

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
February 25, 2004 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, Boone, Carter, Chafel, D'Ambrosio, Dilworth, Harste, McCarthy, Osgood, Sutton, Thompson. **Dean's Staff Present:** Howard-Hamilton, Kloosterman, Lambdin. **Staff Representative:** Apple, Pascoe. **Alternate:** Bob Appelman **Guests:** Valarie Akerson, Eric Ban, Tom Brush, Jack Cummings, Ginette Delandshere, Dave Kinman, Tim Niggle, Jill Shedd.

Because a quorum was not established at the start of the meeting, Dean Kloosterman began the meeting with the Dean's report.

I. Dean's Report

A. Budget Report

The budget meeting held last week with Neil Theobald and Ken Gros Louis, established that the School of Education is in fair condition financially. Although there was overspending this year, this overspending was anticipated and compensated for by utilizing around five-hundred thousand dollars of reserve finances. The Trustees are considering a 3% increase in student tuition for next academic year, no more than four percent. Assuming this 3% increase and considering that expenses in general will increase about 1.5%, the school is projecting faculty raises. If faculty and staff are given a 1% raise, the school is projecting a two-hundred and twenty thousand dollar deficit for next year. A 2% raise would place the projected deficit at around two-hundred and seventy thousand dollar deficit next year. The Dean's office will keep all faculty and staff posted as things progress.

Sutton asked if there was any discussion concerning changing the assessment formula.

Dean Kloosterman responded that there has been discussion and the general thought is that it may be simplified somewhat. However, there is no guarantee that the School will be better off in the end. In the coming year, we will have less assessment. But in exchange we will be afforded less state appropriations.

B. Chancellor's Fund

The Chancellor's fund will have money available for projects on campus. The SOE requested money for two connected projects: to develop the P-16 Center and to update the ILF. These are thought to be good areas for advancement because of the political timeliness surrounding P-16 policy throughout the state. Additionally, the ILF is

anticipated to be used as a mechanism to facilitate P-16 collaboration and communication across the state at various levels.

C. Commitment to Excellence Funds

The focus on the Commitment to Excellence program has shifted. The revised procedures for appropriating funds are aimed at soliciting a small number of proposals geared toward strengthening and perpetuating old programs already established on the Bloomington campus. This stems out of the concern that current programs are eroding due to lack of funding.

Within the SOE, based on recommendations from the Faculty Affairs Committee, the deans, and other informal conversations, we are going to put together a proposal focusing on Teacher Education as the program within the School that we want to strengthen. From this, we will include the proposals previously submitted by SOE faculty as they pertained to Special Education, Museum Education and International Education.

McCarthy questioned whose decision it was to change the Commitment to Excellence focus.

Dean Kloosterman commented that he wasn't sure if the decision came from any one person, but that the final decision involved Ken Gros Louis. The rationale for this change stemmed from the general impression on campus that many excellent programs are in jeopardy because of lack of funds.

McCarthy noted that as a faculty governance group, the PC needs to be vigilant in its support for these decisions. A great deal of time and effort was put into developing proposals, after which the process was changed. Similarly, this type of misinformation occurred with the earmarked funds in that the faculty developed proposals that later were not considered. If this continues to occur, faculty may decide it is not worthwhile to develop proposals.

D. Space within the School

Issues dealing with the limited space available within the SOE have been considered. Dean Gonzalez has asked Gene McClain to survey the building to determine how space is currently being used. Based on his findings, we will be looking at how to better maximize the space within the building. A recent consolidation occurred in the mailroom area. Where two rooms were previously being occupied for mail distribution and duplication, now one room houses both areas. This opened up a room for future classes.

E. Faculty Searches

Faculty searches have been held in the areas of: Math, Inquiry, Learning Sciences and Language Education. Offers have been made for Math and Inquiry candidates. Both Learning Sciences and Language Education reviews will be concluding shortly.

* Quorum was established at this point in the meeting.

II. Approval of Minutes

A. Approval of the Minutes from January 28, 2004 Meeting ([04.19M](#))

Chafel noted editorial changes.

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the minutes with editorial changes. The minutes for January 28, 2004 were unanimously approved.

III. Agenda Committee Announcements

A. Report by Sutton, Committee Chair

1. Spring Faculty Meeting

The Spring faculty meeting will take place April 30, 2004 from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. in the IUB School of Education Auditorium and via videoconference in room 3138E School of Education at Indianapolis.

IV. Old Business

A. Report from Committee on Teaching ([04.21](#))

Valerie Akerson, Committee on Teaching co-chair, spoke to this item. Akerson presented a policy developed by the Committee on Teaching as a response to the pressing issue of plagiarism within the School. The proposed policy would require that all students, both undergraduate and graduate, complete the on-line plagiarism tutorial that has been developed by Ted Frick. Verification would be established by printing off the certificate of completion available upon successfully finishing the tutorial. In addition to requiring student completion of the tutorial, the Committee strongly recommended that all instructors discuss plagiarism in their courses.

