

MINUTES  
POLICY COUNCIL  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
March 26, 2014, 2013

1:00-3:00 p.m.  
IUB – Room 2140  
IUPUI – Room 3138E

---

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

**Members Present:** D. Cross, J. Cummings, J. Damico, B. Dennis, B. Edmonds, C. Guarino, R. Helfenbein, D. Hossler, C. Hill Morton, K. King Thorius, **Alternate Members Present:** K. Wohlwend, **Student Members Present:** E. Mickey **Staff Member Present:** T. Niggle **Dean's Staff Present:** J. Alexander, E. Boling, G. Gonzalez, R. Kunzman, P. Rogan, R. Sherwood

**I. Approval of Minutes from January 29, 2014 Meeting (14.20M)**

E. Edmonds moved to approve the minutes as presented, and J. Cummings seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved.

**II. Dean's Report**

G. Gonzalez followed up on the legislative bills discussed during the previous policy council meeting. House bill 1388, the teacher education preparation accountability bill, has passed. It has articulated a set of responsibilities that departments of education and schools of education will have to report. These include data regarding the preparation of teachers in Indiana and performance after they leave their programs. Some of the things outlined that will be required include surveys of teachers and their principals about their satisfaction and level of preparedness they received. It also requires departments of education to work with the labor department to report on employability data of graduates, including retention of teachers once they have entered the field. The reporting of GPA (from high school or transfer), SAT and other indicators of admissions quality criteria for students will be required as well.

The bill puts together a set of parameters that will go into a matrix to evaluate teacher preparation programs that will be publicly available. The bill mandates that the matrix have a minimum level upon which if a school drops below, would trigger an examination of the program by the Indiana Commission of Higher Education. The commission has not previously had a role in teacher preparation program approval or review. The measures that go into the matrix itself and the minimum level schools are required to meet before examination by the commission will be set by a committee made up of representatives from the department of education, the commission for higher education, and from colleges of teacher preparation. All data are to begin the process of collection by July 2016. Thereafter, the data will be used to annually review programs and for public posting.

It is a new development in Indiana and possibly even at the national level, to have legislation in place outlining the parameters of teacher preparation. Several deans of education, including Dean Gonzalez, testified in support of bill because the alternatives were considered to be much worse. Our voices were heard and we ended up with a bill that in the end was much better than what it started out to be. In the process a rather encouraging development occurred in that people who had been highly critical of teacher education and education in general showed a new and refreshing willingness to engage in discussions with educators and faculty. While we will not agree on everything, moving from what could be characterized as a confrontational mode has now shifted in the direction to one of conversation. Even if it means we have to have some compromises this positive development will be more likely to lead to better results in the future.

One of the elements in the bill will tie the district level evaluations of teachers to the institutions that prepared them. There is currently an evaluation system in Indiana that takes into account multiple dimensions including student growth and requires teachers be evaluated and placed into one of four categories of highly effective, effective, needs improvement or unsatisfactory. Those data will be reported in aggregate to the department and linked to where those teachers are prepared. Part of the matrix will then be how our graduates (at least two years out) are performing in those district level teacher evaluations. There are problems with that because every district has a different system. Eventually, what leads to those evaluations will be influenced by the matrix and the biases of the evaluators in each district.

There are discussions currently taking place in Washington around federal policy to regulate teacher preparation, with some of the same kinds of things taking place here in Indiana being discussed at the federal level. It is likely we are going to see more teacher evaluation and teacher preparation program evaluation across the country.

The state board of education had a meeting on REPA III earlier this month. A summary of the public comments made were presented and discussed. Recommendations were made for staff in the new career of education center based on the comments that specific changes be made that would then come back to the board for approval. If the recommendations hold, all of our serious objections to REPA III will be removed. In effect they will continue to require masters level degrees for principals and education specialist degrees for superintendents. They will be doing away with adding licenses by examination beyond the ones that were approved in the previous REPA. It also looks like the adjunct permit will be eliminated. Most, if not all of the things that were strongly rejected appear to have been recommended for removal by the board. If nothing changes when the staff goes to work on the language for the revised rules then the concerns put forth collectively and individually will be honored. Dean Gonzalez expressed his feelings of encouragement that the board also seems to be exhibiting a new spirit of engagement with the educational community.

