

**MINUTES  
POLICY COUNCIL  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

December 13, 2006

1:00 P.M.

School of Education

IUB Room 2140

IUPUI Room 3138E

\*\*The following are summaries of speaker contributions\*\*

**Members Present:** Bichelmeyer, Cummings, Dilworth, Helfenbein, Korth, Levinson, Lopez  
**Alternates Present:** Akerson, Blackwell, McDuffie, Pawan **Dean's Staff Present:** Gonzalez, Kloosterman, Lambdin, McMullen, Murtadha **Staff Representative:** **Student Representatives:**  
**Visitors:** Boling, Brush, Goodman, Houser

I. Approval of the Minutes from the October 18, 2006 Policy Council Meeting

A motion was made by Bichelmeyer and seconded by Akerson to approve the minutes from the October, 18, 2006, Policy Council meeting. The minutes were approved unanimously.

II. Announcements and Discussions

a. Report of the Agenda Committee

Levinson announced that Administrative Review Committees have been formed for Cary Buzzelli and Cathy Brown. Committee members for Cary Buzzelli are Christine Bennett (co-chair), Jacqueline Blackwell, Gerald Campano, Enrique Galindo (co-chair), Jill Turner (student representative), and Jeane Novotny (staff representative). Committee members for Cathy Brown are Joyce Alexander, Sasha Barab, Gretchen Butera, Keith Morran, Rob Toutkoushian (chair), Camille Kandiko (student representative), and Sara White (staff representative).

Levinson also thanked Jacqueline Blackwell and Vasti Torres for serving on the Agenda Committee for the past semester.

b. Dean's Report

Dean Gonzalez reminded members that the School of Education recently received funding for the Center for Research and P-16 Collaboration in Bloomington and the Urban Center for the Advancement of Science/Mathematics Education (UCASE) in Indianapolis. Recent efforts have focused on defining the missions of the centers and implementing their charges. One effort was to introduce the Pathways Initiative, for which IU made a special request to the Indiana General Assembly. This initiative

would allow special relationships to be established between a set of urban schools in Marion County, Lake County, and St. Joseph County to improve student achievement and college preparation, particularly in the areas of math and science. The idea is to demonstrate how a multi-campus research university can engage with high-risk school districts. Last Friday, the initiative was reviewed by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education. Unfortunately, due to budget projections and other priorities of the state, the Pathways Initiative was not forwarded to the Senate Budget Committee by the ICHE. Although there are other ways to pursue funding for Pathways, Dean Gonzalez recognized that having additional time to think about how to overcome obstacles that prevent us from building more successful relationships with urban schools could be useful. The original ideas have been scaled back, and using funds from the P-16 Center, we will be increasing our efforts with two high schools in Indianapolis, one high school in South Bend, and single-gender elementary academies in Gary. The School of Education will also be working with a program announced by the governor to start five new high-tech high schools, including one in Monroe County.

Dean Gonzalez addressed these and other issues last week at the IU Trustees meeting. The Trustees are very interested in improving education in the state of Indiana, and Dean Gonzalez was able to share some of the innovative programs that the School of Education offers, such as the Cultural Immersions Project and Transition to Teaching program. *Time* magazine is currently carrying a cover story about schools of the twenty-first century, and the trustees have communicated with Dean Gonzalez to participate in a discussion about ways to implement some of the ideas promoted in this article. Dean Gonzalez believes we will be asked for further engagement in K-12 schools besides our traditional role of teacher education.

Dean Gonzalez referred to the Core Campus Committee that was commissioned by the President and chaired by Charles Bonser. A copy of the committee's report was presented to the Trustees for discussion last week. The report is very positive about the core campus system, but recognizes the impediments and barriers that exist. The President informed the Trustees that in February he will report his recommendations in response to the committee's findings. Dean Gonzalez believes the University is committed to strengthening the core campus, rather than dissolving it. Dean Gonzalez sees this as an opportunity to identify the substantive barriers that prevent the core campus from being more successful. He has asked Khaula Murtadha to arrange a meeting of the faculty at IUPUI to discuss changes that may need to take place. He also encouraged Bloomington faculty to give input about the core campus system. At the Trustees' meeting, several references were made to the School of Education as a model of what the core campus system should strive to be.