Harste noted that monitoring completion of the tutorial could be carried out by including the tutorial component in courses required for all students, such as W200 and W201. At the graduate level, certificates of completion would be submitted to the Graduate Studies Office and filed in each student's personal folders.

Harste further elaborated that the Committee on Teaching recognized this as a first step. The Committee intends to continue monitoring the issue of plagiarism and will make further recommendations to the PC as they are developed.

Alexander suggested that students be required to turn in the certificate of tutorial completions prior to submission of their first paper for the course. This is a technique used by the Early Childhood program.

Pascoe commented on the ease of "plagiarizing the plagiarism tutorial." She elaborated that students can have a friend complete the tutorial for them by logging in under their friend's name. Students can also print out the correct and incorrect answers. Because of

these particulars, Pascoe and McCarthy emphasized the need for instructors to reinforce the principles behind understanding and avoiding plagiarism.

Sutton posed to the committee the question of how to operationally define a way to have all instructors incorporate the discussion of plagiarism into their courses.

Alexander suggested considering a policy stating that every course's syllabus must include the topic of plagiarism.

Lambdin observed the need for this educative process to be positive, rather than punitive. She also called attention to the need for greater awareness among faculty and staff as to the proper steps of reporting plagiarism. She referred to Pam Freeman's data presented to the council last year that showed there were not many reports of student plagiarism from the SOE, yet it is knowingly occurring. Furthermore, it is important to understand that turning students in for plagiarism is an important mechanism for keeping track of the problem and for identifying those students who are repeatedly caught plagiarizing.

Cummings called attention to the syllabus format used by Instructional Consulting where links to the University's Students' Rights and The Student Code of Conduct are provided. He recommended these links be on all syllabi.

Sutton questioned the feasibility for implementing the suggested tutorial component at IUPUI and for Graduate Studies at IUB.

Osgood commented that it could be readily implemented at IUPUI – that it would be a matter of letting instructors for W200 and Y520 know, because almost all students at the undergraduate and master's level, respectively, take these courses. All other students could be monitored on an individual basis.

In regard to IUB graduate students, Howard-Hamilton suggested that completion of the tutorial could be added as a check-off item to the graduate studies database which is currently being developed.

McCarthy also stressed the importance of specifying the responsibility for instructors to talk about plagiarism in their classes during the AI training.

Alexander motioned to establish a policy suggesting that faculty incorporate a statement on plagiarism in their course syllabi. Chafel seconded this motion.

Discussion followed concerning the extent to which plagiarism should be noted in syllabi. Suggestions about listing the websites for the Student Code, Academic Honesty and the SOE policy on plagiarism were made. Also encouraging all instructors to engage in discourse with their students about issues surround plagiarism were discussed.

Alexander revised her motion to read: establish a policy that strongly recommends all instructors incorporate statements about plagiarism and/or the larger questions of academic ethics in their course syllabi.

The motion was passed unanimously.

Harste questioned if a vote was still needed to pass the initial recommendation made by the Committee on Teaching regarding the completion of the tutorial by all SOE students.

The motion states: establish a policy that all students in the School of Education are required, during their first year of School of Education coursework, to take the tutorial How to Recognize Plagiarism (Frick, 2002) available on the web at <http://www.indiana.edu/~frick/plagiarism>

Motion was unanimously accepted.

IV. New Business

A. Master's Degree in Educational Leadership Program ([04.22](#))

Sutton introduced the proposed program which was developed by Eric Ban and Leonard Burrello. The program had been approved by the Committee on Graduate Studies. Sutton called attention to previous remonstrances that had been launched against courses in this program. Those remonstrances have since been resolved. There are no outstanding issues with the program.

Eric Ban provided background on the evolution and objectives of the program. Locally, focus groups were developed to look at the needs of practicing teachers who were looking to go back to school to get their master's degrees. From these focus groups and from the recent NCATE report, components of the proposed program emerged. Some themes included: having a cohort base, a clear beginning and ending date for the program, focus on the National Board in program framework, and collaboration from local school systems for supporting local teacher participation.

Discussion surrounding the implementation of the program developed. Questions surfaced regarding the leave of practicing teachers by their respective school districts to participate in this program. Ban highlighted that this concern in part drove the involvement of district superintendents on the program planning team, and that as it stands, the program has support from the participating district superintendent. For the first year, the program would only be offered to Monroe County Schools. However, it is anticipated that next year the program would be open to all interested school districts.

Another question targeted how participating teachers would collaborate with faculty from their content areas of interest under the current program format. Ban responded that the area of concentration would allow for 6 credits of coursework to support their curricular focus and professional goals. Additional questions stemmed from the placement of these 6 concentration credits within the program, because they are scheduled to be taken at the end of the program. Concerns were voiced because students would have focused on educational leadership topics in absence of having the content-focus they were seeking to build upon throughout the program. Ban responded that the program would work toward individualizing the coursework to tailor each student's professional goals. Sutton also re-emphasized the need to be up-front with students at the start of their coursework and direct them to faculty within their content areas of interest immediately. Advising would then be key.

