

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
December 11, 2013

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

What follows is a summary of speaker contributions

Members Present: J. Cummings, J. Damico, B. Dennis, B. Edmonds, N. Flowers, C. Guarino, R. Helfenbein, E. Mickey, C. Hill Morton, K. King Thorius, **Alternate Members Present:** J. Danish, K. Wohlwend, **Student Members Present:** O. Hopf, L. G. Lebeau, **Staff Member Present:** T. Niggle **Dean's Staff Present:** J. Alexander, G. Gonzalez, R. Kunzman, P. Rogan **Visitors Present:** D. Adomat, T. Brush, F. DiSilvestro

I. Approval of Minutes from November 20, 2013 Meeting (14.11M)

K. King Thorius moved to approve the minutes as presented, and J. Cummings seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

R. Helfenbein announced a small change in the agenda to accommodate scheduling.

II. Diversity Topic

K. King Thorius, a principle investigator with the Great Lakes Equity Center, presented the diversity topic. She discussed the happenings and focus of the Great Lakes Equity Center, described some of the research and productions of the center, and provided a power-point for additional center information.

The Great Lakes Equity Center is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's (DOE) office of elementary and secondary education. It has been in place for just over two years. Equity assistance centers have been in existence since the 1960s as a result of the civil rights act. There are ten regional centers across the U.S. Previously, the center for this region, which covers six states, was located in Michigan (for 30 years). In a broad sense, the center works with state and local agencies (including schools, school districts and state level departments of education) to provide technical assistance around issues of equity concerning participation, access, and outcomes for students regardless of, and responsive to, race, gender, and national origin (which is the language of the federal legislation). More specifically to the center situated in the SOE at IU, a lot of time is spent in facilitating education agencies that want to make improvements reactively as situations have come up, and pro-actively before situations occur.

14.15M

Being located in the SOE is unique to the Great Lakes center. This center engages very purposefully in scholarly research, and is in collaboration with other university centers and faculty. The center utilizes and is operated by several graduate assistants, which include doctoral students, along with 3 principle investigators, a full time director and 2 assistant directors. There is also a robust advisory board made up of experts in policy and practice from around the US, as well as locally.

There are four main goals of the center. One is to provide technical assistance through professional learning opportunities. The second is to internally develop a number of products related to equity in education. Another center goal is to bring people together to network and disseminate the equity efforts that are happening throughout the U.S. and the world. The final aim is to engage in collaborative inquiry and continuous improvement, also regarded as research and evaluation.

The center engages in technical assistance in multiple ways, from long-term partnerships to short-term consultation. One example of an ongoing partnership is in the work the center does with the Michigan DOE on closing opportunity gaps for African American male students. The center has been working with them for several months around policy review and practices statewide that provide obstacles and avenues for success of African American male students. The center is currently engaged in a research study on this case with the State Education Agency (SEA). The research was presented at the University Council for Education and Administration and an article is in progress.

The Great Lakes Equity Center also hosts a variety of events at the SOE in multiple formats. There is an upcoming webinar on implementing the common core standards with a focus on inclusive education. In the focus of product development the center also sends out monthly newsletters to multiple stakeholders concerned with equity and education that are like mini-research papers. The most recent newsletter was centered on immigrant and refugee students. In addition, the center writes briefs of concise and actionable steps that can be taken by practitioners to address equity concerns. The center website hosts a virtual equity library with nearly 1,000 free and downloadable resources that have been vetted for high quality, with several additional resources added monthly. The website has currently had over 30,000 page visits from 47 countries and 49 states. The center has a process for evaluating its own projects and operations, with that process continuing to develop. Research efforts coming from the center in just the last two years since it opened include internal professional learning, two article publications, two book chapters, numerous conference presentations, data summaries, and a successful dissertation defense based on research conducted through the center by one of its doctoral students.

Faculty questions and an enthusiastic discussion followed K. King Thorius's presentation. A summary of that discussion follows.

