

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
April 23, 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. Edmonds, N. Flowers, C. Guarino, R. Helfenbein, D. Hossler, C. Hill Morton, **Alternate Members Present:** D. Danns, B. Plankis, K. Wohlwend **Staff Member Present:** T. Niggle **Dean's Staff Present:** J. Alexander, G. Gonzalez, R. Kunzman, P. Rogan, R. Sherwood

I. Approval of Minutes from March 26, 2014 Meeting (14.32M)

C. Hill Morton moved to approve the minutes as presented, and T. Niggle seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved.

II. Dean's Report

G. Gonzalez reminded members that the spring core campus faculty meeting was taking place Friday April 25, at 10:00am in the SOE auditorium. Due to the large number of items on the agenda, and the presentation of annual reports from the standing committees, G. Gonzalez announced that he would give his complete report at the upcoming core faculty meeting, unless anyone had specific questions they wanted to discuss. No questions or comments were offered by committee members.

III. Annual Reports of Standing Committees

Faculty Development

Andrea Walton presented the annual report for the faculty development committee. This committee met six times throughout the course of the year. The committee did a significant amount of work in the areas of orientation as well as sponsoring a new faculty lunch at the end of the first semester. The committee worked with the Dean's office to administer guest lecture funds and planned and hosted the Miller Lecture Series. Dr. Barbara Rogoff was the guest speaker for that event this year, which was very successful. The dossiers of those nominated for teaching awards were carefully reviewed with considerable time being devoted to the task. Considerations for updating award criteria were also discussed.

A special charge from policy council to take up the issue of grade inflation was given to the Faculty Development Committee and has been part of the agenda for roughly the past two years. The

committee looked at a graduate grading policy from 1987 (the most recent one that could be found) and went to departments to solicit input with revised grading guidelines. The committee was then able to draft a proposal for graduate grading guidelines.

IUB Faculty and Budgetary Affairs

Dionne Danns presented the annual review for the IUB faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee. This committee represented the SOE for updating campus policies for tenure and promotion. In looking at the core campus voting policy balanced cases needed to be considered so the FABA was able to step in and represent that aspect and make recommendations of language which protected balanced cases. FABA also revised annual review policies to include academic appointments beyond faculty, including researchers working at centers. The committee discussed increasing adjunct pay for long-time successful contributors, which will be done through promotion of adjunct faculty. The committee also recognized the need to distinguish between a policy for adjunct teaching and other adjunct positions. Rather than combine two policies, two separate policies, one an adjunct policy, and one an adjunct teaching policy resulted. The lecture and promotion policy was updated and passed onto IUPUI FABA for review.

C. Guarino asked if there were any substantive changes involved in any of the mentioned policies. J. Alexander responded that she felt the biggest change was to the university wide faculty promotion and tenure document. One version of the document presented did not allow for voting from the core campuses and would not have allowed balanced cases, as there were no criteria for balanced cases. It was dealt with not only by us but by other core schools as well. It was good to get that settled to reflect the needed changes. That policy was passed last week.

Diversity Committee

Ellen Vaughn presented the Diversity Committee report. The committee met seven times and met 7 and will meet again in May. Two broad initiatives were worked on over the year. One was a continuation of working with ETS to develop a reporting tool to monitor recruitment, admissions, matriculation and graduation of underrepresented groups. The committee is still working with them to narrow down primary questions to generate reports at particular times of the year. The timing for that is currently underway, in terms of when information is received about the various areas of interest. The next step is having a long term goal and planning for sustainability. We want to be able to generate information that will be useful info at the school level as well as at the department and program levels.

The second initiative that is currently in progress is cultural climate survey. It was put together by the committee, drawing from other surveys from other institutions and also matching with the goals for diversity of the SOE. Barry Chung, along with his research team put together the survey, had it reviewed through IRB and disseminated the survey to students, faculty and staff. Over the summer Barry Chung and his team will be working to analyze data. There is discussion about how this survey fits into a plan for long-term and how to use the results, as well as repeating the survey to monitor change.

Undergraduate Scholarship Committee

Katie Paulin presented the Undergraduate Scholarship Committee annual report. The report is fairly concise and straight forward. It documents a complex process however. Approximately 140 at IUB completed applications for scholarships which were then reviewed by committee faculty. There were a total of 72 awards granted to 58b students, with total awards of about \$106,000 being given .

