Due to the careful stewardship of former Dean Warren, Barry Bull, and the Budgetary Affairs Committee, the School discovered that at the end of the year there was a surplus of funds. It was decided that those dollars would be invested in ways that would advance the School's mission, rather than be put into reserves, where there would be a risk that they would be tapped by outside interests. As discussions about how to invest the money were taking place, the dean insisted that whatever programs were put forward, that there would be clearly articulated, measurable goals created for those programs. Based on those discussions five projects were funded. They include:

1. Establishing an office of outreach to schools and communities
2. Support for a web-based master's degree in IST and Language Education
3. Assisting in the creation of a "fast-track" master's degree (alternative certification degree), for people who have significant experience (peace corps, vista, etc.)
4. Research initiatives, including expanding the Office of Research

5. Investment in technology (e.g. for distance education)

Decisions had to be made fairly quickly, based on certain time constraints. The goals that were articulated earlier became invaluable in making decisions about where the money should be invested (as a helpful framework).

The third issue related to the “21st Century Teachers Program”, a program designed to increase collaboration between the Liberal Arts & Sciences and the School of Education, to improve the teacher preparation curriculum. A report has been released, recommending that the effort be continued by looking thematically at the teacher preparation curriculum, with a goal of improving not just the professional education part of the curriculum, but also the Arts and Sciences part. That recommendation was well received by the Chancellors. It was agreed that the program should occur now, and that it should be implemented system-wide, where constituents will work on their own campuses, and then a coordinating board that will help keep the “conversation” going across campuses. One of these conversations will be focused on whether there should be agreement around the notion of common course pre-requisites for teacher preparation, while another major issue is related to course transferability. Through it all, the School of Education will be exercising a leadership role in the discussions.

A question was raised as to whether the Teacher Education Council, and its membership, was the appropriate vehicle for assisting in the planning process for the 21st Century Teacher’s Program, rather than the existing ad hoc committee.

b. Agenda Committee

1. President Myles Brand’s visit to Policy Council

President Myles Brand will be addressing the Policy Council at the November meeting.

2. Faculty meeting dates

Tentative dates have been set for the faculty meetings in the fall and spring. An announcement on those dates will be forthcoming. There was a comment made related to conflicts in scheduling when setting important meetings, and a suggestion that the Dean of Faculties should be alerted when meetings are set.

III. Old Business

There were no old business items.

IV. New Business

a. General Education Proposals (01.05)

Dean Gonzalez commented that the General Education Proposals are the outcome of discussions taking place at IUB around the general education curriculum. The question asked by the memo relates to whether the general education curriculum is appropriate for teacher preparation. The memo’s key component is a request for the appropriate School committees to look at the proposals embedded in the documents, and respond formally to the University Curriculum Committee by February 18, 2001. The task of the Policy Council is to decide on which are the appropriate committees and how it wants to approach the task. There was a question regarding whether the proposals presented were separate, or “both/and”. Sutton reminded the Policy Council that the memorandum was a response to past feedback the Council sent regarding an earlier General Education proposal (along with T.E.C. and Dean’s

Advisory Committee), adding that she sees this as a “both/and” proposal (as the second proposal for common proficiencies is an elaboration of point number 5). Cummings commented that Barry Bull would be the contact person for any questions related to the proposals.

The Dean stated that the 21st Century Teachers program relates to the proposals, and will have implications for it. Again, a question was raised as to whether the School was organizationally structured to do it; that is, is it sufficient for the TEC, deans advisory group and Policy Council to review each subsequent set, or will there be a need for additional coordinating mechanisms (on each campus)? There was also a concern about whether the strategy taken on this issue reflects a reactive vs. proactive approach. St. John pointed out two ideas presented during the discussion that were proactive:

1. Using the budget process to leverage pedagogical strategy
2. Facilitating the development of this project as an outreach mechanism

It was suggested that the 21st Century Teacher’s Council will provide a forum for a discussion about course requirements, and that the broad areas needed to be agreed on first before addressing areas appropriate for teacher preparation curriculum and credit hour numbers. Other issues presented during this discussion include:

1. Questions related to course content vs. pedagogy
2. Concern about the possible narrowing down of student’s flexibility, as a result of decreasing the number of acceptable pre-requisite courses
3. Questions about the make-up of the TEC, specifically related to adequate representation for the 21st Century Project
4. A suggestion that that General Education Requirements be made at the program level, rather than the School level, and a discussion about what that would look like.

Carter made a motion (which was amended) to refer the April 26, 2000 General Education Proposals (memo, Burkholder to Dean of Education) to Teacher Education Council and the Dean’s Advisory Committee. The TEC is directed to solicit input on the General Education Proposals from all teacher education programs.

All were in favor of the motion. A motion was then made by Sutton to refer to the TEC with a request that they deliberate on a mechanism for working in collaboration with the 21st Century Teachers Council. The motion was seconded and unanimously accepted.

b. Specialist’s Degree in Education (01.06)

Mueller presented three action items from the Graduate Programs Committee. The first two pertain to changes in general requirements for the new Graduate Bulletin, the third to a revision and consolidation of Specialist in Education degrees.

1. An addition to the document, inviting applicants to submit a brief resume, is proposed for admission criteria to graduate programs. A second to the original motion was made (to include the sentence regarding the above issue in the new bulletin). All were in favor.
2. Elimination of the sentence, “Courses over 20 years may not be used in graduate programs”. McCarthy seconded the motion to take the sentence out. All were in favor.
3. Bulletin changes- The motion to accept the changes for the Ed.S. program components, as well as the consolidation of program areas with low enrollments, was seconded and unanimously approved.

c. Special Education Program Revision-“A Community of Teachers Program” for Pre-service Special Education Teachers at Indiana University-BL (01.07)

The Committee previously passed this program revision. Klein commented that this is a new Teacher Ed program, focusing on secondary special education (which the School has not had before), and combining content area and special education (a double major). A motion was made to approve. The motion was seconded, and all were in favor.

d. English Major Program Revisions (01.08)

These revisions were also approved by the TEC. A motion was made to approve, which was seconded, and all were in favor.

Overview on website: Minutes of Policy Council will be available on the web in the future. Questions about the site relate to who should have access to the minutes, and how far back they should go.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.