Dean Gonzalez concluded his report by discussing happenings with the National Council for Teacher Policy. The council is conducting its own study on teacher preparation. Most in the field of education have vigorously objected to the council's methodology and even purposes. Their methodology is fatally flawed due to force of participation. It is the opinion of G. Gonzalez that any data collected under duress

is inherently flawed. In addition, conclusions were based on review of syllabi, which may have little to do with the actual delivery of instruction in the course. They have now changed their report into a system of rankings and in partnership with US News and World Report, will be publishing the results of that study in the form of rankings of institutions. That group had asked many if not all institutions in the country to confirm if conclusions were based on accurate data. Some institutions refused to participate because of the invalid methods of data collection. A national discussion around that issue led to Dean Gonzalez writing a letter to the editor of Education Week affirming the decision to voluntarily not participate. The editors then invited the dean to write a full length column about what appropriate methods of evaluation might be. Dean Gonzalez complied to the request, after which Education Week invited a group called Teach Plus Indianapolis (made up primarily of teachers) to write a response. The response was published today. It was found it to be a reasoned response although it was felt there were some factual inaccuracies. Dean Gonzalez, as a representative of the IU SOE, was invited in that response to engage in discussion about what role teachers and alumni can play in helping to improve teacher preparation. Gonzalez intends to follow up with the group to engage in that discussion but does not yet know yet what direction it will take. As the conversation evolves Dean Gonzalez plans to bring it to the entire faculty. An update will be provided at the core campus faculty meeting in April.

### **III. Diversity Topic**

The diversity topic was presented by Christina Wright Fields, representing the Balfour Scholars Program. C. Wright Fields began by passing out some handouts with information about the Balfour Scholars Program and then discussed some basic information about the program and followed up by answering questions from policy council members.

The Balfour Scholars program was developed after looking at current IUB programs designed to support and encourage underrepresented and minority students at IUB. The P - 16 Center within the SOE collaborated with the offices of Enrollment Management and Diversity, Equity, and Multicultural Affairs to develop a wrap-around support model for students who identify as underrepresented to get them interested in going to college, with the hopes that they come to IUB. Residential programs and services as well as the career development center came on board, along with additional campus partners.

The program capitalizes on existing partnerships with high schools that the P-16 center works with, in addition to searching for new partners, for the purposes of increasing higher education success for underrepresented students. The P-16 center, in collaboration with campus partners, submitted a proposal to the Balfour foundation in the spring of 2013. The proposal was accepted and the grant was awarded mid-spring. C. Wright Fields joined the program in June 2013 just prior to launching the Balfour pre-college academy in July.

There are four main goals of the Balfour Scholars program. The first of which is increasing the number of underrepresented students at IUB, followed by the retention of such students. Another of the goals is to develop a coordinated delivery system of support for Balfour Scholar students, with the final goal being to establish a network of feeder schools for IUB.

A main component of the Balfour Scholars program consists of a pre-college academy. This is where high school students actually come to IU during the summer to get some experiences of being on a college campus and engage in some college preparation activities. Students participate in a daily cultural identity class, where they learn about the intersections of their identity and how it relates to the community and society. They also learn how their own personal identity can become their motivation to achieve academic success and pursue post-secondary education. They also take part in daily sessions on career development. Students are able to complete interest inventories and discuss potential careers and college majors that would fit with their interests. They then work on developing a plan of action to achieve their college and career goals. Self-reflection exercises are also a part of the curriculum.

Workshops conducted by the office of first year experience, office of scholarships and office of admissions, are also a large part of the pre-college academy. Additionally, sample lectures are given that students can attend. This past summer sample lectures were conducted by professors in law, psychology, and sociology and this summer there will also be sample lectures in business and education added. The ultimate purpose of the academy is to get students interested in coming to college and help them to be more comfortable with the IUB campus and more aware of the resources they have available to them.