R. Helfenbein asked if scholarships awarded were similar to previous years. K. Paulin replied that it was actually a little more than previous years. There were a few more scholarships which means a greater dollar amount. Some of the endowed scholarships are currently going to returning students as renewable awards so they are not identified in the report. Overall, more awards and more money were given than last year. Each year we tend to increase a little compared to the previous year.

R. Helfenbein asked of diversity of the distribution of awards was examined. K. Paulin responded that this was being done. A greater concern of the committee however, is the number of diverse applicants for scholarships. Students from underrepresented populations are getting the message to apply, but there are not as many applying as we would like to see.

Learning and Teaching with Technology

Karen Hallett presented the Learning and Teaching with Technology committee annual report. This year the committee convened close to the same time as the new classrooms were being finished. The committee began by surveying faculty students to determine what needs still needed to be met with the eleven new classrooms and how student and faculty were reacting to the additions. Based on survey results it was decided that some of the classrooms could use multi-conference capabilities. Michael Taylor, the director of ETS worked with Karen Hallett to give those capabilities to some of the renovated classrooms. The committee also worked with issues of online courses. The committee has been in frequent communication with the office of online education. A plan for course evaluations is being worked out. Additionally, e-texts and how they might have an impact on programs has been a concern.

The chance to be a developer and explorer with Google Glass was offered. The Google Glass has been received and now some exploration with that mobile technology is under way, while giving feedback to Google. Learning analytics was a topic of committee discussion in how we may be using it in our programs. The committee had speaker present and then thought about ways in which the data might be used. The faculty initiative this year was called Just in Time 2. Faculty can learn more about particular kinds of technology over the summer that enhances teaching, with this year's theme being open education resources.

R. Helfenbein asked if Google approached the committee or if the committee reached out to approach Google in working with them on exploring with Google Glass. K. Hallett replied that they were Google contacted the Instructional Consulting department and ETS and made an invitation to become developers.

IUPUI Committee on Teacher Education

Linda Houser presented the annual report for IUPUI CoTE. The committee met twice during the year and passed three certificate proposals, one change in the elementary program from Columbus, and a concentration proposal. All of the proposals were given great suggestions of how to make them even stronger than they already were.

IUPUI Grievance

Linda Houser presented the annual report for IUPUI Grievance committee. There has been a downward trend in appeals, in part because we no longer accept appeals for CASA due to the state denying any waivers to admission for the teacher education program based on the CASA test, which has lowered appeals considerably. There was one grievance carried over from the previous academic year that was resolved early this year.

IUPUI Faculty and Budgetary Affairs

Jackie Blackwell presented the annual report for IUPUI FABA. The Committee met monthly over the course of the year. There were three major areas focused on, one was the primary committee membership for Promotion and Tenure. Lengthy discussion took place on this topic in terms of composition. One future consideration the committee will explore is reciprocity in terms of additional policy procedures. Additionally there was a follow up on the faculty annual review policy to look at expectations and guidelines for tenure and non-tenured faculty.

Another major focus was on the allocation of faculty time and workload. Currently, workload of faculty, including teaching assignments, with overload and under-load is being discussed and assessed. The next step is to look at load of service work. The committee has been working with the Executive Associate Dean where they are currently in a strategic planning mode. Three committees, graduate education, undergraduate education, and research, are working together on this and looking to move it to the next level in terms of growth and fiscal health. By May 2nd additional information will be available.

The last major focus area was in line with funding. Priority goals are being considered which will shape funding and resource allocations decisions. There has been some funding for faculty proposals for online badges and certificates to enhance online education. Additionally, the committee has looked at how the school does business in terms of processes and flow charts were created for the FABA and Agenda committees.

IUB Committee on Teacher Education

Anne Leftwich presented the annual report for IUB CoTE. The committee met six times over the course of the year and will be meeting one final time before the end of the semester. There were nine new courses approved throughout the course of the year, along with two name changes, two new minors, one new potential program, a change in admissions and graduation requirement policy for teacher education, and music education revisions with special education.

The collaborative student teaching initiative was discussed by the committee. It is an effort to try to make sure that teachers are more mutable to welcoming student teachers, with all the testing requirements, we want to make sure that they are able to relinquish their classrooms to student teachers. Overall the feedback has been positive about the collaborative teaching model over the more traditional student teaching model.

