

**MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

January 26, 2006
1:00-3:00 P.M.
School of Education
IUB Room 2140
IUPUI Room 3138E

The following are summaries of speaker contributions

Members Present: Delandshere, Eckes, Korth, Levinson, Mason, Ochoa, Odom, Rosario, Ross.
Alternates: Appelman, Barab, Lester. **Dean's Staff Present:** Gonzalez, Kloosterman,
Lambdin, McMullen, Murtadha. **Staff Representative:** Wyatt. **Student Representatives:** Jing-
jing Lou. **Visitors:** Campano, Daleke, Shedd, Thompson, Torres.

I. Approval of the Minutes from December 14, 2005 Meeting ([06.19M](#))

A motion was passed to approve the minutes from the December 14, 2005, Policy Council Meeting. The minutes were unanimously approved.

II. Old Business

Graduate Program Review – David Daleke ([06.12](#)) ([Program Review Packet](#))

Mary McMullen introduced David Daleke, who is the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs for the University Graduate School. Daleke was present to discuss graduate program reviews with the Policy Council.

Daleke stated that his philosophy of program reviews is that the responsibility of the Graduate School is to assist program reviews in whatever way it can. He noted that he started working in the Graduate School only a few months ago. John Slattery, who was a former Dean, left IU in September. Before he left, he hired Daleke and asked him to undertake the project of being in charge of graduate program reviews. Slattery had a particular interest in graduate program reviews because in his position at the University of Washington, his office ran the program reviews for all of the university. The program reviews at University of Washington were done differently than they might be done in other universities, particularly Indiana University.

Daleke's goal for the current year is to talk to as many academic units as possible who are considering adding program reviews to the existing programs that they haven't been doing regularly to find out what is being done throughout the University in terms of program review. At the end of this process, he hopes to develop some recommendations that will be routed through the proper channels. These proper channels would include the

appropriate faculty governance bodies and the ALC, for example, at the Bloomington campus.

Daleke stated that he was pleased to talk with Dean Gonzalez about possible program reviews in the School of Education. The School of Education is the first group that Daleke has spoken with who is interested in considering implementing program reviews, or changing the way the way program reviews are done within the School of Education. Hopefully Daleke will be able to meet with many departments and schools to be able to fine-tune a process that the entire University will be able to follow.

Daleke referred to the second page/document (“Procedures for Program Reviews,” adopted by the University Faculty Council in 1993) in the packet of information he provided (available [here](#)). This very short document gives recommendations for how program reviews should be done. There wasn’t an impetus for having a policy for program reviews; but rather, just to have some set guidelines for how to implement program reviews. Thus, it is not a policy, it is a procedure, which is something to note. Indiana University does not currently have a policy for program reviews. One of the questions that Daleke has been asked and is asking is “Should we have a program review [at Indiana University]?” It is clear from this list of procedures that all of the major components for the process of a program review have been incorporated, but it is not very detailed. The next question is, “Should we have a more detailed description for the procedures that we would recommend for program review?” Most of the answers to that question have been that we should have a more detailed list of procedures than are currently described by this document.

Some of the questions that come up are, “Who is responsible for program reviews?” Daleke noted that in this document, the responsibility falls to the deans of the schools, or in some cases, the campus, especially if it is a regional campus. That responsibility has been followed, with the exception of two items. The first item in question is the regularity of program reviews. For instance, it is recommended that they occur every five to seven years. Secondly, it is recommended that the program reviews be reported to the Academic Leadership Council (ALC), which at the time these procedures were approved was called the Academic Leadership Cabinet. These two items need to be addressed. It is highly recommended that program reviews be done on a regular basis. Also, there needs to be some method of passing the information that comes out of the reviews somewhere in the University where it can be used by the academic leadership of the campus and the University.

The second document was generated by the Graduate School in its previous incarnation as RUGS. This offers a bit more of an explanation for how program reviews may be done. Because the ’93 document was so sparse, this is an expansion of that document. After learning about this document, Daleke noted that he feels it is his responsibility as part of this project is to fine-tune these documents as much as possible to make them more useful.

The rest of the packet of information contains descriptions of parts of a program review, although not all the parts. Some version of this information may go back up on the Graduate School program website at some point in the future as a result of this process of gaining more information about program reviews at Indiana University.

