

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
April 25, 2012
1:00-3:00 p.m.
IUB – Room 2140
IUPUI – Room 3138E

****What follows is a summary of speaker contributions****

Members Present: D. DeSawal, S. Eckes, R. Helfenbein, T. Ochoa, R. Skiba, C. Thompson, D. Winikates; **Alternate Members Present:** C. Buzzelli; **Student Members Present:** Meagan Benetti; **Dean's Staff Present:** J. Alexander, T. Brush, G. Gonzalez; **Visitors Present:** V. Borden, C. Brown, M. Manifold.

I. Approval of the Minutes from March 21, 2012 Meeting (12.38M)

D. DeSawal motioned to approve the minutes and C. Buzzelli seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved with no abstentions.

II. Announcements and Discussions

Dean's Report

Dean Gonzalez began his report with updates on REPA 2. There are a number of issues that are of great concern to schools of education, educators, teachers and faculty and school leaders across the states. Some of the changes revolve around indefinite permits without preparation, changes in special education, accreditation of teacher education programs, and a reduction in requirements for school leaders. There was a meeting of the deans of the major public schools of education across the state with John Ellis, the executive director of the Superintendents Association, and Ena Shelley, the Dean of the School of Education at Butler University, and Kathy Moran, who is the President of the Indiana Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. They discussed plans to call public attention to the proposal, and the comment period for the proposal began today. Parents of students in schools, faculty and students in schools of education, and others in the education community are encouraged to comment on the proposal.

Dean Gonzalez announced that all of the tenure and promotions cases were approved. Those promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure include Carmen Medina, Meredith Park Rogers, Joel Wong, and Melissa Gresalfi. Mary Ziskin was promoted from Research Associate to Assistant Research Scientist. At IUPUI, Gary Pike was promoted from Associate to Full Professor.

Dean Gonzalez announced that Russ Skiba has been invited to be the featured speaker at a conference sponsored by the Indiana Civil Rights Commission tomorrow night. Dean Gonzalez will also participate in a panel discussion and as a new member of the Indiana Commission on Hispanic Affairs.

III. Old Business

Diversity Topic:

S. Eckes announced that she invited Lillian Casillas, director of La Casa, Indiana University's Latino Culture Center, to speak at the meeting. She could not attend but agreed to speak at the next meeting in September.

IV. New Business

a. Proposed Revisions to the Early Childhood Program (12.40)

C. Buzzelli discussed the proposed revision to the program. He noted that the program will be condensed from five semesters to four, will begin in the fall semester of the student's junior year, and now meets the new limit of 120 credit hours for a bachelor's degree. The changes in the program are the result of reducing the number of student teaching hours and redundancies in the curriculum.

This came to the Policy Council as a motion. The motion unanimously passed with no abstentions.

b. Proposal for GRE Waiver for Master's in School Counseling IUPUI (12.44)

C. Thompson addressed the proposal for a waiver of the GRE for admission into the Counseling Master's Program. She noted that the test does not necessarily provide information needed in the admissions process and that the GRE is often an unnecessary barrier to minority students and students from low socioeconomic backgrounds. An interview and/or writing sample would be accepted in place of GRE scores. This waiver attempts to make the program more accessible to all high quality students.

The motion to allow the GRE waiver for the Master's in School Counseling at IUPUI was unanimously passed with no abstentions.

c. Proposal for GRE Waiver for Master's in Educational Leadership (12.41)

S. Eckes addressed the proposal for a waiver of the GRE for admission into the Education Leadership Master's program. She said that much of the reasoning for the waiver was the same as what C. Thompson had just discussed. She noted that, in addition to those reasons, many of the programs applicants to this program had been out of school for some time and often delayed applying because they could not commit the time or resources necessary for the GRE. She also noted that there is only a 12 credit difference between the licensure program and the master's so to require the GRE for such a small number of credits is counterintuitive. There has been a discussion of also waiving the GRE for the Ed.D programs, but LCLE has not reached a decision on this.