Last year there were about 100 applicants to the academy, which resulted in approximately 85 participants. Half of the participants were from Indianapolis, with remaining students from Lake County and South Bend. Roughly half of the attendees were African American, 15% Latino, 9% Multi-racial, 8% White-Caucasian and 1% Asian-Pacific. Out of the 85 students who participated in the program, 60 applied to IUB and 25 were admitted as of January. During the program daily and weekly assessments were completed in order to look at factors of quality improvement throughout the course of the academy, and to help plan for this coming summer's academy.

Currently, the recruitment cycle for this summer is underway. Applications have been available since February and had some additions compared to the first year. Transcripts, along with a letter of recommendation are now required. The idea is to have it similar to the college process to give students more experience in that domain. So far there have been about 200 applications submitted with an anticipation of about 150 participants for the upcoming academy. Recruitment efforts have taken place in Indianapolis, Fort Wayne, Elkhart and the Gary areas. Telephone outreach with last year's participants has also been conducted, offering assistance to students who may be applying and need any questions about the admissions process or financial aid answered. Collaboration with the Hudson and Holland Scholars and the Groups program has been underway as well. A liaison program with high schools, encouraging counselors and principals to become a point of contact to the Balfour program was established to further program outreach. Schools have been provided with workshops and informational sessions for parents and families to help them encourage their students to pursue college as well.

C. Wright Fields then opened the floor to questions and comments. The following is a summary of speaker contributions.

D. Cross asked how long the program had funding for. C. Wright Fields responded that the program has funding for four years with an \$800,000 grant from the Balfour Foundation. The program currently is in its second year.

J. Cummings asked about the staff of the program and C. Wright Fields said that currently the staff is made up of people who were counselors for the academy last summer. For next year the plan is to recruit IU students who were part of the academy as high school students (the first class of them entering this upcoming fall) so they can provide participants with their personal experiences.

G. Gonzalez asked about the curriculum and contributing members. C. Wright Fields explained that individuals from the career development center and faculty from within the SOE, including Dr. Hall, Dr. Sylvia Martinez, and Dr. Stephanie Power Carter have all contributed to the curriculum.

A few questions regarding funding were asked. C. Wright Fields clarified that Balfour Scholars participate in the program with no fees; they receive transportation to campus from central pick-up locations, stay in dorms, have a meal plan and attend programming for the week. Then, if they choose to apply to IU they are offered an application fee waiver. Beyond the direct program and offering information on how and where to seek financial assistance, at this point that is the extent of the financial aspect that the Scholars receive but further options are being looked into.

B. Dennis asked if students who applied to other universities were tracked. C. Wright Fields responded that during the telephone outreach one of the questions asked is if the student applied to IUB or any other colleges.

J. Alexander commented that this program is being looked at by the Bloomington campus as a possible model for a long-term program.

K. Wohlwend asked if students were offered any support for high school admissions testing, like SAT or ACT, if not directly through the Balfour program then as part of support services that they could be offered through other avenues in collaboration with Balfour. C. Wright Fields replied that when she goes into recruitment efforts at high schools she has seen a variety of supports that are offered at different schools. The differences in what is available to students is an avenue that she would like further explore to make sure students are getting the resources they need to be strong candidates to come to IU.

G. Gonzalez offered comments on the high number of students admitted out of those that have applied from the Balfour Scholars program. He was impressed with this and commented that the rate of admissions was much higher than the general population.

D. Cross asked if the retention of students completing the Balfour program would be tracked and C. Wright Fields confirmed that it would be.

R. Helfenbein thanked C. Wright Fields for her time and then D. Gonzalez announced that an internal search for a new director for the P-16 center was being initiated (although not yet released) as the current director was retiring. C. Wright Fields also added that if faculty knew students who might be

interested in being a counselor for the program they can contact her or go to the Balfour website for more information and to find applications on-line.