“What constitutes a program review?” Daleke explained the intent and rationale for a program review. He stated that, first of all, a program review should not be a punitive measure. It should not be applied indiscriminately or to target particular programs for one reason or another, such as the program is not doing well. This does not serve a good purpose because it downgrades the morale of the faculty. Secondly, program reviews should highlight the quality and the excellence of the programs and identify areas in which there needs to be more support, where there needs to be a shift in resources. The core of this is that the reviews are in the hands of the faculty. The faculty should be the driving force for all academic program reviews. The rationale is to make sure our programs are regularly looked at in-depth and we are assuring that we are maintaining high-quality and modern practice in the individual fields. Overall, there is a benefit to doing program reviews. The downside is that it does take time and effort. There is some cost for doing the program reviews – for the administration and administering unit (i.e., the school), but especially for the faculty. It takes a lot of time and effort to collect data necessary to perform a program review. This is one of the areas of resistance for doing program reviews, but this is an area that the Graduate School hopes to help with in terms of dividing some central form of information that is collected at the Graduate School. The schedule for the program review is also an important aspect to consider. Typically in planning the review, it is important to give the program at least one year. In doing so, the program would perform a self-study – collect data from faculty, students. This data would include where the students have come from, where they have gone, what they have done. There is also a faculty involvement component that is very important. Faculty members are asked to write a statement for how well they feel they are involved in the program and how they have contributed to the mission of the program. The self-study usually occurs over a period of time – a semester or more. The self-study is usually preceded by the identification of external reviews, in collaboration with the leaders of the program (e.g., the department head and the dean). The external reviewers are experts in the field outside of the University. External reviewers may be individuals who are internal to the university, but external to the program. This design is up to the faculty members of the program. Once the external reviewers are identified and the site study begins, usually the external reviewers come for a site visit – usually a couple of days – in which they interview faculty, students, given all the information that has come out of the study, including questions that the faculty, administration, and students would like the self-study to address. The external reviewers perform the site visit for a couple of days and at the culmination of this visit, they will write a report, which is often completed while they are still on campus. The external reviewers are given an honorarium and all expenses are paid by the department. This is one of the areas contributing to the costs involved in conducting regular program reviews.

The important part of the review is what comes after. The report is usually given to the dean and communicated to the faculty in the program. The faculty will then have the chance to respond to the review. The review usually contains recommendations that may involve some significant changes, usually involving the shift in resources, but the faculty can respond to it and that then starts the conversation between the program and the dean. The action that comes out of this is another important benefit to move the program in a direction that everyone agrees upon and to improve the program. What is not often done, however, is to take the information and distribute it widely. One example that Daleke showed was the program review for a new program in the College of Arts and Sciences. The statistics program has not begun yet, but has already begun doing program reviews. Daleke would like to see Indiana University distill parts of the program reviews and publish them in a way that everyone can look at. They could be used as descriptive documents for the program or recruiting tools.

Daleke noted that he had sent some questions to Dean Gonzalez to respond to regarding what is currently being done in the School of Education regarding program reviews. He also wanted to get an idea about the relationship of program reviews to professional accreditations.

The first question relates to the process of professional accreditation. In terms of similarities to the graduate program review, the program would undergo a similar process; but, it is entirely up to the program. For the professional accreditation, you would collect data that is the same type of data that is used in a graduate program review. It is to the benefit of the faculty to do them in close timing to one another; perhaps not at the same time, however, but near the same time. Also, whether or not graduate and undergraduate program reviews are conducted together depends upon the structure of the programs and the norms of the discipline.

Ross explained the process of NCATE accreditation for the School of Education. One of the questions that the Agenda Committee and others have had with this accreditation process and the program review is how these two review processes will articulate with each other, in terms of timing, etc. Clearly, this kind of program review will impact programs across our school differently, depending on the kinds of data already being generated by accreditation reviews.

Gonzalez explained that NCATE is now on a 7-year cycle. NCATE looks at the Teacher Education unit. Some graduate programs in the School of Education, such as Counseling Psychology, School Psychology, etc. undergo their own reviews by accrediting bodies.

Daleke said that this is the kind of timing issue that is important to consider when undergoing the reviews to save the faculty as much time as possible. There should be a way to coordinate the different reviews to use the data from one review for the other.

Appelman noted that when introducing a new doctoral program in IST, one of the students asked what type of evaluation is going to be done on this new program.