This motion was unanimously passed with no abstentions.

d. IUPUC Procedures for Promotion and Tenure (12.42)

C. Brown discussed the proposal for IUPUC procedures for promotion and tenure cases. She said that the procedures were modeled after IUPUI's process, but with a few additional steps. IUPUC is about to consider their first tenure case and had not yet established their process. She noted that everyone at IUPUC was supportive of this proposed process.

The protocol is as follows: a dossier is submitted by the candidate to the Head of the Division of Education at IUPUC, and is then submitted to the Executive Associate Dean of the IUPUI School of Education. Next the dossier is sent to the School of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee for review. The committee votes for the recommendation for tenure/promotion, and the dossier is next submitted to the Dean of the School of Education. He/she will include a letter expressing their opinion on the case and the dossier is next sent to the Vice Chancellor and Dean of IUPUC. After they include their letter of recommendation, the dossier is submitted to the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure for a final recommendation and vote.

R. Skiba motioned to approve the protocol, D. DeSawal seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed with no abstentions.

e. School of Education Goals Revised (12.46)

V. Borden presented the Long Range Planning Committee's (LRPC) revised School of Education goals. The original document created in 2002 is still a valid framework, but adjustments were made to reflect today's realities. The overall language was kept the same, but the goal was to make this more inspirational. Goals and plans were analyzed from other universities. The values statement was added. For each goal, language was used that was more inspirational. Last year, international aspects were addressed. Goal one, which refers to teacher education, was broadened to speak more generally about excellence in education, and to discuss the role of the School of Education on the Bloomington campus. Jill Shedd and Tom Brush were involved in creating goals one and two. The international focus was incorporated more explicitly, and the focus on technology was broadened to include the campus infrastructure and the proficiency of all graduates.

The diversity subsections were combined to create an entirely new goal. This helped to broaden the scope to recruitment at all levels (students, faculty, staff), and other topics such as curriculum, teaching strategies, resources. The goal was intended to encourage promotion and appreciation of diversity, a climate of honor and respect and research and scholarly work on diversity, equity, and social justice.

The Long Range Planning Committee wants to get feedback and/or approval on the goals from the Policy Council members and then will focus on how to find

evidence of progress, how to monitor progress, and what is being accomplished in each area.

J. Alexander asked about rationale 3.1 & 3.2, specifically the incentives and disincentives in P&T and annual reviews. V. Borden said that the committee had discussed how the incentives system aligns with the goals in teaching, research, and service. For example, the goals seem to promote working in collaboration, however the reviews focus more on individual work. J. Alexander suggested rewording 3.1 to “align incentives to ensure they promote rigorous, multidisciplinary, and innovate measures,” and Dean Gonzalez suggested “enhance incentives and remove disincentives to promote rigorous, multidisciplinary, and innovate measures.” 3.1 will be reworded and clarified by the LRPC.

J. Alexander asked about emphasizing technology, and what the ultimate goals were of this. T. Brush suggested that 4.3 be amended to include “to promote teaching, research, and learning.” J. Alexander asked that the word “all” be removed from 4.1 as well. She mentioned that in 3.2 the word “sufficient” is used, but it hard to define. Dean Gonzalez said that qualifiers, such as sufficient and effective should be removed.

R. Skiba asked for clarification about why the diversity sub-goals were merged into Goal 5. V. Borden said that the LRPC had discussed the options of making diversity initiatives more explicit in its own goal, or leaving it implicit as a sub-goal, where it’s imbedded into each initiative. He also mentioned that the LRPC wanted to make each goal “tighter,” clearer, and more distinct for added visibility. S. Eckes suggested that the LRPC imbed diversity into each of the sub-goals, as it had been before. D. DeSawal also added that diversity should be mentioned in the Values Statement. J. Alexander also asked that a point 5.5 be added that says something to the effect of “foster a climate of advocacy within faculty, students, and staff, so that these issues are valued and integrated in everything we do.”