The TPA results include 65 volunteers for spring semester, and doctoral students are currently evaluating portfolios to see if it could be a potential model for in-house evaluations. At IUPUI there has also been a career service advisory council established which include many of the districts human resource directors from central Indiana. They are providing feedback on what students can do to get jobs. The office of teacher education has also been trying to help prepare students for the Pearson pedagogy test.

Long-Range Planning Committee

Joshua Danish presented the annual report for the Long-Range Planning Committee. The committee had three main objectives this year. The first was to re-examine the representation of international activity within the plan. A consensus was reached that it was most effective as it is currently structured, which is that it is placed within all of the other goals so that there is representation of that focus throughout the plan. Moving forward we are looking at ways to inventory those international efforts.

The second objective was to look at metrics uses within the long-range plan to determine success. Time was spent focused on identifying those that already exist, which can be utilized, or ways that existing reporting structures can be used. The faculty analytics program seems to be a valuable source of information, however, IUPUI is not represented there yet (they are scheduled to be added within the next year).

The final objective was to plan a core faculty retreat, which is scheduled for October 2014. It will be linked explicitly to the long-range plan and to the committees that will be responsible for making progress on the goals within the long-range plan. The attempt is that there will be working groups throughout the day to identify at least two of the priorities that are of interest to them, and then meet with members of that committee and reflect on how the school can move forward on those elements of the plan.

IV. New Business

a) Graduate Grading Policy Guidelines Proposal (14.39)

Andrea Walton presented the proposal on a guideline for grading graduate students. This proposal was modified from a 1987 grading policy document with input from several SOE faculty across departments. The general amendments made were to reflect a common language that would be precise enough but at the same time allow instructors across disciplines to use it. There were some concerns about students being recommended for counseling if the final grade is below a C. Those in teacher education, along

with other departments felt this helps grading to align with licensure standards, program expectations and to ensure a high quality of students.

C. Guarino asked if A. Walton could comment on the rationale of the guidelines and if data was consulted. A. Walton responded by discussing last year's report which outlined an extensive study conducted by Adam Maltese on data collection and analysis of grades and grade distribution. She also pointed out that the faculty on the committee felt strongly about not putting forth a guideline that would recommend certain percentages of students should receive certain grades. There was also a discussion about feelings that the timing of the course evaluations and the use of the evaluations do influence the administration of grades. This questions needs to be further studied and evaluated.

C. Guarino asked if there was similar concern at the graduate level of grade inflation as there was at the undergraduate level. A Walton replied that from all grade reports and trends analyzed that was not a concern. The grading guidelines came more from a sense that it was important to distinguish what grades actually mean and have consistency throughout the SOE.

J. Damico asked if there were any differences between masters and doctoral level students. A. Walton responded that there was not much differences discussed between the different levels.

C. Guarino asked if there was any discussion about incorporating grade distribution as part of annual reviews. A Walton replied that the committee did not discuss that. J. Alexander commented that grade distribution is one of the pieces of information that is now requested so it is available for the committee to examine.

R. Sherwood asked how students and faculty would get the information to know what the guidelines are. J. Alexander replied that it could be added to the graduate studies website and could be part of faculty orientation (if the committee agrees).

The proposal came as a motion from the faculty development committee. *Outcome:* Passed unanimously

b) Proposal for the use of Strands for Masters in Ed. Leadership (14.35)

Suzanne Eckes presented a proposal to use strands in the Education Leadership Master's program. The presented proposal would change the Master's program by taking some courses that are not part of the 24 core credits needed for licensure and principal certification, and develop strands of interests for 9 elective credits, while adding in one additional core course for a total of 27 credits in core courses. The interest areas are coming from various requests and discussions. For example, many international students have been interested in both foundations and Ed. Leadership so this Master's program might appeal to them. The strands proposed are all from existing courses currently being taught and are areas that would appeal to a wide variety of students. Future strands could also be developed. Most of the courses are available online and the ones that are not are in the process of approval as on-line courses. For residential students in the program they would have the option of taking the courses that are available on campus as face-to-face if they chose to.

