

01.27M

MINUTES

School of Education Policy Council
January 24, 2001
IUB - Room 2140
IUPUI - 3138G

The following are summaries of speaker contributions

Members Present: Anderson, Armstrong, Beyer, Carter, Klein, Lambdin, Levinson, McCarthy, Manset, Martens, Rosario, St. John, Schwen, Singh, Sutton. **Deans Present:** Brown, Gonzalez, Wilcox. **Guest:** Professor Barry Bull.

I. Approval of the minutes for December 6, 2000 ([01.22M](#))

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve minutes.

Minutes for December 6, 2000, were unanimously approved.

II. Announcements and Discussions

a. Dean's Report

The Indiana Professional Standards Board, in a letter to President Brand, has articulated their evaluation regarding the progress IU has made towards the unit assessment system (that the School of Education is required to have in place by 2002). If the School of Education continues on its present track, it is not going to meet the deadline.

The steering committee will consider this item and come back to Policy Council with a response at the next meeting.

b. Policy Council

There will be a search for an Associate Dean for Teacher Education. An announcement will be forthcoming.

III. Old Business

a. Update of General Education Proposals from Teacher Education Council (01.05)

Beyer stated that the TEC reviewed the proposals and had prepared some comments. Bull gave a history of past general education proposals, including the current document's history. He also described specific proposal details, stating that there were two motivations for this activity:

1. Ken Gros Louis' belief that it would be good to have some kind of common requirements. Among the advantages to this are that it is potentially marketable for the admissions of freshmen and would make IU distinctive among R1 institutions.
2. That student groups were asking for it, out of a concern about tendency for students to be set back one or two semesters for "exploring", before deciding on teaching later in their careers.

Lambdin commented that there seemed to be two motivations for the proposal, and that people haven't

normally had problems with the first, but often have taken issue with the second. They are:

1. The desire to have all students, no matter what they are studying, involved in a common core of proficiencies.
2. The need for easy transferability between programs.

Beyer stated that the School of Education has two dissimilar, but interrelated responsibilities:

1. To help create the best opportunities for students who want to become teachers.
2. An obligation to its students' education, at large, beyond a specific set of required courses.

Gonzalez summarized the questions that the two proposals were asking:

Proposal 1: "Do we agree that it's a good idea to have a general set of general education requirements, to which all student who complete a bachelors degree ought to have been exposed?"

Proposal 2: "If we say yes, can this be accomplished by articulating a set of principles, and letting each school decide how they're going to meet those principles, and are these the appropriate set of principles that characterize a general education? Can it be achieved by listing a set of courses, and do we agree that courses from this general set would do that?"

It was agreed that the two proposals were independent of one another, and that the Policy Council may endorse either one, or both.

Motion on Proposal 1: The Policy Council can endorse the first proposal - that it is a good idea to have a general set of general education requirements, that all students who complete a bachelors degree ought to have been exposed to - on the assumption that the authority to certify the competencies of graduates is maintained by the individual schools.

Modification of the motion on Proposal 1: (Schwen) moved that the Policy Council recommend to the TEC that they consider how the common proficiencies recommendation, addressed by the campus curriculum committee, could be implemented in the School of Education, in a manner consistent with the other professional standards mechanisms that are now in place (The intent of the motion is not to make it a mandate, but simply that they consider it). This motion included an amendment that states "...and that the TEC respond in a fashion that meets the February 18th deadline". Further, there was agreement that the Policy Council should endorse this proposal with two additional caveats:

Caveat 1-The schools needs to be able to prove those areas within their own schools.

Caveat2- That there be a specific mechanism in place that is in consonance with the school's governance of teacher education.

A majority passed the amended version of the motion related to Proposal 1.

Motion on Proposal 2: (Sutton) moved that the Policy Council advise the Campus Curriculum Committee that it is unable to accept Proposal 2 as it stands. Part of this motion will reflect that the Policy Council wants TEC's advice on how to proceed with this (via the steering committee).

All were in favor of this motion.

IV. New Business

a. PTA - Endorsement of National Standards for Parent/Family Involvement Program (01.24)

The time for the PTA endorsement is passed, but a number of issues were raised concerning the idea of endorsing the standards, that is, whether the School of Education should be in the process of approving standards.

This item was moved for discussion until next meeting.

b. Selection of Nominations & Elections Committee

Four people have expressed an interest in being on the committee: Barbara Bichelmeyer, Diana Lambdin, David Silk, and Peg Sutton. The Agenda Committee will name a fifth member at their next meeting, through consultation.

c. Associate of Science Degree in Early Childhood Education (01.25)

This item comes as a motion from the TEC. It was deferred until next meeting for discussion.

d. TEAC

Sutton stated that, in the past, there was strong faculty reaction against an effort to put the School of Education up as a pilot site for the TEAC accreditation process. However, she was not sure that there is currently a strong feeling against membership in TEAC, and believes that there are colleagues who, on the contrary, feel strongly that The School of Education should continue to be a member of TEAC.

A recommendation was made to poll the faculty on this issue.

Motion: After a poll of the faculty on this issue, the steering committee will make a decision on which organization to go with in two weeks. This motion was seconded, and all present were in favor.

e. Course Approvals

No specific concerns were raised regarding any of the courses listed. There was no objection to having consensual approval of the list.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:16pm