#### **IV. New Business**

##### **a) Masters of Education in Instructional Systems Technology - online (14.22)**

E. Boiling, a representative from graduate studies, presented the proposal for a Masters of Education in Instructional Systems Technology to be offered on-line. E. Boiling explained that it was not that long ago that this masters program was revised into three tracks due to changes in the field. Now it is being collapsed back into one program, although not exactly the same program it used to be. In the meantime, the workplace learning track has been folded into all of the core classes due to the movement of the field where it has become a focus that every graduate needs to have. Having the three tracks was kind of complicated. What has been done is that they have been pulled back together, been simplified, and placed the area of emphasis that any individual student wants to pursue back between the student and advisor. This has made advising both more personal and simple. Distance students especially appreciate this. We tell them what they will need to have, yet there is still some variety.

D. Hossler asked that when online programs quit having a high level of prescribed courses does it become less clear about which courses students will sign up for. E. Boiling replied that the program consists of a core of five courses and a requirement in the outside electives for one of two courses. When looking at the program there are not a lot of free form components. Several of the primary electives are taken by students who are on campus but may also be taking an on-line course. There is a larger internship component for on-campus students. Overall, between the two populations there is a greater difficulty finding instructors than there are students. The online courses are heavily populated.

J. Alexander clarified by asking if the program was generally just removing the specializations and going back to basically the same program it was five years ago. E. Boiling responded by saying that it is removing the specialization areas but that it is not really the same program from five years ago. The courses have been revised; in particular the workplace learning component that had been separated to be on its own has merged back into the main stream program.

G. Gonzalez asked if the proposal had been reviewed by the graduate studies committee and E. Boiling replied that it had.

The proposal came as a motion from the graduate studies committee. *Outcome:* Passed unanimously

##### **b) Adding BIO 101 Principles of Biomedical Science as an accepted science course prerequisite for the Elementary Teaching Program at IUPUI (14.23)**

B. Berghoff, chair of the Elementary Teacher Education program, presented the proposal to accept biology 101 as a pre-requisite for the Elementary Teaching program on the IUPUI campus. R. Sherwood asked if B. Berghoff knew which other science courses were required. Berghoff was unsure of the exact courses but added that nine credits of science courses are required. R. Sherwood followed by asking if this course would be the only option for a biology course. B. Berghoff responded that there were other

biology courses students could take to meet the pre-requisite. The proposed course would not take away any of the other electives but would add to the existing pool of possible science courses.

J. Alexander asked T. Niggle if this would be a course that the IUB biology department would find acceptable as a pre-requisite. T. Niggle responded that there might be a concern that the course might not be broad enough in that it focuses on human biology only and does not touch on cell or plant biology that is thought to be important for preparing teachers for elementary education.

J. Alexander then asked if the course was being proposed as a collaborative effort with the science departments at IUPUI or if it was coming exclusively from the teacher education group. B. Bergoff responded that the coordinators are from the science department and have worked with the teacher education group to make the option available to students. The CoTE committee also has members from sciences on it who were part of that approval process.

The proposal came as a motion from COTE. *Outcome:* Passed with one abstention.

**c) Masters of Education in Technology for Learning Proposal- IUPUI - online (14.24)**

B. Berghoff presented a proposal for a Master's in Education in Technology for Learning to be offered on-line at IUPUI. She explained that this proposal has been on its way for quite some time. It started as a track in the Secondary Education Masters that was developed with the schools. It was instituted it as a track in the program but then they found out that permission to offer it online had not been granted when the office of on-line education conducted a review of programs. Since then, they have been working to get it approved as an online program, working with IST in the process. It is now coming as proposal for a new masters degree so it can be moved through the approval process.

R. Helfenbein added that the proposal has been approved by graduate studies and that letters of support, including ones from Tom Brush in IST in Bloomington, were provided.