N. Flowers asked what implications it would have for the vote that some courses still needed to be approved for on-line delivery. S. Eckes responded that the strands would only be listed as available to students when they have all courses available on-line. She also pointed out the section of the proposal that discusses advisor roles in working with students on strands. The idea was to limit the stands to courses already available so students were not overloading advisors with wanting highly tailored strands. However, if students are interested in a strand not listed they can look for three courses that are offered that would fit together, make sense, and are offered online there is that possibility those could be approved.

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

c) IUPUI Master's in Ed. Leadership K-12 Principal Leadership Track (14.41)

Brendan Maxcy presented a proposal for a K-12 Principal Leadership track for the Master's Education Leadership program. The proposal seeks more flexibility in the principal leadership track. It adds more electives in the foundations area. This would give students a couple more options. It adds T531, A560, K505 and L500 as options. The required foundations courses would then change from 9 credits to 6 credits while the electives foundations electives would change from 3 to 6 credits to allow for more flexibility and choice. Similar to the strand proposal, this would allow students to take two elective courses in foundations that would go well together, opening up the options for future possible certificates moving forward.

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

G. Gonzalez pointed out that the university seal used on the documents was no longer allowed as it is to be reserved for presidential and trustee functions. The forms used should be updated from the older versions and have the seal changed to use the IU logo.

d) Core Inquiry Courses (14.34)

Barbara Dennis presented the proposal to update the list of inquiry courses that fulfill core inquiry requirements. Currently the way the policy is worded, it is in the affirmative in that there is a list of inquiry courses that fulfill core requirements. However, each time we want to add new course the approval list the process to add the course must be undertaken. As it stands, there are a number of inquiry course not included on the core list without a good rational. A review of the history of core inquiry course was done to try to determine what distinction was made in terms of including or not including courses as core courses. What was discovered was that primarily Y courses were intended to be on the inquiry list with the list set up to consider other course that may also count as core inquiry courses. This proposal would change the current set-up to state that all Y courses, with a few exceptions, would be accepted for core inquiry requirements, with those exceptions being listed. Further, inquiry courses without Y designators from around campus that could count as core inquiry courses would be listed and updated as needed. Y courses that would be the exceptions on the list (would not count towards fulfilling core inquiry requirements) include Y500, Y590, Y690, and Y660, as they do not meet criteria that was discussed and established as

needing to be met to be a core inquiry course. These are courses that do not count as core courses now so this proposal would not be removing any current courses but the list of course that would count would increase.

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

e) Degree Change for Ed.S in Counseling (14.36)

Ellen Vaughn presented a proposal for a name change for the Ed.S degree in Counseling and Counselor Education. The proposed change would rename the degree to an Ed.S in Mental Health Counseling. The rationale has to do with recent changes in billing for Medicaid and Tri-Care. Students are having difficulty getting jobs because their degree is in Counseling and Counselor Education and not in Mental Health Counseling. The change would be consistent with our current CACREP accreditation and would also allow them to get the job to accrue 3000 hours to then get their license in mental health counseling.

J. Cummings added that he thinks this is an important change and that the new title is more fitting and appropriate to the curriculum than the previous, old title.

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

f) Online Ed.D in Literacy, Culture and Language Education (14.37)

James Damico presented a proposal for an online Ed.D in Literacy, Culture and Language Education. This program has been in development for the past three years. Planning has included conversations with IST faculty and department chairs. This program would be a response to current Master's students who graduate in the current online program and have really expressed an interest in continuing their education in some way. These students are primarily full professionals both within and outside of the U.S. The proposal is for a 60 credit Ed.D, which mirrors the on-site program for the most part (currently there are no students enrolled in this on-site program). The proposed program is a co-hort model with an anticipation of 10-15 students in the first year. Students would be required to make three visits to campus over the course of their program, with two visits occurring in the summer for departmental conference, and the third for dissertation defense. The LCE faculty includes both IUB and IUPUI faculty. No new courses would be required but some would need minor revisions to be adjusted to an on-line format.

R. Sherwood asked if the online courses could be taken on-site by students as well. J. Damico replied that they could not because the courses for the program would be taken as cohort courses for those enrolled in the online program only. On-site course would be separate for on-site students.

J. Cummings asked if there was any discussion about the possibility of doing a Ph.D. program instead of the Ed.D. J. Damico responded that this was not really discussed. The thought was that the online Ed.D would meet the need for working professionals. Adding another 30 credits for the Ph.D. did not seem to fit as well. This would also be the only program in the country to offer an online Ed.D. in Literacy, Culture and Language Education.

