

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
January 26, 2011
1:00-3:00 p.m.
IUB – Room 2140
IUPUI – Room 3138E

What follows is a summary of speaker contributions

Members Present: G. Delandshere, R. Helfenbein, T. Ochoa, J. Rosario, A. Teemant, E. Tillema; **Alternate Members Present:** A. Leftwich; **Dean’s Staff Present:** T. Brush, J. Cummings, G. Gonzalez, R. Sherwood; **Staff Representatives Present:** none; **Student Members Present:** A. Fetter-Harrott; **Guests Present:** L. Lackey, M. McCarthy, S. White

I. Welcome & Approval of Minutes

G. Delandshere introduced Alli Fetter-Harrott, one of the graduate student representatives, to Policy Council.

The following corrections to the minutes from the December 8, 2010 Policy Council meeting (**11.19M**) were requested: add page numbers throughout the document, change ‘Z310’ to ‘E310’ (pg.4), and change ‘IST online Ph.D.’ to ‘IST online Ed.D.’ (pg.5). The minutes were unanimously approved with these corrections.

II. Announcements and Discussion

a. Dean’s Report:

This year, the legislature will be approving budgets for state agencies for the next two years. Some significant changes have been proposed in the way that higher education is funded. The Higher Education Commission, which recommends the budget for all institutions, recommended that just over 6.12% of our current state appropriations from this past fiscal year be cut and redistributed to any state university based on performance measures¹. This would amount to \$11.7 million cut from the IUB budget, and a cut of \$4.9 million from IUPUI. The governor has also proposed an additional cut of 3% from state appropriations. If these recommendations are adopted as proposed, IUB will see a total reduction of 8.8%, or \$16.8 million, in state appropriations. Likewise, IUPUI (General Academic side) would see a reduction of \$1.1 million. This is very concerning to the university, particularly with regard to how the performance measures are implemented, as this represents a departure from how funding decisions were previously made by the state.

The Bloomington campus is also starting a review of RCM. The guidelines that have been distributed to the review committee suggest that there will be a push towards greater

¹ Performance measures include additional undergraduate degrees produced (relative to last year), additional 4-year undergraduate degrees for low-income in-state students, additional credit hours produced, additional competitive research expenditures and additional dual credit produced.

centralization of budgetary decision making. If we see a continued reduction in state appropriations, along with movement away from RCM, this may have huge implications for the School of Education. We have always done well with the RCM model, and under a more centralized model, it will become much more difficult for us to compete for allocation of funding. We should all be mindful of these trends, and bring any questions to the Dean's office.

There have also been some policy initiatives pertaining to education. The first bill introduced in the Senate was a teacher credentialing and accountability bill. Two of the most concerning parts of the bill are: 1) it prohibits districts from using level of education (that is, any degree beyond what is needed for initial licensure) as a factor in determining salary increases, and 2) it permits charter schools to hire up to 50% of their teachers without a license. In addition, districts across the state are individually responsible for generating performance measurement criteria for teachers, with the requirement that a majority of the evaluation variables be based on student outcome data. Under this framework, teachers will be evaluated as 'ineffective,' 'in need of improvement,' 'effective,' or 'highly effective,' and only those rated as 'effective' or 'highly effective' will be eligible for salary increases.

Finally, the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ), a teacher advocacy group, has partnered with the U.S. News & World Report to produce a review of teacher preparation programs. They will be requesting that the largest institutions with teacher preparation programs submit documentation that they will review to determine if programs meet their standards. They will then produce a ranking that will be publicized through U.S. News & World Report. This is concerning because NCTQ has traditionally been quite hostile to schools of education, and it is unclear how their standards were generated. Further, NCTQ is not a research organization, and they have been known to use flawed and/or unclear methodology in their work, that can lead to an inaccurate picture of what they are investigating.

R. Sherwood mentioned that we can expect to be evaluated in areas such as how well our students perform with children in the field, which may be difficult for us to find data to support. NCTQ may also use a standard to determine if our curriculum contains 'extraneous' courses. NCTQ has published a review of teacher preparation programs in Illinois, which is available on their website. Dean Gonzalez stated that IUPUI recently underwent a NCTQ review of student teaching experiences.

III. Old Business

a. Diversity Topic

Last week, a speaker from the University of Louisville presented on strategies on how to recruit diverse students to the School of Education, and several faculty members from both IUB and IUPUI were in attendance. Discussion about how IU could better recruit underrepresented students at the undergraduate and graduate levels ensued. At the meeting, M. McCarthy noted that it is challenging to recruit underrepresented students to programs within the School of Education if the field of education in general is being spoken about negatively by teachers and other school staff. G. Delandshere presented recommendations generated from this presentation, including changing the Praxis process (i.e., requiring students to take the Praxis earlier, allowing

time for remediation for those who are struggling), having faculty and students from the School of Education visit recruitment sites with other IU recruiters, and to establish contact with undergraduate programs with a high proportion of minority students. In addition, we can also find out which institutions the underrepresented students in the School of Education tend to come from, and build relationships with those institutions, and also try to recruit several students from an institution at once. J. Cummings mentioned that we can also be a part of student recruitment fairs, namely at Florida A&M and Tennessee State universities. Indiana University and School of Ed administration are committed to providing resources for recruitment of underrepresented students. It is also important that we focus on recruitment of diverse faculty as a means to recruit a diverse student body.