Fortunately, the department chair was familiar with the discussion of program reviews going on at the university level. Is the Graduate Studies office looking at the reviews as a “program” or “departmental” review?

Daleke responded that when reviews would occur, such as with the new IST program, would be up to the faculty in the department.

Would the external reviewers be from equivalent programs in other universities or within other departments on the IU campus?

Daleke stated that his initial recommendation was that this is something that is up to the program faculty. It may be appropriate to find external reviewers in similar programs at other institutions. But, it may be that there are not many of these individuals available to conduct the program reviews. An external review panel may be comprised of external faculty members of similar programs at outside universities; or, the external review members may include faculty members from Indiana University who are external to the School undergoing the program review. The benefit of the latter model is to communicate the structure or details of your program to other departments of the University community, so you can get the word out about your program to other departments in the University. However, the description of the College and IUPUI review procedures do involve an internal person who is external to the program who can serve as a guide. When bringing in individuals from outside the University, they will need someone to interpret the landscape of the University as well as the structure and organization of the University.

Lester questioned what is in the procedure that would make the faculty unit take the review seriously enough, other than professional standards and integrity, to make the review beneficial. Is there anything at-stake that will make the review seem beneficial for the faculty members?

Daleke stated that this could be answered in two ways. First, especially when instituting new programs, there is always the question of how the program/department is being assessed. Secondly, the other real benefit is the recommendations that come out of the reviews. The recommendations often times will help guide the allocation of resources. The reviews could serve as a way of telling the Dean that the program/department needs resources to be able to accomplish that which was recommended by the review panel. The power of an external review can be very dramatic. Daleke noted that he has seen program reviews that suggested that the size of the faculty be doubled. This was taken very seriously by the Dean and the faculty has grown as a result of the review process. The outcomes can be very important in terms of how the School allocates its resources. The information that comes out of these reviews helps to clarify where the program might want to improve or where there are successes. A review would not be useful if there were not outcomes that could be addressed as a conversation between the faculty and administration.

Gonzalez stated that he is of the opinion that there are some intrinsic values of doing program reviews, other than to argue for external resources or high-stakes gains. The system of self-regulation that we assume as members of the faculty to ensure the quality of our programs is also very important. It is important to keep this in mind. Also, being oriented towards external rewards, it is clear that this university and the trustees are moving rapidly toward Centers of Excellence and the University wants to invest in schools that they deem “Centers of Excellence.” The School of Education was very fortunate to be one of the first recommended to Commitment to Excellence (CTE) funding. The U.S. News and World Report ratings are a form of such external ratings. Dean Gonzalez noted that he suspects that we are going to see more kinds of funding similar to that of the CTE funding. Well-conducted, well-documented reviews that speak to the quality of the programs in the School of Ed are going to be necessary to maintain higher levels of recommendations and competition. Internally, the way we allocate faculty resources is through a discussion, an internal prioritization system that has evolved through various department chairs and associate deans. Usually three questions are asked: 1. What is the need for the resources requested for productivity, 2. What is the documented quality of the program, 3. What are opportunities for the future? How is this investment going to make us competitive? Documenting quality is uneven. It is difficult to document this on a competing basis. A program review would allow us to put all of the different indicators of high quality together. It can help to improve resources and sustain resources, etc., but it does come at a cost in terms of time among faculty, staff, administration, etc. It is more than a tool to convince others to respond to external funding.

Daleke noted that there is rarely a time when you are able to collect the opinions of the faculty and see if the program is going in the right direction.

Gonzalez asked, institutionally, why don't the reviews occur, as is stated in the document by the Bloomington Faculty Council?

Daleke noted that it was never a policy, it was only a procedure. Institutionally, there is no program review process, only a recommended procedure. With the changes on campus, Daleke noted that he will probably be involved in the graduate program reviews for some time. But, there may be a different academic leader responsible for the program reviews at the undergraduate level. Hopefully by the end of this year there will be a new document that will be a better description of the procedures that more programs can follow. In addition, he will be more than happy to help in any capacity of designing program reviews.