R. Sherwood asked if some of the courses would be online courses taught through Bloomington. B. Berghoff responded by saying that some courses could probably be offered at IUB but that the program is built around IUPUI's own capacity to offer the courses. R. Sherwood followed up by asking if there would be a different focus for the program offered at IUPUI compared to the Masters already offered on the IUB campus. B. Bergoff offered that the IUPUI program does have a different focus and is meant to serve a different population of students. It is really designed for teachers and also has a focus on urban education. R. Helfenbein added that those differences were a large part of the nature of the review and comments offered by Tom Brush and Elizabeth Boiling.

The email from T. Brush was pointed out to be on pg. 20 by J. Cummings, who then asked about the background of some of the points made in that email. One of them being that a full time coordinator for the program was to be identified and hired who is a tenure line faculty member with experience. B. Bergoff discussed how that was addressed in part of the proposal for the program. The needs for the program in terms of support include hiring a full-time tenure line faculty member to teach the core courses of the program. J. Cummings asked if that person had been hired yet and B. Bergoff responded

that at this time there had not been because the program is not yet approved so it is not being offered yet. Once approval goes through then the plan is to bring on a new faculty member.

J. Cummings also mentioned questions raised in the email about titles of some of the core courses. B. Berghoff discussed that area of the proposal as well. New titles for courses have been proposed along with re-written descriptions of the W courses. That process for course change is separate however, so we wanted to get the approval for the program underway and will continue to work on the course title changes. J. Alexander asked if the courses would have new designator numbers at some point. B. Berghoff explained that the course numbers will not change but that the titles and descriptions are out of date and do not accurately reflect the content of the courses. For example, a course entitled Computers in Education would be changed to technology in Education to reflect the content of the course that technology goes far beyond computers in the educational setting now.

The proposal came as a motion from COTE. *Outcome:* Passed unanimously.

**d) Policy of Dual License Student Teaching - IUPUI (14.25)**

B. Berghoff presented the proposal for a new policy at IUPUI regarding dual licenses and student teaching requirements. This policy proposal comes out of a need for the teacher education program. Students getting dual licenses were under the assumption that they could do their student teaching as they were finishing their dual licenses. Some students were doubling up and taking two or three dual licenses and then having difficulty fitting in all the student teaching. A policy was needed to limit only one dual license as part of an undergraduate program.

J. Alexander asked how this policy compares to what is done at the IUB campus. T. Niggle discussed how this is also a problem at IUB and a similar policy may be effective for the IUB campus as well. There is a problem with some students extending out their student teaching because they keep adding more and more things, so this would solve or at least minimize that type of problem. A brief discussion ensued regarding the possibility of this type of policy at IUB in the future and if it would interfere with any other programs, like that of Global Gateways.

The proposal came as a motion from COTE. *Outcome:* Passed unanimously.

**e) Undergraduate Certificate in Literacy and Learning Proposal - IUPUI (14.26)**

B. Berghoff presented a proposal for an undergraduate certificate in literacy and learning at IUPUI. One of the purposes of this certificate and the others being presented today is to stay current with offering programs of interest that fulfill the needs of students. Another purpose is to have some smaller groupings of curriculum to offer students who are looking for credentials that they can add as they go through our programs, which will make them more marketable. We are finding that students are interested in knowing what they needed to know, to do more with literacy, but without going through the process of getting licenses and certifications. These certificates are 12 to 15 credits (this one is 12) and will be recorded on student transcripts. B. Berghoff is responsible for the literacy and learning certificates at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. The courses for the certificate are being offered already. With the certificates there is a hope that they will attract students who are not



necessarily teacher education majors but who would take courses with education if they could earn a certificate. They may be headed for afterschool settings or working in other contexts that could benefit from having this type of knowledge.

R. Helfenbein remarked that this proposal has been approved by the Literacy, Culture, and Language department and also by COTE at IUPUI.

The proposal came as a motion from COTE. *Outcome:* Passed unanimously.

**f) Graduate Certificate in Literacy and Learning Proposal - IUPUI (14.27)**

B. Berghoff presented a proposal for a graduate certificate in literacy and learning at IUPUI. The certificate is very similar to the one proposed for undergraduate students but for masters level students. This certificate would also be using existing courses and hoping to attract an outside audience. Since the certificate is offered for a smaller amount of coursework than a degree program, it is the hope that this would be marketable to students in complementing fields who are interested in gaining additional skills but want something that can be more efficient than a full degree program.