Discussion ensued about some of the difficulties in recruiting diverse faculty for some programs (i.e., Inquiry). J. Cummings suggested that departments report on the process they use for faculty recruitment, to ensure that top-producing programs with many underrepresented are contacted for potential applicants. With regard to student recruitment, some programs in the School of Education are doing well with recruiting minority students; for instance, the HESA program has established relationships with some Historically Black Colleges and Universities. G. Gonzalez mentioned that while we have seen some success with recruitment for graduate programs, it is more challenging for undergraduate programs, because recruitment at the undergraduate level is a university function, rather than a function within the School of Education. Even though we have the Direct Admit program in place, these students must first be recruited and admitted through the university. It is challenging to co-ordinate all of the recruitment efforts that are taking place across IU.

At IUPUI, there have been efforts to reach out to the local community, in the form of panels and other connections with African-American churches to talk about the field of teaching. The issues at IUPUI are more centered around retention; there are several freshman from underrepresented groups, but there is a great deal of attrition as students progress to the sophomore and junior levels. G. Gonzalez stated that the Praxis test is a barrier to students in undergraduate teaching programs. However, the state has recently changed requirements to allow for more flexibility in our entry-level criteria.

Next steps: Russ Skiba is compiling a list of the outcomes and recommendations that emerged from the meeting. Katie Paulen and Ghangis Carter are also compiling reports and suggestions for follow-up to be shared with the faculty.

IV. New Business

a. Election of Policy Council Nominations Committee

G. Delandshere announced that the Agenda Committee has nominated Nancy Chism, David Flinders and Stephanie Carter to serve on the Nominations Committee.

Result: A motion to approve the nominees was put forth by R. Helfenbein, and was seconded by A. Leftwich. The motion was unanimously approved.

b. Third Year Review Policy for Clinical Faculty (11.22)

The proposed policy for Third Year Review was generated by the Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee, as there were previously no guidelines in place for this faculty rank. They were created based on the third-year review guidelines for tenure-track faculty. The proposal applies for Bloomington clinical faculty only.

Result: A motion to approve the third year review policy was put forth by A. Leftwich, and seconded by T. Ochoa. The motion was unanimously approved.

c. Committee on Teaching Recommendation regarding Trustees Teaching Award (11.23)

Lara Lackey presented recommendations from the Committee on Teaching regarding the current selection process for the Trustees Teaching Award, which emerged from last year's annual report. The primary issue is that the same faculty tend to be nominated for the Trustees Teaching Award year after year. Also, there is currently no mechanism in place for evaluating growth in the dossiers submitted for consideration from year to year. The Committee recommends that 1) faculty who have received the award in two consecutive years be ineligible for nomination in the subsequent third year, but may be re-nominated after a one-year gap, 2) faculty who have repeatedly received the award be considered instead for the Gorman Teaching Award or campus-wide awards, and 3) nominations be made based on criteria not linked to the merit review alone.

Questions and brief discussion ensued. It was recommended that the wording on page 1 be edited to specify that these recommendations are relevant to IUB faculty only. L. Lackey mentioned that additional criteria for the award could include a personal statement from the nominee or recommendation letters from colleagues, but this is yet to be decided by the committee. G. Delandshere stated that the nominations process will require more discussion at the department level.

Result: A motion to approve the addition of a one-year gap for faculty who receive the award in two consecutive years was put forth by T. Ochoa and seconded by A. Leftwich. The motion was unanimously approved, with the recommended change in wording.

d. Process for Selecting the ELPS Chair (11.24)

M. McCarthy presented a proposed revision to the existing policy for the selection of the ELPS department chair. Specifically, the department would like to change item 5, such that if the balloting process produces a very clear ranking of three to five candidates, this list is submitted to the Dean, rather than having an additional meeting to decide on the ranking. Otherwise, the process that was previously approved by Policy Council remains the same. Some discussion and questions about the proposal ensued.

Result: A motion to approve the proposed revision was put forth by J. Rosario and was seconded by A. Fetter-Harrott. The proposal was unanimously approved.

V. New Courses/Course Changes

The following courses were announced as being open for a 30-day remonstrance period:

New Course Proposals:

K601 Introduction to Special Education Scholarship

K650 Paradigms and Policies of Special Education in the U.S.

K681 Evidence-Based Practice in Special Education

****G. Delandshere adjourned the meeting at 2:40pm****