14.15M

G. Gonzalez asked questions regarding funding and collaboration with the other equity centers. K. King Thorius responded that funding was competitive and ran in three year cycles. The center is in its third year of the cycle and is undergoing external evaluations as well as rigorous internal evaluations. She feels confident that the center is in a good position. Collaboration with other centers also occurs on a regular basis. Gonzalez was also interested in learning about what features of our center at IU are unique or stand out in comparison to the other regional centers. King Thorius highlighted the flexibility of the center in the way it provides technical assistance using a model of tiered support, in response.

B. Dennis asked about how equity issues were prioritized at the center and if there were common issues in equity that would be important to know about in preparing pre-service teachers. King Thorius responded that they broadly focus on the priorities outlined by the U.S. Secretary of Education for equity centers, yet when working in partnership with a state DOE or school district, there is a very specific focus that is centered on the needs of the agency the center is assisting. The center focuses on facilitating change alongside their partners. Some common equity issues that come to the center are concerns with achievement gaps between Black and White students and in response the center tries to work with its partners to expand the notion of what that means, to an opportunity to achieve and learn gap. The policies and practices that impact student's opportunities to learn are often examined. A second common equity issue is around discrimination in the form of bullying and harassment of students perceived sexual orientation and gender expression, as well as students who have been discriminated against on a racial basis.

Other comments and questioned were offered by J. Alexander, B. Dennis and G. Gonzalez ranging from the free provision of these services to partners seeking assistance, to state-wide LGBTQ policies, to who are the primary clients of the center. K. King Thorius responded to all questions and comments and also directed faculty to the center website for additional information. R. Helfenbein concluded the discussion by adding that the power-point accompanying the presentation should be uploaded to the policy council website.

III. Dean's Report

G. Gonzalez began by reminding everyone of the invitation to the holiday event at new president's hall in Franklin hall. He then discussed a couple of major developments that took place very recently that have potential impact on the SOE.

Tax collections for the state are down, as announced in newspapers across the state just this morning. In light of this, the governor has issued a directive to reduce university budgets of state appropriations by 2%. IU as a whole has not yet decided quite how to handle that. However, if we are asked to give back 2% of our state appropriations for the next six months for example, at the Bloomington campus that would be about \$87,000 out of our budget. The irony is that during budget construction this year, the trustees were assertive in attempting to hold tuition rates down

14.15M

due to state's promised substantial increase in funding of about 5%. Now based on this new directive it looks like it is going to be more like 3%, assuming there are no additional reductions. This is something that will need to be watched and has caught everyone by surprise.

Ironically, this call came at the same time that governor Pence announced his budgetary priorities, two of which are to reduce personal property taxes that businesses have to pay and to expand road construction. This raises lots of questions among legislative leaders about how this can be accomplished. In addition, the reduction in personal income tax that Pence championed last year won't go into effect until 2015, yet, before that cut materializes, there are already calls for state cuts in expenditure. These are rapidly evolving developments that we have the need to keep watching and respond accordingly. G. Gonzalez also stated that it is likely that the deans will get some understanding of what the university and campuses plan to do in response, within the next few weeks.

The governor also announced his priorities for education in the state yesterday. This is the governor's call for legislative actions to be taken during the next session of the general assembly. One priority announced was to expand vouchers to preschool. The state has gone on record for several years as wanting to support early childhood (EC) education but has lacked money for funding. This proposal would be a voucher system parents could take to private or public EC providers. It is unclear how this would work however. In the current voucher system, when a parent takes advantage of the voucher, the money for education follows the student. If a student is attending a private school and parents have used a voucher, the money that would have been allotted for public education follows the student to the private school they attend. For EC, there currently is no public money because EC programs are not state funded. This raises questions on how this initiative would be funded.

The other high priority of concern is incentivizing charter schools. The details have not all been shared but one of the ideas is that the state will provide incentives for teachers to work in charter schools. The argument is that charter schools do not pay as much and teachers do not have the same level of protection as traditional public schools. Incentives are therefore necessary to get high quality teachers in charters. It is unclear where that incentive money would come from. The governor has said repeatedly that one of his priorities is school choice. These proposals are likely a beginning indication of how the governor plans to advance those ideas.

