

**MINUTES  
POLICY COUNCIL  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

January 29, 2003 1:00 – 3:10 p.m.  
School of Education  
IUB Room 2140  
IUPUI Room 3138E

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

**Members Present:** Alexander, Barman, Bichelmeyer, Boone, Chafel, Harste, Hossler, McCarthy, Ochoa, Rosario, Zimmerman. **Dean's Staff Present:** Cummings, Gonzalez, Lambdin, McCarty, Murtadha. **Staff Representative:** Wickemeyer-Hardy **Student Representatives:** Pascoe, Singh. **Guest:** Ron Barnes, Barry Bull, Frank Lester.

I. Approval of the Minutes from November 20, 2002 Meeting ([03.09M](#))

Because of an incompleteness in the November minutes, the minutes were not approved.

II. Announcements and Discussions

A. Report from Dean Gonzalez

1. Governor's Budget

A report from Judy Palmer, Vice President of Administration for the University, outlined the impact of the Governor's proposed budget on the University if it is adopted. In light of the proposed budget, the standard 4% tuition increase would not be sufficient to account for expenditures. This may result in cut-backs University wide next year. Contingency plans are currently being developed at Bloomington and IUPUI campuses. Budget hearings for the School of Education will be held in early February.

2. Merger of the Center for Research on Learning & Technology and the Office of Research & Development

The merger is an outcome of multiple conversations with faculty and through recommendations by a committee that was convened to look at our financial operations and to see how we can provide maximum flexibility with strong accountability. The merger is expected to provide technical assistance and support from pre-proposal through post-award to all principle investigators. The merger brings center-like support to all faculty members who engage in the pursuit of funding for projects.

3. NCATE Review Status

The NCATE examiners have issued their report from their review of both the Bloomington and IUPUI campuses. The report reiterates the findings reported by the examiners at the exit interview. The report specifies that the School of Education has met the Standards and includes recommendations for improvement in assessment systems. A rejoinder is currently being developed by David Kinman and Linda Houser to be sent to

NCATE, after which the final NCATE report will be issued to the School. A forum for reflection on the NCATE process and its findings is planned for after the final NCATE report is received.

#### 4. Forum Planned to Discuss the Merit Review Process

Jonathan Plucker, Moya Andrews, George Walker, and David Zaret have been invited to visit the School of Education and hold a forum on January 30, 2003. The forum is geared to invite serious conversation about the merit review process and procedures. The objectives of the forum are to look at our merit review process and see if it is currently the best mechanism to increase salaries of high performing faculty to competitive levels and do so differentially.

#### 5. Strategic Plan

The IUB campus is developing a Strategic Plan to outline the process by which funds will be allotted to individuals or groups of individuals who wish to create major multidisciplinary projects, based on one of the 5 strategic priorities and one or more of their broad underlying themes. The 5 strategic priorities include: Life Sciences; Applied Sciences and Technology; Interdisciplinary Projects in the Liberal Arts; the Arts; and International Globalization. Several broad themes underlie the strategic priorities. Some of these themes include undergraduate education, diversity, teacher preparation, and teacher partnerships. Although Education is not one of the 5 specific strategic priorities, there are numerous opportunities for projects encompassing each of the 5 strategic priorities as well as each of the underlying themes.

The current priorities are academic in nature. However, this is only the first phase of the Strategic Plan. Future goals of the Strategic Plan are likely to encompass non-academic as well as further academic priorities for the Campus.

These major projects will be chosen for their commitment to excellence and for the betterment of the University. Concept papers, 2-pages in length, may be submitted to Dean Gonzalez for review by February 7, 2003. A small number of concept papers, after consulting with the Bloomington Budgetary Affairs Committee and the Associate Deans, will be selected to be formulated into a 10-page proposal that will then go to the Chancellor for review and approval. Throughout the process of proposal review, there are multiple opportunities for collaborative relationships and multidisciplinary teams to be formed at the prompting of the Strategic Planning Committee, the Council of Deans, the Bloomington Faculty Budgetary Affairs, and the Chancellor. If similar project proposals are submitted, it may be suggested that the projects be combined into one collaborative project. Once projects have been accepted, a funding base starting at \$250,000 per year will be awarded.

Alexander and McCarthy suggested that the Fall Faculty Retreat be an opportunity to motivate the process of forming collaborations and begin creating possible project proposals.

#### B. Agenda Committee

1. Visit by Chancellor Brehm ([03.19](#))

Dean Gonzalez explained that Chancellor Brehm has asked to be invited to a Policy Council meeting so that she may engage in a meaningful discussion about the strategic directions for the Campus. Specifically, she would like to obtain feedback and suggestions about the Strategic Plan and the Presidential search. This meeting is tentatively scheduled for February 26, 2003.

Chafel reads an excerpt from an e-mail message she received from Chancellor Brehm:

“Now is an excellent time to make sure that the campus fully understands the Strategic Plan and the process by which it is being developed and will be implemented. I very much wanted to hear from all of the members of the council about the major goals, challenges, and opportunities that they see for the Bloomington Campus over the next two years. By focusing on these issues now, we will all be better prepared to be helpful to the new president.”