C. Guarino asked if the certificates require that students already be enrolled in another standard degree program. B. Berghoff responded that a student would need to be enrolled in a graduate program already in order to be able to earn the certificate. C. Guarino followed up by asking if there was any sort of separate admissions procedure for taking a certificate program. B. Berghoff replied that there was not.

J. Alexander clarified the point by saying the certificates could be earned by students who were already admitted to a program and were working towards a degree, but could add the certificate as a credential. There was additional brief discussion clarifying that the certificate is not a license, however, it will show up on a student's transcript that they have earned a certificate.

J. Alexander also commented that C. Guarino raised a good point in bringing up possible admissions criteria and asked if a separate admissions criteria or process was ever considered. She also asked about the possibility of teachers or other professionals who were working in the field and decided they wanted to take some courses to earn a certificate but did not want to enroll in a degree program. B. Berghoff appreciated the question and felt those were future considerations that should be discussed. At present though, the certificates can only be taken by existing, enrolled students.

There were several comments made about the area of certificates in general and possible future directions for them. It was concluded this was something that warrants further attention and will need to be discussed in the future. J. Alexander offered an example about an IST certificate for students who have completed a bachelor's degree and works almost as a portal into the graduate program. Students who complete the certificate and then apply do not have to take the GRE to be admitted. If viewed from this angle, graduate level certificates become more of a recruitment mechanism rather than being something students can add when they are already here.

The proposal came as a motion from graduate studies. *Outcome:* Passed unanimously

**g) Undergraduate Certificate in Inclusive Special Education in Urban Schools –online IUPUI  
(14.28)**

K. King Thorius and P. Rogan presented a proposal for an undergraduate certificate in inclusive special education in urban schools for k-12 to be offered at IUPUI on-line. The certificate is specifically geared towards undergraduate students from multiple majors. There is a specific focus with this certificate on preparing students to work with students with disabilities in inclusive settings, which for the most part would be in general education settings. It is also focusing on inclusive settings in urban schools. If looking at the outcomes section on the proposal there are a number of student outcomes that focus on both inclusive and culturally responsive education in urban settings.

J. Alexander asked for clarification because she did not see that piece provided which focused on urban settings, except in the certificate title. K. King Thorius responded that she thought it was in the student outcomes section. J. Alexander replied that there was such a core ability to address the urban issue at IUPUI that she would really like to see it highlighted in the outcomes so students understand that added value the certificate brings. K. King Thorius agreed and P. Rogan said the language around the focus of urban settings was used, while the specific term urban is not mentioned in the outcomes.

J. Alexander wanted to be sure that she understood that the certificate does not add a license or involve student teaching. P. Rogan said that was correct. J. Alexander followed by offering that under current state rules, students who took this certificate would not be able to be licensed as an inclusion teacher. Again P. Rogan responded that this was correct and offered an example of how the certificate could be a credential for a gym teacher, or someone similar, but is not licensure in special education.

J. Alexander wanted to make sure that when students take the certificate it is very clear to them that this certificate would not lead to licensure in special education so there are no misconceptions. P. Rogan explained that the certificate can be a stepping stone for students that can be extended towards certification or licensure. J. Alexander offered that perhaps that piece should be included, in what students would need to do additionally beyond the certificate to move towards licensure and certification.

K. King Thorius remarked that all of the required courses for the certificate would fit into a program that leads to licensure if a student wanted to pursue that route. J. Alexander clarified that in order to meet licensure requirements students would have to complete additional course work and also have student teaching. K. King Thorius confirmed.

The proposal came as a motion from COTE. *Outcome:* Passed with one abstention.

K. King Thorius added that she would like to add the emphasis on urban settings under the outcomes section to the final proposal. It was approved to make those changes and provide them following the proposal approval.