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

g) Changes to Music Ed. Curriculum (14.41)

Brent Gault presented a proposal in changes to the course requirements for the music education program. New trends in general music education, like non-traditional ensembles and technology in music education we were not being well covered by the current program. Additionally, vocal music education majors have to take international vocal ensemble (IVE). That class fulfills a diverse learning requirement. It works well because the course does not count into the 120 credits for the degree. The school of music is having trouble filling all of the vocal ensembles because of changes in ensemble requirements. We are trying to find another solution, for IVE, which is only required vocal music Ed students (those being certified in k-12 instrumental do not have that requirement). The first part of the proposal was to create a 3 credit course, Inclusive Participatory Practices that covers informal individual learning situations and also has co-requisite about world and diverse music experience that used to be part of IVE. All music education majors would be required to have this, with a service learning component as well. This course would replace IVE and an additional general music course that was a requirement for the instrumental music students.

The challenge would be that this course now counts into degree credits. Additionally, instrumental students would no longer have the required general music course. That is a problem because they will be certified to teach general music. The proposed solution is to E231, the old k-12 general music methods course with the E232 and require all music ed students to take the elementary general music course that currently only choral students are required to take. What that does is gives everyone the diverse music practice experience, with the opportunity to still take a general music class. It is becoming more common in districts to have the same person teach both high school or middle school band/orchestra and also teach elementary general music.

In essence it adds credit hours to the degree and since we have to keep credit requirements to 120 there needs to be an elimination of a course elsewhere. The course K205 (Introduction to Exceptional Children) was discussed, primarily out of necessity. The SOE time-blocks for courses do not fit well with music ed course time-blocks. The only place K205 can fit in is when students are first semester freshmen. The goal then in this process was also to find a way to embed the special education course content into our methods courses. Music Ed. has worked with Special Ed. and others to find the best way to do this. Through collaboration it was decided that special education would create a one-credit class (K207) which would provide some of the content related to special education that will be taken concurrently with the general music class. Since the general class also has a field experience component and students are taking it as juniors rather than freshmen they will be able to apply that content in a more significant and meaningful way.

P. Rogan asked if K207 is a variable credit course. J. Alexander replied that the designator was randomly chosen by her for convenience but that a correct designator number would be used once that is looked up.

The proposal came as a motion from the committee on teacher education. *Outcome:* Passed unanimously

h) IUPUI Elementary Math and Science Concentration Proposal (14.38) – 2:44 4:23

Eric Tillema presented a proposal for a joint concentration in science and math for elementary education program. This concentration meets REPA requirements. It puts together six courses, three each of math and science. REPA requires 12-18 credits in a content area to qualify as a concentration. The way this proposal is written, when the three courses per content area are added with pre-requisites there are two additional science and math courses in the total (due to pre-requisites) for 15 credits each of math and science. The concentration combines math and science for several reasons. First, the math and science faculty tend to collaborate in the teacher education program. Additionally, the combined concentration will make it so that there is only one additional course that needs to be added to the load for math (N343) and science (Q405). If the concentrations were separate for math and science then two courses would need to be added in each area. Further, the joint concentration will help with enrollments. In the undergraduate program there may be some who were more interested in math or in science and separately enrollment might not be high enough. The joint program will hopefully capture both populations so enrollments will be high enough to be able to run all the courses.

G. Gonzalez asked how the concentrations would show up on a student's degree, if it would show as two concentrations (one in math, one in science) or one joint concentration. E. Tillema replied that he believed it would present as two separate concentrations under REPA requirements. However, as far as he was aware, the concentrations are not listed on the actual degree a student receives. It would be something a student could list on their C.V., but would not be stated on their transcripts.

C. Hill Morton asked why it would not be called a STEM concentration. E. Tillema responded that the concentration would not include the T & E components; however, there has been some discussion about future possibilities of expanding to a certificate that would add those components in.

The proposal came as a motion from the committee on teacher education. *Outcome*: Passed unanimously

V. New Courses/Course Changes

R. Helfenbein directed the Policy Council members' attention to the new courses/course changes. The courses are open for faculty remonstrance and will be approved unless remonstrance is received within 30 days.

**** The meeting adjourned at 2:43pm ****