

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
September 17, 2014
1:00-3:00pm
IUB—Room 2140
IUPUI—Room 3138B
IUPUC—Room 155E

What follows is a summary of speaker contributions

Members Present: B. Edmonds, C. Guarino, B. Maxcy, C. Bonk, P. Carspecken, D. DeSawal, R. Martinez, C. Walcott; **Alternate Members Present:** S. Parades-Scribner; **Student Members Present:** B. Jarrard; **Staff Member Present:** T. Niggle; **Dean's Staff Present:** J. Alexander, E. Boling, G. Gonzalez, P. Rogan, R. Sherwood; **Guests:** T. Hall

- Minutes from April 23, 2014 Meeting (**14.42M**) were approved (1 abstention).
- Minutes from April 23, 2014 Organizational meeting (**15.04M**) were approved (1 abstention).

I. Announcements and Discussions

Dean's Report: Dean Gerardo Gonzalez

Dean Gonzalez announced that he was on his way to Washington, DC for a meeting of the Learn Coalition—a group of AAU Deans of Education who came together about five years ago to advocate for a greater investment of federal dollars in educational research. One of the key issues on the table recently has been the reauthorization of the Institute of Educational Sciences (IES), which is the only agency of the federal government whose primary mission is to fund educational research. There has been some question about whether it would be reauthorized, as sequestration and federal cutbacks have made it vulnerable. But Congress has reauthorized the IES as of this morning. However, when the House voted to reauthorize, they added a provision that the director of the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) be appointed by the director of IES, who is a federal appointee. There has been some disagreement among various education organizations about whether or not to support the bill to reauthorize IES in light of this provision. The Learn Coalition has taken the position that it is more important to protect IES as an independent federal agency and to have money allocated to it—which this bill does—than it is to have the authorization of the bill held up because of how the director of NCES is appointed.

The next thing that is likely to happen is that Congress will focus its attention on reauthorizing the Higher Education Act which includes what is called Title II—a provision for teacher preparation. Every year we have to submit data to the federal government about our teacher education programs. The reauthorization of the Higher Education Act could lead to the incorporation of some form of a teacher evaluation system that would be used to determine which institutions get federal grants to support teacher preparation. There is a lot of debate

around what that would entail. We are likely to hear a lot more about teacher preparation, accountability, and the role of federal research in the coming year. And we are likely to be a lot closer to action than we have been in a long time.

Related, the Indiana Business Journal (IBJ)—a major trade publication for the Indiana Business community—did a “focus” section recently on education. Dean Gonzalez wrote a column that was printed alongside an article that discusses the results of a teacher evaluation system implemented for the first time last year. In accordance with this evaluation system, all districts—except those that did not have collective bargaining agreements in place—had to evaluate their teachers and rank them as “unsatisfactory,” “needs improvement,” “satisfactory,” “effective,” and “highly effective.” In addition, the state passed a law last year requiring that that all teacher education programs in the state be evaluated. And one of the elements of that evaluation will be how the graduates of various teacher education programs perform on those teacher evaluations in their first two years after graduating. The data from the teacher evaluations were made available for the first time last year, and the IBJ article published the results. The data themselves are debated for various reasons, but they are being used and will have an impact within the business community and among other influential people. Therefore, it behooves us to know what they say. IUPUI had the 7th least number of graduates who received a rating of ineffective or needs improvement. IUB was 9th in this category. Among colleges who had the highest percentage of graduates rated as highly effective, IUB was 4th in the state and IUPUI was 8th. We are likely to see more of these data and reports going forward.

Also related, Dean Gonzalez’s column in IBJ discussed REPA III. Thanks to the vigorous opposition by the educational community, many of the debated proposals included in the earlier iterations—for example, eliminating the secondary major and limiting the number of education credit hours students could take to become teachers—were taken out of the bill prior to its passing on September 3. But it does still allow anyone to earn a “career specialist” license who 1) has 6000 hours or more of experience in a field related to a subject taught in secondary education, 2) passes a test, and 3) earned at least a 3.0GPA in an undergraduate major. This has been changed from a 5-year license in the earlier iterations of REPA to a 2-year license. Also, the latest iteration requires that these career specialists begin a training program in pedagogy within one month of being licensed. So, some improvements to the original “career specialist” provision have been made, but even the revised provision still upsets many people within education. Still, on the whole, many of the measure that would have been most damaging to teacher preparation and to IU in particular were removed. The Governor and Attorney General still have to sign off on the bill, and that is supposed to happen in December. That could be the last we hear of REPA, but we are sure to hear a lot more about other accountability provisions and federal reauthorizations.

In closing, Dean Gonzalez welcomed everyone back, indicated that we are continuing to monitor enrollment leading up to a more official report of enrollment numbers and trends. Also, he announced that his intentions are to make this his last year as Dean. When he steps down in June, he will have served 15 years—the longest service of any Dean on the Bloomington campus. He considers it an honor and pleasure to have served this long, and he looks forward to returning to the faculty.

A question was posed by C. Guarino concerning the teacher evaluation data that came out in the spring. She asked if they had access to the individual pieces of the performance measure. J. Alexander responded by reiterating that the data have been disputed and, in some instance, found to be incorrect. Feedback has been sent to the state in hopes that the data will be cleaned up. P. Carspecken tabled the discussion in order to accommodate E. Boling's time constraints for her presentation.

II. Old Business

None.

III. New Business

Proposed Graduate Bulletin revision regarding Courses Counted in Programs (15.06)

E. Boling presented the proposed revision and discussion ensued.

Result: Proposal passed with revised wording (2 abstentions).

TEP Proposal regarding minimum grade requirements for college majors (15.07)

T. Niggle presented the proposal and discussion ensued.

Result: Proposal passed unanimously.

Selection of Chair of Department of Literacy, Culture, and Language Education (15.08)

T. Hall presented the procedure to be used for the selection of the new LCLE chair. He explained that there will be an initial vote to narrow the candidates to three; those three names will be submitted to the Dean and then a second vote will be held. The candidate who gets the majority of votes will be selected. J. Alexander asked why there was a two-phase voting process. T. Hall responded that the department thought this would add legitimacy to the process. J. Alexander asked if faculty would be allowed to excuse themselves at any point in the process. T. Hall responded that no one will be allowed to do so. J. Alexander said that the list of the final three candidates does not need to go to the Dean's office until the three names are rank-ordered. P. Carspecken expressed hope that anyone who really does not want to be chair can have their name removed from the eventual 3-person list. J. Alexander pointed out that in a small department, allowing faculty to remove their names could be problematic.

Result: Selection process was approved unanimously.

V. New Courses/Course Changes

P. Carspecken announced that courses listed are open for 30 day remonstrance.

****P. Carspecken adjourned the meeting at 1:49pm****