McCarthy moved to accept the program as proposed. Carter seconded the motion.

Boone questioned if discussions between C&I and ELPS would continue regarding some of the key points of the program. Specifically, he wanted to know if the program was approved and then future recommendations for program changes were made, would it be more difficult to implement the recommended changes?

Ban stressed that future, additional discussions would benefit the program and the teachers. He also stated that in terms of building the program, it would be necessary to frequently review and refine the program throughout every stage of its development. McCarthy spoke in agreement to having a continuous review process as the program emerges.

Hamilton also brought up the concern that there is currently only one person of color interested in this program. Future attempts should be made to recruit persons of color to this program.

The program was unanimously approved as proposed.

B. Programs for All Grade Physical Education, B.S. Applied Health Science, B.S. Kinesiology: Physical Education ([04.23](#))

Tim Niggle spoke to this item. Recently the licensing requirements have changed in the state of Indiana. Two programs that are currently offered through the SOE are actually run by the school of HPER, these programs being Health Education and Kinesiology Education. The new licensing requirements do not allow for this pairing through minors and endorsements. As a result, the HPER has collaborated with the SOE to develop new degree programs with an optional cognate component. The cognate is an additional 31 credits. The cognate will allow for students who are obtaining degrees in Health Science to be licensed in physical education. The Committee on Teacher education has reviewed the programs and has approved the changes.

McCarthy moved for approval of programs as proposed. Boone seconded.

Kinman went on record as commending the collaborations between HPER and SOE for facilitating program changes to comply with new state licensing agreement. Specifically, Tim Niggle thanked Dr. Colby and Dr. Warren from HPER for pioneering this process.

The motion to approve the programs was passed unanimously.

C. Computer Educator Licensure (CEL) Program ([04.24](#))

Appelman provided background on this item. The proposed undergraduate and graduate program changes are also the result of the new State licensing requirements which now do not recognize endorsements. The changes involve addition of three courses to the Computer Educator License Program, which will result in an All Grades License. The All Grades License will allow for teachers to teach computer application courses in any of the environments.

Sutton asked who will oversee these programs.

Appelman will be the program coordinator. Appelman will be responsible for oversight of the undergraduate path and Tom Brush will be responsible for the graduate path. Appelman noted that there are many teachers who will have to be re-licensed because after 2005, they will not be appropriately licensed. As a result, the program will have to be ready to accommodate this influx.

Clarification of prior approval was noted. The undergraduate program had been approved by the Committee of Teacher Education and ready for PC approval. However, the graduate program had not been approved by the Graduate Studies Office. Therefore, the graduate program changes could not be voted on during the current meeting.

Harste motioned to approve the undergraduate program changes as presented.

Boone seconded.

The undergraduate program changes were passed unanimously.

D. Undergraduate Evaluation: A Planning Document ([04.25](#))

Sutton reviewed the undergraduate education planning document brought forth by the Chancellor's Office and shared with academic units through distribution to the deans. Sutton moved to forward this document to the Recruitment and Financial Aid Committee and to the Committee on Teacher Education and to ask for their written feedback prior to the March 24th PC meeting.

E. Electronic Faculty Summary Annual Report ([04.26](#))

Delandshere spoke to this item, expressing concerns about the nature and process of submitting faculty summary reports through an electronic database. In discussing this matter with fellow faculty, additional concerns were brought to light. Topics included issues of security; feasibility and logistics of new process; variations in the current form compared to past years; purposes, use and access of the database; and quantification of the data being collected.

Delandshere summarized some of her conversations with Fred Cate concerning this matter. It was his understanding that there was no suitable reason for having social security numbers in the current database because it is irrelevant to the purpose.

Delandshere further articulated her apprehensions with databases within public universities which could be construed as being public property and public domain. Therefore, how can access to this information be restricted?

It is her request to have faculty involvement and oversight into this issue.

Cummings responded to Delandshere's concerns. He called attention to an e-mail circulated by Larry Riss that addressed security matters prior to implementation of the electronic submission of annual reviews. The use of the social security number was to

connect course information via the Registrar's office to the annual report forms, thereby limiting the amount of work needed to complete that section of the annual report. The only possible way to do this currently is to use the instructor's social security number, as this is how information is listed through the Registrar's database. Speaking to the issue of the purpose of the reports, Cummings noted that throughout the year statistics are requested for various national and international reports and journals. In the past, such statistics were generated by sending out mass e-mails and faculty feedback was inconsistent. With the database information is available more accurately and feasibly.

McCarthy motioned that a task-force committee be formed to look at the concerns surrounding the submission of annual reports to an electronic database.

This was approved unanimously.

V. New Courses/Course Changes open for 30 day Remonstrance

None

Meeting ended at 3:15 PM