R. Helfenbein asked for clarification on the process of approving these goals. C. Thompson said that she would like other faculty to look at these goals before they are approved. Dean Gonzalez said that these goals have been the topic of discussion at faculty retreats and other committees. He stated that the initial approval is part of the process, where after the approval of the goals the LRPC will start to discuss how progress on each goal can be measured. There can still be more discussion about the goals at future forums or retreats.

S. Eckes clarified that the vote would approve the draft of the goals, with diversity imbedded in the sub-goals and added to the values statement, and with amendments made to 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.3, and 5.5. There was no motion to approve the goals with amendments.

The motion to approve the document as it was presented did not pass.

The Policy Council decided to postpone the approval of the goals and revisit the document next fall after the Long Range Planning Committee considers some of these recommendations.

f. Grade Inflation (12.45)

J. Alexander addressed the grade inflation report created by the Committee on Faculty Development. The School of Education at IU Bloomington was cited as a school with high levels of grade inflation according to a recently published article and the committee was charged with looking into it. The report claimed that compared to other students who attend IUB, historically students who enrolled in programs at the School of Education did so having comparatively lower SAT scores and graduated with higher GPAs. Faculty surveys and fifteen years of grade data from 200- and 300-level courses were compiled and analyzed by the committee to address these claims.

The faculty surveys sought to examine what they thought grade inflation looked like, if it was a problem, and if so, how they dealt with it. Some faculty members did not think there was a problem, some attributed high grades to their instructional goal of content mastery, while others commented that they changed the way they teach and grade because of student expectations of high grades. Possible solutions mentioned include eliminating extra credit, raising student expectations, rethinking the faculty merit system, and leaving the issue alone.

Graphs created from the data suggest that the average section GPA from classes taken at the School of Education typically stayed about .3 points higher than the cumulative GPA across the campus since 1994. The data also suggests that the mean average section GPA has remained higher for 300-level courses than 200-level, and since 1994, the number of B's has decreased while the number of A's has increased at both levels.

M. Benetti discussed this issue from a student perspective, saying that as a student she understands striving for high grades in every course, but believes the grade should be deserved. Dean Gonzalez agreed, adding that the complexity of the issue should lead to further conversation with undergraduate students. C. Thompson said that the climate of the school leads to increased pressure on faculty to inflate students' grades.

g. Approval for High Ability License Program (12.43)

M. Manifold discussed the proposal for the High Ability Licensure Program. This 12 credit hour program is the result of revisions made to the 15 credit hour Gifted and Talented Endorsement Program. The changes make it competitive with other similar programs in Indiana and reflect the state's updated license title. The content of the five courses was condensed into four courses that reflect current educational practices. The two instructors currently teaching the courses are not full-time faculty members. This would be the first program of its kind in Indiana

that offers some of the courses in a face-to-face format; the others are offered exclusively online.

S. Eckes addressed concerns the Agenda Committee had about Z510 and any content overlaps with Jonathan Plucker's creativity courses. Minor changes were made to the description to address the content overlap concern. The course title was also changed to Arts & Creativity for High Ability Students. J. Alexander asked for the reasoning behind approving a program that doesn't have full-time faculty committed to teaching the courses. M. Manifold said that this is a concern, but there are instructors who want to/are willing to teach the courses while funding for a full-time faculty member is discussed. C. Thompson mentioned that high ability students are disproportionately white and from high socioeconomic backgrounds, and she would like these courses to address this issue and alternative ways of identifying high ability students. M. Manifold addressed this concern, saying that these issues are discussed in one of the courses.

The courses have not been routed for approval, but it will be announced when the courses are up for remonstrance so faculty can voice their concerns in the fall.

The motion was passed with one objection.

V. New Courses/Course Changes

S. Eckes directed the Policy Council members' attention to the new courses/course changes. The courses are open for faculty remonstrance for 30 days.

**The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m. **