IV. New Business

- a. Honors Notation in education – Jill Shedd ([06.21](#))

Shedd stated that they have been asked by Hutton Honors College for several years whether the School of Education could identify an honors program within

the School of Education, due to the fact that they have several students that they have actively recruited, who have an interest in education. In addition, there have been queries regarding admitting high quality students into the School of Education during their freshman year. What has been proposed to the Committee on Teacher Education (CTE), and what has been approved by that committee, is a way in which the School of Education can offer students interested in education, the opportunity to add to their diploma and course of study the opportunity to participate in honors seminars and coursework, and have the distinguished notation other their diploma. The first option identified by 06.21 required the least amount of new coursework and new effort within the school and that option is the one that was approved and adopted by the CTE. To meet the requirement for the honors notation on their diploma, they must complete successfully a minimum of 21 credit hours in an honors designated course. What the staff in the Office of Teacher Education has done is to review the current requirements among all of the program requirements and identify honors level programs to take an honors option course to meet the required coursework in the School of Education. There are several courses already offered, either through the Hutton Honors College or the College of Arts and Sciences that already have honors designation that can easily meet the School of Ed's requirements in general education, area of concentration, or in the major among secondary students. It is a matter of documenting for students in a way that they can easily identify courses that will fulfill the requirements for the Honors College. There is one course in the School of Education that has honors designation, but it has not been offered very often in the School of Education. The Office of Teacher Education hopes to offer this option for freshmen entering in the 2006 academic year. Should there be students who are currently in the School of Ed who have already taken some honors courses, they will work with these students to help them get the honors designation on their diploma if they choose. But the program will be formally introduced to the entering class in the Fall of 2006.

There are two additional areas which the committee aspires to develop, but it is now a work in progress. One of these areas is the notion of developing an honors area of concentration which could be integrated into the current elementary and early childhood programs where they are already required to have an area of concentration. The committee is going to look into finding ways of designating and focusing an area of concentration that would be all honors work. The second effort that the committee hopes to look at is to create a community for the honors students. One option in doing this is in identifying an honors cohort of students that may participate in an ongoing honors seminar with a senior member of the faculty in the School of Education. The only reservation in this would be students in any program, grade level, and in any discipline in which the students would have the opportunity to get together with colleagues and a senior faculty member weekly or monthly and talk about important issues in education. It is thought that the excitement of having this type of seminar as the students are faced with issues in schools and in their field experience, that this could stimulate interesting

conversations and readings for these students. Hopefully at some point in time there will be a more finite honors opportunity for the students that would be like an ongoing seminar kind of like the model that Project TEAM as served these students in the past.

Ross questioned if Option Two is still being considered.

Shedd responded that it is still being considered. There are members of the committee that would like to continue considering option two. However, at the time of the meeting there were no members identified who wanted to take on this task.

Lester questioned the difference between Option One and Option Two. He stated that he cannot see any justifiable reason for promoting Option One.

Shedd noted that the definition of an honors designated degree is that only six of the 21 credit hours of the honors degree can be from any one department. It is not the intent of the degree to be an immersed honors effort to be within the major or within any one focus. A student cannot have any more than 6 hours of EDUC-H classes for the honors degree. That is why there was a question about having an honors seminar.

Wyatt noted that one of the nice things about the honors seminar is that it can begin in the freshman year. However, by passing Option One, it allows students to receive the honors designation now, while the committee continues to work on Option Two.

Shedd stated that her impression and understanding of the honors designation is to afford the opportunity for students to study at a higher and more in-depth level with full-time and senior faculty. It affords the students who have done an in-depth amount of study to have the honors designation and for others to infer that they have done a high-quality of work while they were students here in Bloomington.

Ross noted that Option One is what has been approved by the Committee on Teacher Education. A motion cannot be made to approve Option Two because it has not been approved by the committee and there is currently no honors seminar to offer students.

Mason stated that he would be in favoring of making a motion to approve Option One, under the stipulation that it can be modified while still allowing students to gain the honors designation while the committee works on modifications.

