

MINUTES  
POLICY COUNCIL MEETING  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
October 18, 2017  
1:00-3:00pm  
IUB—Room 2140  
IUPUI—Room 3138B  
IUPUC—Room 155E

---

**Members Present:** D. DeSawal; J. Anderson; S. Power Carter; Y. Cho; P. Rogan; C. Morton; T. Nguyen; G. Gonzalez

**Alternate Members Present:** M. Nyikos; G. Pike; D. Estell

**Student Members Present:** P. Ober; J. Rizzi

**Staff Member Present:** M. Boots

**Dean's Staff Present:** E. Boling; K. Barton; B. Chung

**Guests:** J. Lester; E. Tillema; S. Whiston; P. Sutton; J. Conner-Zachocki

Approval of the Minutes from September 29, 2017 Meeting **(18.11M)**

**Motion made by:** D. DeSawal

**Second:** G. Pike

**Abstentions:** none

**Result:** *Approved Unanimously*

## I. Announcements and Discussions

### *Agenda Committee*

Policy Council Chair, S. Power Carter informed members that in her conversations with committees she has come to realize that the Policy Council as well as the committees may benefit from having a template that outlines specific information to include in the committee annual reports. S. Power Carter suggested the Council set aside time to review past annual reports to make ensure clarity regarding the purpose of the committee is and what should be documented in annual reports.

Core Campus Faculty Meeting is October 27, 2017

### *Dean's Report*

Dean Mason is traveling and so Executive Associate Dean Boling provided the Dean's Report. E. Boling informed members that Dean's search committee nominations provided to the Policy Council Chair by Policy Council members have gone to Provost Robel. The grand challenge on the opioid addiction crisis is moving forward. So far the Deans of the participating units have primarily been involved with this project, but soon the SOE Counseling Psychology faculty will be brought in to the collaborative planning discussions. Also, soon we will be forming an ad hoc advisory group to support the Dean's Office in identifying an exceptional external candidate for a joint role as faculty member and Director of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion for the School of Education. This is a way that we can move forward with the goals of the School of Education diversity plan. This position will not take the responsibility off of everyone else, but instead be a visible mechanism for channeling our efforts towards diversity, equity and inclusion. TEA talks continue to be ongoing. Please come to these talks and get your students involved in these talks. They are not intended to be lectures, but a forum for conversations around these important issues.

## II. Old Business

### *Diversity Topic: Update on Diversity Plan*

J. Lester, co-chair of the Diversity Committee, shared an update on the work of the Diversity Committee with respect to the Diversity Plan. The TEA talk initiative has extended into this academic year with over 70 participants attending, mostly students. The next talk is this Friday and is focused on microaggressions. TEA talks are not lectures, but community conversation, and we would like these community conversations include faculty and staff as well as students. The diversity committee has identified TEA talks as one of the top priorities for this year and they will continue with 3 more scheduled in the Spring. Associate Dean Chung and the Graduate Studies Office will be working closely with the diversity committee and coordinating the effort, which will be a great help to the committee. Another activity assigned to diversity committee was generating a tool kit for faculty recruitment. This is a top priority for the fall. We recognize there are a lot of resources available to us across campus, including individuals with expertise in this area. We are bringing together a variety of tools to create an SOE toolkit that can be a support in our faculty search efforts. A third priority is the review of policies. We have reached out to the Faculty Affairs Committee and will work with them to accomplish this task. As the Faculty Affairs Committee reviews policies related to the split with IUPUI, they will forward policies to the Diversity Committee to be reviewed through the lens of diversity, equity and inclusion and provide feedback. A fourth priority is to initiate conversations across the School to create a school-wide diversity plan. We are currently reaching out to staff council to begin the process of building a school-wide plan. Related to the potential for an Office for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, the committee has begun to think about ways to generate a list of duties, a description of what this position might look like to support the Dean's Office in the work they are engaging in. Finally, not a part of the diversity plan, but related to it, the Graduate Studies Committee asked us to do a review/report of students and faculties receiving fellowships in regards to understanding the representation of diverse groups as recipients. This process is just beginning but we hope to have the report generated prior to January.