Not unrelated is the controversy taking place between the governor's office and the superintendent of public instruction. By administrative action, the governor created a new state agency called the Center for Education and Career Innovation (CECI). Five million dollars was taken out of the department of education and put it into this new, separate agency, which provides staff support to the state board of education. Under the existing statute, the state board of education is chaired by the elected superintendent of public education. There has been a lot of conflict surrounding this. There have been various arguments centered on the appropriate role of

14.15M

the superintendent versus the board, and responsibilities of the chair versus the member responsibilities.

The staff for CECI has offered a series of policy ideas that were obtained by the DOE and released to the media. One of these was a recommendation to the governor that the superintendent be removed as chair of the board. That led to express concern from the superintendent that CECI was trying to undermine her authority. Nearly all other policy recommendations in that document appear to be gaining support, as they are ones that the governor has now said will be his priority for education. The governor said he rejected the idea of undermining authority of the superintendent though. The chambers of the legislature say they do not intend to change authority of the superintendent. However, with super majority in both houses, anything is possible. As a result of what happens there, there is impact on the SOE because we depend on the function of the DOE for a variety of things. The longer the controversies continue, the more dysfunctional education in the state becomes. We need to continue to pay attention and be mindful things could change at any time.

At this time G. Gonzalez opened up the topic for discussion or questions. J. Alexander asked P. Rogan if she had heard anything previously about the 2% cut to higher education and P. Rogan responded that she had not. Comments were made that this was an unexpected surprise to everyone campus-wide, with no forewarning to the trustees or president.

C. Guarino asked about any knowledge or guidance that might be understood from other states. In states where a separate body from the DOE was created, how has that worked out for them and can they offer any guidance to Indiana as far as how to proceed under those circumstances? G. Gonzalez replied that he has not personally looked into any research in that area but that Indiana is currently only one of two states where the elected superintendent is also the chair of the state board of education. Several states have a superintendent, often referred to as the commissioner of education who is appointed by the governor. There are other states that have elected commissioners, but with a separate board of education.

IV. New Business

a) Graduate Certificate in Adult Education (14.13)

F. DiSilvestro, a representative from Adult Education, presented information on a proposal for an on-line graduate certificate in adult education. Students come from a variety of settings to obtain the skills gained in the adult education master's program and then also apply those skills across settings from government, to corporations, to universities. Some people however, cannot pursue a formal graduate degree and for those students, a certificate would be very useful and helpful to pursue their career needs. There are more and more adult learners and there is a need to learn how to teach these adult learners and develop programs for them. Our program is therefore designed to meet the needs of people who cannot get to a campus, because it is offered on-line. It will be the only program in Indiana that offers an on-line certificate in adult education (although

14.15M

there are many other programs through-out the country). This program will not only meet the needs for people in this state, but will be attractive to those in other states and internationally. The major topics for the program are from our Adult Education master's program. The topics, courses, admissions and completion information are described in the proposal. Assessments for the courses are aligned with the master's program assessments with on-line exams and projects, along with follow-ups of people who earn the certificate. Certificate students may also apply to the master's program in adult education once courses are complete. Resources required to implement the program are already in place.

T. Brush added that the certificate is a great addition to the current adult education offerings. It bundles together core courses already offered in the master's program for those who may not be able to commit to the master's program.

J. Alexander asked if students who complete the certificate and want to go on to enroll in the master's program are allowed to waive the GRE like allowed in the IST program. T. Brush responded that that is the plan, pending approval from graduate studies. It can act as a feeder into the master's program similar to the IST program's certificate.

J. Cummings asked if it was known how successful the IST certificate has been as a feeder into the master's program and T. Brush responded that it has been quite successful.

R. Helfenbein commented about two recommendations from the meeting minutes of the GSC, regarding the proposal. One was the tracking of the certificate to see if it will draw people towards or away from the master's program, and the other was about applicable courses and how this program interacts with others at IU.