Ross responded that this suggestion can be sent to the committee and they can put it in this form and it can be put on the agenda for the next Policy Council meeting, with clarity as to what is being voted on.

b. Student Professional Expectations – Jill Shedd ([06.22](#)) ([06.23](#))

The professional expectations document ([06.22](#)) is a result of the ongoing efforts by the Office of Teacher Education to address issues related to field experience and student teaching. They have put together a succinct understanding of the professional expectations of the students in the School of Education. The faculty on the Committee of Teacher Education has developed the document with the 6 guiding principles in mind to reflect consistency of goals in mind. The students will see this for the first time when they are applying to the Teacher Education program. Students will see a shortened version at each field experience. This is to develop the students' knowledge that there are certain expectations to withhold during their field experiences as a burgeoning professional. Signed copies of the document will be kept in the Office of Teacher Ed for each student. The students will see this document when they enter the program, through their field experiences, and culminating in the student teaching experience. It is the goal to remind the students that they are professional students and they have certain responsibilities to uphold as a professional. It was important to define how the school talks about and documents its expectations for the students in the School of Education.

The intent of the alert form on professionalism ([06.23](#)) is to inform the Office of Teacher Education of behavior that is not professional in nature.

Ross stated that this item ([06.23](#)) has been modified, so it should be considered an action item as well. She asked if there were any questions or comments.

Korth noted that she is opposed to these items in general. She is not opposed to professional expectations, but she wants the students to behave like students who are struggling with information, not necessarily professionals. She does expect them to demonstrate respect, however. What does it mean to “dress appropriately”? There is a difference in when students are going out into the schools and when they are sitting in class.

Lambdin noted that it is important for the students to find out what is appropriate for their school.

Barab stated that the language of the document could be confusing for some students, in order to determine what is appropriate for school and class.

Shedd noted that the importance of the documents is to impress onto the students that they need to assume a professional responsibility for children, parents, etc. and when admitted into the School of Education the students kind of give up being a “collegian” on the Bloomington campus. Entrance into the School of Education means that the students have a heightened responsibility for professional behavior.

Barab noted that if this is the case, the document’s language may be misleading. Perhaps it should say that “some of these are more appropriate for certain contexts which you will be in.”

Odom stated that perhaps the last sentence of the first paragraph of document [\(06.22\)](#) could be changed to “...student teaching, **and/or** interactions...”

Mason said that Shedd put the point well when she introduced the document by stating that the students have a special responsibility when they enter the School of Education to uphold certain professional expectations. Perhaps this could be added to the document to impress upon the students the nature of their responsibility.

Ross stated that she hears general recommendations to reword the introduction of the document [\(06.22\)](#) and suggested that Shed bring this document back to the Policy Council after discussion with the Committee of Teaching along with the document describing the honors designation.

- c. Program change – proposal for a license addition in reading – Gerald Campano [\(06.24\)](#)

Campano introduced the proposal for a license addition in reading. He stated that it is a revision or modification to current program. It is for students who are adding the reading license to their teaching license. The rationale for the modification is based on state requirements and standards, as the state of Indiana will not longer be offering a reading minor. The main changes include adding a pre-existing course to the Level One reading license and have created a new course. The Level One reading license is for classroom teachers who want to have a specialty in reading. The Level Two designation is for individuals who want to be literacy specialists. In order to receive the Level Two designation, the student must already have the Level One license. To receive the Level One license, the student must have a teaching license.

Gonzalez asked how students can add a license if they don’t have a teacher’s license?

Campano stated that the students can work on the addition to the teaching license while they are working on their teaching license.

A motion was made and accepted to approve the proposed revision to add a reading license to the elementary teaching license.

V. Announcements and Discussions
Dean's Report

Dean Gonzalez stated that he would like to draw the members' attention to the Trustees' action for reorganization within Indiana University. There are still some uncertainties about how the structuring of administration will occur. A concern expressed by the deans is that one of the items the Trustees' listed for action is a review of RCM (responsibility centered management), which is a method for allocating funding to the academic units. The Deans in Bloomington have discussed the matter and are writing a joint letter that will be sent to the President, Trustees, and the committee that's reviewing RCM. There are some areas where RCM could be strengthened, but as a system for budgetary allocations, as a system of management for higher education, it is almost like a democracy; that is, it looks messy until you ask what the next best thing is. Because of its decentralized nature, RCM insulates the academic units from the kind of turmoil that the institution is undergoing currently. In a centralized organization when there is instability in the system, it ripples through the institution. Because we are somewhat insulated by RCM, we [the Deans] think that this type of system adds to the ability of the academic units to withstand some of the organizational instability. RCM is not widely understood, but when the Deans looked at it, it was the sentiment of the Deans that RCM serves the academic mission well. Changes to RCM can have a significant impact on the way we do things in the School of Education.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:02pm.