### III. Old Business

- a. Professional Leave for Clinical Faculty ([05.38](#))

Kloosterman said that this document originally came before the Policy Council in April 2005. It was referred to the departments for review and discussion. All departments have reported back. The feedback was positive, but one suggestion was made in regards to the eligibility. The document had read that “A clinical faculty member in the School of Education at Indiana University is eligible for one professional leave during each period of seven year’s full-time service (including time on professional leave), following the completion of the first six years of full-time service as a clinical faculty member.” The Counseling and Educational Psychology asked that “as a clinical faculty member” be deleted.

A motion was made by Cummings and seconded by Dilworth to accept the original form of the Professional Leaves Program for Clinical Faculty policy ([05.38](#)).

Helfenbein questioned whether this policy was a Bloomington-only policy. Kloosterman confirmed that it was, but Dean Gonzalez stated that policies created by one of the Core Campus committees can help to shape discussions at the other campus.

Korth suggested that the department chairs and deans negotiate professional leaves when they are making offers to clinical faculty candidates. People who are already in clinical positions would not have the opportunity to negotiate, however. Cummings responded that because this change would only affect 2 or 3 people, if the department chair supports the leave, then the decision could be left to the dean’s discretion.

Kloosterman pointed out that these applications will be reviewed by the School of Education Faculty Affairs committee, but do not need approval from the campus-wide sabbatical committee. He also stated that the application deadlines for professional leave for clinical faculty will follow the same as deadlines for tenure-track faculty, although one application has been submitted for next year under the assumption that this policy would be approved by Policy Council.

The motion was approved unanimously.

b. Approval of Standing Committee Memberships ([07.02R](#))

McMullen clarified that Gerardo Lopez is the chair of the Student Retention, Admissions, and Financial Aid committee.

A motion was made by Blackwell and seconded by Bichelmeyer to approve the standing committee memberships. The motion passed unanimously.

c. Approval of Policy Council Changes ([07.00R](#))

A motion was made by Bichelmeyer and seconded by Korth to approve the changes to the Policy Council members and alternates. The motion passed unanimously.

#### IV. New Business

##### a. CEL-T Program Change ([07.14](#))

Levinson brought forth the revised requirements for the Computer Education License for Practicing Teachers (CEL-T) that had been passed by the IUB Committee on Teacher Education.

A motion was made by Cummings and seconded by Akerson to approve the revised requirements for the CEL-T program.

Brush explained that these changes were necessary, because a formerly required course (P506) is no longer being offered. In place of this course, they proposed that one of two courses (R546 or R547) be required. One of these course options responds to feedback from current high school teachers who feel they need more experience learning about programming and authoring skills.

The motion passed unanimously.

##### b. International/Comparative Education Program Change ([07.16](#))

The program change for the International/Comparative Education Masters program was approved by the Graduate Studies Committee pending demonstration by the department that the school requirement for 12 credits outside of the program area was met. Levinson responded that the department felt it was implicit that the 9 credits of concentration courses would come from outside the program. Additionally, the 3 credits of Inquiry Methodology courses would come from outside the program area.

McMullen inquired about the A630 course. A separate proposal has been submitted for an A631 course that has the same name and similar course description. Levinson responded that the current A630 course tries to serve two different constituencies, and that proposal has been created to filter these two groups. It was decided to continue with the proposed program changes. If further changes are needed to include A631, this would be brought back for further discussion at a later date.

Levinson described that the program changes were necessary due to a course in the program that had not been offered in several years. The course had had much overlap in content with H551 and H552. Changes were also necessary due to changing needs of students with diverse interests and a desire by faculty to officially include inquiry courses in the curriculum.

A motion was made by Akerson and seconded by Lopez to approve the changes to the International/Comparative Education Masters program.

Helfenbein expressed concern about students having the ability to choose courses in the Specialized Studies in Educational Foundations requirements. He believes a student could take courses and skip some of the major foundation areas. Levinson responded that most of the courses in the program are taught by faculty with strong foundational backgrounds, and H551, H552, and H637 are taught from a foundational perspective.

In response to the Graduate Studies Committee concerns, a motion was made by Levinson and seconded by Pawan to amend the proposal under Section III to state, “Three courses from outside the Foundations program area, selected with the advisor, that form a coherent concentration pertinent to the student’s specific interests in the content of comparative and international education or the application of comparative methods to the study of education, for example, African Studies, curriculum, East Asian Studies, higher education, language education.”