Dean Gonzalez highly encouraged all who are interested in participating in the Plan and in formulating projects, to very closely study the Strategic Plan and its detailed process.

For more information about the Strategic Plan see website:

[http://www.iub-chancellor.indiana.edu/strategic\\_plan/](http://www.iub-chancellor.indiana.edu/strategic_plan/)

III. New Business

A. Nominations Committee Members ([03.15](#))

Bichelmeyer moved to approve the Nominations Committee members who were recommended by the Agenda Committee. Motion was seconded and approved.

B. Proposal from Graduate Studies Committee to Grant Temporary Exception for Second Year to Education Specialist Degree ([02.42](#)) ([03.13](#))

Frank Lester, representative of the GSC, opened the discussion. Lester suggested that there may be various issues surrounding the Ed.S. Leadership degree that is temporarily being offered to students at the IPFW campus, particularly the issue of the GSC recommending a second year of exception for the number of credit hours required at a Core Campus. The new program at IPFW reduces the number of credits to be taken at a Core Campus from 35 to 24, which goes against existing policy. If the program has to wait for PC to vote on whether or not to change the existing policy, then the program could not recruit for the coming year. In order to allow the program to pursue another class of students for the coming year, the GSC proposes that they grant another exception. The reason the GSC is calling this an “exception” is because the GSC is not on record for supporting changing the policy from 35 to 24 credit hours on a Core Campus.

Dean Gonzalez stated that last year the GSC recommended a one year exception to the policy to put this program at IPFW in place and planned to evaluate the program in one

year to decide if continued exception would be recommended or if deemed necessary, to review the policy in general. He suggested then that there are really two issues being brought to the table: first, the current recommendation for the GSC to expand the exception to the program for an additional year and second, to review the existing policy.

Barry Bull noted that last year the IPFW program was approved by the GSC prior to the acceptance of the program by the Department of Education Leadership and Policy Studies. The Department had a meeting this fall and voted in favor of the one cohort exception that the GSC had already approved. The Department was not requesting a permanent exception for the GSC, but instead was just offering the Department's support of what the GSC had already approved. The Department then did not approve and is not requesting that a second year of exception be provided. It was the understanding of the Department that once the initial cohort had been accepted and was near the completion of the program, that the data would be evaluated to look at the effectiveness of the program at IPFW. The Department then is seeking for the PC's approval of the one cohort to be allowed to complete the program, not for another cohort to be accepted.

Lester emphasized the merit of having the Ed.S. Leadership program in place at IPFW. However, the GSC wanted more than an evaluation at the end of the cohort's program. The GSC wanted to have information on who is going to monitor the progress of the students through the program; who is going to be in charge of the program; and who is going to be responsible for infrastructure and guidance throughout the program's existence. Is this going to be the responsibility of the Core Campus? These issues illustrate the reason why the GSC only granted a one year exception to the program and planned to reevaluate the program after one year.

Barry Bull reiterated that the Department of ELPS is requesting that the first cohort be permitted to finish the program at IPFW and that with the provisos outlined by the GSC for evaluation, monitoring, and other infrastructural guidance, that the Department be able to request the extension of a second cohort at a later time if decided appropriate.

McCarty explained that it is the concern of the GSC that recruitment may have begun already for the next cohort.

Ron Barnes stated that in discussions with IPFW, he told them that they needed to have a cohort admitted by 3/15/03 so that it is known who is in the cohort and they must have been through the admission process.

McCarthy suggested that additional issues of concerns, other than the issue of the policy, are quality control, monitoring of student progress, and guidance of the program. She suggested that PC wait until it is an appropriate time to evaluate the program at which time they can decide whether or not the policy needs to be reviewed.

Lester supported McCarthy's summary and clarified that the issue for GSC was not whether or not GSC could give approval for a new program on a temporary basis, but instead, was that GSC was allowing a violation of policy, which is why this issue was brought to PC. Therefore, GSC is allowing this violation of policy, unless PC decides otherwise.

Dean Gonzalez suggested that the question still remains if another cohort is going to be admitted and if this is the case, another exception must be granted by the PC.

Barry Bull noted that this break from the process may have been due to him being on sabbatical. Neil Theobald who was interim chair was involved in this process and may not have followed procedures by taking the issue to the Department for approval.

Cummings explained another difficulty associated with distance education programs is in determining if a course taken by students at a branch campus, taught by an instructor at a Core Campus, is a Core Campus course or not? The concept then of needing 35 credit hours on a Core Campus has merit and should be sent back to the GSC for review.

While a motion was being discussed by the PC, Barry Bull further explained that currently, 7 students have been admitted to the program, while others are still in the admission process. Therefore, a cohort has not yet been comprised. Those students who have already been admitted and are in the program now, are taking courses at this time, but these courses are general courses. The cohort will not be completely formed until 03/15/03.

Bichelmeyer moved that the PC accept the GSC recommendation to grant the program provisional approval, but for the GSC to accept a friendly amendment to change 1 year provisional approval to 1 cohort provisional approval.

Lester reiterated that he was unsure if this motion was in the “spirit” of the GSC’s request for only one year provisional approval. However, as representative of the GSC, he did accept the friendly amendment.