**h) Promotion and Tenure Primary Committee Composition at IUPUI (14.29)**

J. Blackwell from the budgetary affairs committee presented information on changing some wording to offer clarity to the composition of promotion and tenure primary committees. This was to clarify the process of faculty from departments serving on the primary committee. The proposal discusses identifying the program area of the faculty, forming the committee, and that IUPUI faculty always be a majority. However, if that is not the case, in consultation with the executive associate dean, then they will explore how to expand the committee. Looking to letter E, it stipulates that if less than five members are found from the IUPUI faculty (which would then not constitute a majority) then the executive associate dean in consultation with the dean will appoint an appropriate number of qualified faculty. There was a faculty discussion within the FABA, and a faculty vote then it was sent back to the chair of the agenda committee. There have been extensive conversations about the proposed document. It just formalizes and clarifies the IUPUI process for primary committees.

R. Helfenbein offered that this document has been reviewed by FABA Bloomington. J. Blackwell responded that it was, and that FABA IUB had made one minor suggestion that rather than use the word professors just use the term faculty as professor would be a rank. The document was changed to use the words "all eligible faculty members." The IUPUI group accepted the change of wording and J. Blackwell pointed out that the change was only wording and not a change of content. J. Alexander commented that the IUB faculty affairs committee saw a draft and felt it provides a lot of clarity for figuring out who is on the primary committees, who gets to vote and who does not. The language in E is in current documents and was left in just in case that type of situation ever was to occur, which is unlikely.

R. Helfenbein commented that this came from the agenda committee of the policy council based on some conversations around promotion and tenure cases the last couple of years. The intent here is to clarify the process. J. Alexander offered that the old policy worked great for a time but now that IUPUI does not do departments it does not work as well as the wording does not fit.

J. Cummings asked about the assignment of program area at the time a candidate is hired. He felt that program area might change over the course of several years and so might work for when a faculty was going up for initial promotions but that program area could be different when faculty were going up for full.

A lengthy discussion around this issue ensued. The main points brought out in that discussion was that since IUPUI does not have departments it has sometimes been a point of confusion with IUB who IUPUI faculty are affiliated with (on the IUB campus). That piece in the document is intended to clarify for the faculty member, upon joining, where those relationships between campuses are. Teaching course loads for IUPUI faculty might span over what would be multiple departments at IUB, which is where some confusion can come in, so by choosing a program area it lessens the possibility for this type of confusion. The primary committee at IUPUI is set; it is when IUB faculty members join committees for IUPUI faculty that there can be some fuzziness of which program areas the members should be coming from. If an IUPUI faculty member was affiliated with science education, but also taught inquiry courses for example, when going up for tenure they should be voted on by people from science, rather than inquiry.

Concerns were raised about what happens if a faculty member changes their program area after some length of time. Voting committee members should be those who work with the faculty member, so using a program area chosen upon hiring may not reflect that if program area were to change. P. Rogan offered that the document could be modified to express that faculty have an identified program area, without expressing any specific time when the program area is chosen.

It was discussed that some bigger issues of concern or questions with between campus committee members and affiliations should be continued in the future that are unrelated to the current document.

The proposal came as a motion from faculty and budgetary affairs. *Outcome:* Passed with one abstention.

**i) English Education Proposal (14.30)**

M. B. Hines and D. Wyatt presented the proposal on changes to the English Education program. The English Education department is required to have their major the same as the COAS (College of Arts and Sciences) major. When the COAS major changed, this proposal was brought forward to comply with what was being done there.

R. Helfenbein asked if some specifics of the changes could be pointed out. M. Hines responded by describing the big picture. High schools have been offering some of the earlier courses in English, with the outcomes of students not being where the English department wants them to be. The English department therefore is trying to create more of a common experience for the majors. As part of this, one of the things that have been done is to take one required course and make it into two. These courses will then be taken upon entering IU, to provide students with a shared experience of the two courses. In English there are multiple ways to study language and literature, one is from a historical period approach, another is a thematic study approach, and another is from a genre approach. As part of the desire for students to have a shared experience a genre course is being required. There are options for courses but they are using the genre based approach. Additionally, the need for a capstone course was addressed by requiring a final capstone course for students.