The proposal was unanimously approved as amended.

c. Waiver of GRE Requirement for IST Masters Program if Student is in IST Certificate Program ([07.17](#))

Boling introduced the proposal which will allow students who have completed nine hours in the IST certificate program with a GPA in those credits of 3.7 or higher to be exempt from the GRE requirement if they apply to the IST Masters program.

Lopez asked what the motivation would be to apply to the Masters program as opposed to the Certificate program. McMullen responded that they have to achieve at least a 3.7 GPA. Boling added that the IST faculty members do not have a preference regarding whether students begin as their Masters coursework while enrolled as pursuing a Certificate. If students apply to the Certificate program and are performing well, they would be qualified for the Masters program.

A motion was made by Helfenbein and seconded by Cummings to approve the waiver of the GRE requirement for the IST Masters program with the stipulations stated in document [07.17](#). The motion passed unanimously.

d. General Education Requirements

Levinson updated members on the campus-wide discussion to establish general education requirements for undergraduates. The meeting of the General Education Committee was happening concurrently with the present meeting. Diana Lambdin has requested that School of Education faculty members identify specific courses, both within the School of Education and COAS, that should be included in the Common

Ground general education requirements.

e. NCATE's Decision to Drop Social Justice Language ([07.15](#))

The issue of NCATE choosing to remove “social justice” from its accrediting standards was originally brought to the Agenda Committee’s attention by Jesse Goodman. Levinson stated that this issue had been discussed by the Elementary and Secondary Education Councils and the respective Committees on Teacher Education. The documents provided ([07.15](#)) included an article from *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, a letter from Dean Gonzalez to the NCATE President, and an email response from an NCATE vice president. Levinson described that the Agenda Committee suggested that the Policy Council discussion should focus on two points: the meaning of the recent changes in NCATE standards for our teacher education programs and what else could or should we do to address these changes.

Goodman thanked Dean Gonzalez for writing the letter to NCATE, but was not happy with their response. His main concern was the pressure that political groups bring to organizations like NCATE to try to control teacher education issues.

Houser stated that in her role as a chair and member for BOE visits, she has found that institutions that included social justice in the missions of their teacher education programs were viewed favorably by the teams that visited these institutions. Dilworth asked whether we were concerned that because NCATE has dropped this language that IU would be penalized. Houser responded that each individual institution must determine what they value, and institutions would not be penalized because they valued social justice.

Lopez said that is important to understand the rationale behind NCATE’s decision. There was a lot of political pressure involved, and NCATE’s reauthorization to be an accrediting body is being reviewed this year by the U.S. Department of Education. Due to the lawsuits related to the social justice issue, NCATE felt it would be best to drop social justice language so that they can continue as an accrediting body. Helfenbein added that this position came out shortly after an article by George Will that was critical of teacher education programs.

Dean Gonzalez stated that regardless of whether the wording is stated or not, we will continue to do what we believe is the right thing to do.

Levinson asked whether we wanted to reconsider our relationship with NCATE or communicate with them further. Rather than reinstating social justice, we may want to discuss the process of how political pressure can shape NCATE’s positions. Goodman agreed that his main concern was not in the dropping of social justice, but rather the political pressure on teacher education organizations and the way in which

this change took place. He questioned whether it would be to our advantage to consider withdrawing from NCATE, but understood the difficulties this may present. Kloosterman clarified that there is no membership in NCATE and thus while NCATE accredits us, we are not members of NCATE. As a university we could choose to not go through the next NCATE accreditation process, opting only for State of Indiana accreditation instead.

Lopez believed one of the challenges presented is that schools of education nationwide are uncertain of the consequences of withdrawing from an organization held in such high regard as NCATE.

Dean Gonzalez observed that he believes that rather than to engage in confrontation about language, we should stay focused on what we do, do it exceptionally well, and document the steps we take.

Korth suggested that we at least acknowledge our own identity and values with regards to the issue of social justice and the importance it plays in our undergraduate programs. She echoed the previous concerns and said that if we allow this to “slide by,” she is worried that similar changes would take place in the future.

Although Goodman stated there are many times when universities can encourage change, he conceded that this may not be one of those times.

McDuffie commented that there is an important difference between removing language with which we agree and adding language with which we disagree. Cummings pointed out that although we are not members of NCATE, we are NCATE, and accreditation bodies are made up of representatives of accredited institutions. If there is dissatisfaction with standards set by NCATE, the opportunity exists to be on the boards, make changes, and create the conversation through literature. This change should put us on guard for future changes and allow further discussion to take place.

Levinson adjourned the meeting at 3:10 P.M.