Dean Gonzalez restated the motion on the floor, presented by Bichelmeyer, in that the GSC voted to recommend to PC that the program be given one cohort provisional approval. Alexander seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

C. Discussion of rule of taking 35 credit hours from Core Campus ([03.14](#))

Dean Gonzalez introduced this item. The rule currently stands that Ed.S. programs of study must consist of at least 64 credit hours, 35 of which must be taken at the Bloomington or Indianapolis Campus. Because of advances in technology and the demand for flexibility in program offerings, the need for re-evaluating this rule may be warranted.

Dean Gonzalez offered a possible change to the rule that would make it possible to create exceptions to the current rule with both the program approval and the Dean’s approval. McCarthy voiced her concern about hastily making changes to this rule and suggested that there may be many ramifications of allowing such a change. Possible considerations to changing the rule would include monitoring the quality of programs at branch campuses, advising students in these programs, and evaluation of these programs. McCarthy offered her support of the Dean’s proposed “exception” process of allowing changes to the rule – but not changing the rule into a blanket rule.

Harste offered that the policy should also take into account the doctoral degree programs and that the idea of checks and balances to making exceptions is reasonable. Harste further suggested that each individual case/program needs to be examined carefully.

Bichelmeyer suggested another consideration for changing the language could be to say at least 35 credit hours where the instructor of record is on faculty at either Bloomington or Indianapolis. Bull noted that there are many adjuncts who are faculty at IUB and IUPUI and if they are an instructor of record at Bloomington or Indianapolis, then they could teach at other campuses and then Departments may have very little quality control over the content of the courses.

McCarty expressed her concern that this reduction to 24 credit hours minimum would allow students to complete considerably less than 50 percent, about 37 percent, of their course credits with faculty who are authorized to award their degree. If students are not seeking classes with instructors who are authorized to award their degree, then this creates a problem. There is also the problem of quality of courses is not guaranteed.

Harste supported looking at the rule and allowing exceptions and stated that it is very important for universities of today. Harste commented that it is time to be more radical about the delivery of advanced degree programs. He stated he believes that policies such as the one being discussed are holding up the delivery of advanced degrees to areas where there is high demand.

Barnes stated that 240 superintendents throughout the State will have retired within the next five years. He suggested that if IU wants to have a role in licensing those who will be filling the vacancies left by these superintendents, then they need to seriously look at opportunities to provide programs away from the IUB and IUPUI campuses.

Alexander commented that she would not like to see this conversation extend beyond the Ed.S. degree to the doctoral degrees. She expressed that there is something about residency and being immersed in the graduate committee that is important for doctoral candidates.

Bichelmeyer motioned that the PC refer the issue of changing the language of the Ed.S. program of studies to the GSC for further consideration and a recommendation of this issue be brought back to the PC in due course. Motion was seconded and passed.

#### IV. Old Business

- A. Recommendation of Long Range Planning Committee regarding Goal 2: Strengthen the School of Education's Partnerships with P-12 Schools and Communities ([03.16](#))

Chafel opened the item by referring back to a vote by PC in November to assign the Strategic Goals of the SOE to various standing committees for oversight, monitoring, and implementation. Goal 2, which relates to strengthening the SOE's relationship with P-12 schools and communities, was referred to the Long-Range Planning Committee. The Long-Range Planning Committee recommended that the Teacher Education Committee be the best standing committee for this role. They further advised that the Technology

Committee, Research Committee, Diversity Committee and Graduate Studies Committee should report their activities on their goals related to outreach and partnerships.

Dean Gonzalez emphasized that the LRPC recognized that the TEC may not be able to fulfill this obligation to their fullest because of their many other responsibilities. The LRPC may have preferred that there be a group to look at these issues, but that such a group does not exist.

Lambdin identified that the TEC would be well prepared to report on and comment on their partnerships and outreach with the schools involved in the field experiences with students in teacher preparation programs. However, there are many other aspects of the partnerships and activities that the TEC would be asked to report on as a result of this charge, that the TEC may not be best equipped to report on.

Harste suggested that the PC reconsider charging standing committees not only with fulfilling their duties as a committee, but also with monitoring. Monitoring, he proposed, shifts the role of committees.

Dean Gonzalez agreed that perhaps monitoring was not the right word to describe the intent proposed by the charge. Instead of monitoring others, the idea was that each committee would assess the progress that was made and report that progress, in definable terms with data, back to the PC.

Alexander pointed out that there may be outreach and partnerships that occur throughout the SOE that may not be reported to the TEC and there is no method in place that would ensure that TEC be notified of all outreach that is occurring throughout the SOE. How would the TEC then collect all of this information?

The motion on the floor is for PC to approve the recommendations of the LRPC to assign the Strategic Goal 2 to the TEC for oversight, monitoring, and implementation, as well as charging the Technology Committee, Research Committee, Diversity Committee and Graduate Studies Committee to report their activities on their goals related to outreach and partnerships to the PC at the end of the year.

**This item was postponed until next meeting due to time limitations.**

V. New Courses/Courses up for Remonstrance

Chafel called attention to the listed courses up for remonstrance.