D. Wyatt added that in regards to the English Education program students would be required to take seven literature courses, rather than six so that requirements for the various periods of study can be met while allowing wider variety of literature experiences for students.

J. Alexander commented that this proposal would then exceed the requirements. D. Wyatt confirmed this. M. B. Hines added that in order to meet the NCTE requirements this is necessary.

J. Alexander clarified that the content is the piece that has changed, other than the one additional course and that the content changed due to the COAS changing their content. M. B. Hines confirmed this. J. Cummings asked what was being eliminated in order to stay under the 120 credit hours. D. Wyatt responded by saying that to stay at the 120 hours students need to be selective in their coursework and plan carefully. Some courses double count to fulfill requirements so the program is exactly 120 hours. D. Cross asked if there were several courses that could be double counted. D. Wyatt said there was and that academic advising plays a central role in that area to help students plan and understand which

courses they can take to meet requirements. Additionally, program sheets are laid out in such a way to assist students in choosing the correct courses.

J. Alexander added that the provost recently provided funds to hire additional advising staff so the SOE has hired a university division advisor. The goal is that this will allow better early advising so less students end up having to take extra courses.

The proposal came as a motion from COTE. *Outcome:* Passed unanimously.

**j) International Comparative Education Minor Proposal (14.31)**

L. McCarty presented the proposal for a minor in international comparative education. The new minor was developed by Bradley Levinson and is very timely with the development of the new school for global and international studies. They are very keen on collaborative minors across the campus. B. Levinson has been able to meet and talk with various programs, particularly in the College, as well as SPIA and the School of Public Health. Those collaborators have all viewed the proposal and have made suggestions for change. The proposed minor is 15 hours, with the development of two new courses, H350 Schooling Around the World, and H305 Education Across Time and Culture. B. Levinson worked with various departments that might offer courses that would fit the minor. Students would be required to take nine credit hours from within the SOE and the rest from somewhere else.

J. Cummings asked if the new courses were approved yet. L. McCarty responded that they had been approved in CoTE. There was some brief discussion on whether H350 had come to policy council yet. R. Kunzman looked up past documentation and confirmed that both H350 and H305 had gone through policy council.

K. Thorius asked if students from IUPUI would have this minor available to them if they were willing to take the courses on the Bloomington campus. It was confirmed that this would be fine.

J. Alexander questioned if there might be a problem with the minor showing up on transcripts for IUPUI students though. R. Kunzman responded that it works on the IUB campus for students who take courses offered at IUPUI.

P. Rogan brought up the possibility of having the same courses offered at IUPUI. J. Alexander commented that the minor would also need to be approved for the IUPUI campus, as the current proposal is coming as a Bloomington minor. This does not in any way preclude IUPUI from also having the same minor; it is just a separate approval process.

D. Hossler asked if there was any difficulty for students using financial aid for course work taken on a different campus than the one they are enrolled at. Some discussion ensued about possible financial aid complications when students take classes across campuses in general. It was concluded that this is an issue that warrants further discussion.

C. Guarino asked about students being able to choose two courses that are not internationally related. L. McCarty replied that the two courses in question do have an international component to them where

about 20% of the course content is internationally related. C. Guarino followed up by saying that multiple course options seemed to lack an international component and so asked if it was possible for students, through choosing certain courses over others, to actually have a large part of the minor completed without having courses that have an international focus. L. McCarty explained that components of international education were built into a majority of the course options with requirements that two of the five courses have an explicit focus on international education.

C. Morton asked if any of the courses were cross listed with women's studies. L. McCarty replied that Regulating Gender was but there were also gender components in several of the other courses, although they are not cross listed with women's studies.

The proposal came as a motion from COTE. *Outcome*: Passed unanimously.

There were no new courses or course changes that needed to be addressed.

**\*\* The meeting adjourned at 2:55pm \*\***