T. Brush responded that because the certificate is being proposed, at this time no data has been collected. The other recommendation from graduate studies was about being more open in terms of electives. In the proposal some suggestions were made as to what the elective course could be, but the advisor can work with students as to what their interests are and provide them with a variety of options for the elective course beyond the ones recommended.

R. Helfenbein clarified that the three elective courses in the proposal listed are just suggested but others can be done in conjunction with the advisor. T. Brush responded that that was correct and discussed with F. DiSilvestro whether wording had been changed in the proposal to reflect that option. It was confirmed that the wording in the proposal is a recommended list. If approved, when advertised a broader list of outside electives will be provided. R. Helfenbein added that including additional electives would be of benefit because students can often miss the term "recommended" and may view the program as more limited in choices than it is.

G. Gonzalez added that if a course is not available or currently offered that looks at the topic of career placement that considerations for this type of course may be useful for this certificate. This is a big area of emphasis right now and it seems like it would fit in well with this program.

14.15M

Faculty for courses was briefly discussed. Two current faculty would teach courses. There is an open search underway with the goal of having three faculty positions.

J. Cummings recommended the proposal have an updated reference added under the rationale section (reference used was from 2006), along with page numbers before going to the campus curriculum committee. Additionally, they may not be familiar with the acronym of IST so giving the full name may be useful. Cummings was thanked for his helpful comments.

The proposal came as a motion from the Graduate Studies Office. *Outcome:* Passed unanimously.

b) Graduate Certificate in Children's and Young Adult Literature (14.14)

D. Adomat, a representative from the department of Literacy, Culture and Language Education (LCLE) presented an overview of the proposal for a graduate certificate in children's and young adult literature. The proposal for the certificate developed out of need. Graduate students and those applying to the program have expressed interests in more courses in this area. This certificate would also provide graduates with a stronger focus of expertise when applying for positions. The hope is that the certificate will also draw new masters and non-degree students to campus. Similar certificates exist at other big ten, R-1, universities within their literacy departments. Along with the proposal is a request for approval of four new courses, two of which were previously field tested and found to be well received. The courses were developed with the intention of drawing students from within and outside of the department. Two of the new courses were designed to meet the needs and interests more specifically to doctoral students. The requirements for the certificate would include two required courses and two elective courses. Courses from outside the department may on occasion be accepted as elective courses but would be taken on a case-by-case basis. Additional program requirements can be found in the certificate proposal. Current faculty resources to implement the program are in place.

A lengthy discussion among PC members ensued. The overall recommendations to enhance this proposal are highlighted.

- J. Alexander would like to receive letters of support from SLIS and the English department offering a statement that they are in agreement/support of the proposed certificate.
- Add any current specific course offerings from other departments that would fit the criteria of an elective.
- Highlight the international and multicultural emphasis of courses that make this certificate unique to certificates in this area offered by other institutions. Think of messaging in terms of how this certificate stands out from others.
- Make sure the distinction of course content is clear in the course descriptions and that there is no overlap, particularly between courses L631 and L508.

14.15M

- Make sure course titles and descriptions explicitly reflect the content that is intended to be covered in the course to ensure new or additional faculty can be clear about the expectations of course content.
- Adding immigration and language issues as part of course description to L641
- Adding specificity of the variety of cultures or aspects of culture that are represented or included in curriculum, while addressing that content and cultural focus is not limited to those previously addressed in the course may be helpful. It may increase student interest in the courses to have an idea of specific aspects of culture that could be or have been covered.
- Include information on how content taught in the courses is related to student requirements of literary analysis on common core or state standards.

R. Helfenbein proposed a friendly amendment to take into considerations the recommendations and discussions of the PC members in regards to this propos. The friendly amendment includes changing course descriptions of L631 and L641 to reflect the recommendations outlined above, and to add to the rationale for the proposal to also reflect the highlighted recommendations. The friendly amendment was accepted.

The proposal with friendly amendments came as a motion from Literacy, Culture and Language 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 2:49pm ****