### *M.S. Ed School Counseling and Counselor Education (Information only)*

S. Whiston shared information about the Master's program in Counseling. There used to be two tracks in this program, a school counseling track and a community mental health track. It used to be that for community mental health track, students took 48 credits for the Masters, but most states require 60 hours for licensure, so most students would go on to get an Ed.S. with 65 credits. We decided to revise the program to be a 60 credit Masters. The revised program went through all of the proper channels at the program and school levels and then on to the Commission for Higher Education as a two track program. The program was approved, but due to some clerical errors, the school counseling track was dropped in the approval process, and the community track was approved with only 48 hours as the credit requirement. After some work with the Higher Ed Commission, these errors have been corrected and so we now have both a School Counseling and Counselor Education Masters program with 48 credit hours and a Community Counseling and Counselor Education Masters program with 60 credit hours. There was some discussion about the Ed.S. program. It is still on the books, but it is likely that this route will not be utilized much anymore. Because the Ed.S. program has slightly different requirements, those who choose to go on to an Ed.S. will likely need more than just 5 credit hours beyond the Masters requirement.

## III New Business

### **Proposal to revise Early Childhood Education Program (IUPUI) (18.13)**

E. Tillema presented the revised program. We had an early childhood program on the books, students were coming into the program, but much of the feedback was that the program was too focused on the

elementary level. Most of our students were coming into our elementary program after having done two years of early childhood at Ivy Tech. So a year ago we stopped admitting students into our Elementary program who had done their first two years of early childhood at Ivy Tech because students were finding that they were not satisfied with the elementary program. Now we want to revise the program to focus more on early childhood, shifting the focus to preK - 3<sup>rd</sup> grade. Our Ivy Tech partner covers ages 0-5 and students will have a field experience with that age group before coming to us. When students come to us we will focus on preK-3<sup>rd</sup> grade. We removed some courses that were covered in the Ivy Tech curriculum. The introduction to bilingual education course was a response to some of our placement partners who have students who speak more than one language. We also wanted to have a STEM class. One of our partnering centers has a STEM focus, and also our Elementary student who struggle on the exit exam usually struggle in the area of mathematics, so this change is to address that issue. Methods in special education is added to address feedback from placement partners who are looking for students with more experience with special education. In terms of the structure of the program, we have tried to keep every semester at 6 credits. There is a statewide teach grant that will cover 80% of early childhood student tuition up to 6 credits and so this structure helps student to qualify for the grant. Many centers will also contribute 10% of the tuition, so students are only paying 10%. We want to manage program costs, considering the future earnings of individuals who choose this field. Students need to have field experience in two different settings according to NAEYC standards and in two out of three types of settings. Our field experience has a focus on k-3 and the other field experience will come through Ivy Tech. Another key part of the program is thinking about the market and when students want to take these courses. Most of the courses will be provided in the evenings or on weekends when students are not working. We have been collaborating with Ivy Tech to make sure we are meeting the needs of the students that we know are coming from Ivy Tech. We had an IUPUI CoTE vote on the program. Seven people voted yes, three voted no. The no votes mostly came from people who didn't attend the meeting and wanted to make some changes to the program. They were not opposed to the program itself, but wanted to make curricular adjustments. We are likely to make changes to the curricular content of the program as we get it started and get feedback.

*Discussion:* Discussion ensued about the proportion of courses are online. None of the courses are fully online. L441 is taught on our campus by our faculty. It is always a face-to face format. There was also discussion about the early field experience- is it all configured into student teaching, or will students have this experience throughout the course of the program? Because most of these students are going to be working in an early childhood environment, they will be in the field regularly. The courses will contain assignments that students will carry out at their place of work. If we have students who do not have a work placement, we have made arrangements with IUPUI's early childhood center to accommodate the practical experience aspect of the program for these students. Another question was raised regarding the course substitutions. E. Tillema explained that the program had two foundational courses, Early childhood foundations 1 & 2, but after a review of the Ivy Tech curriculum and program, we decided that the early ages were well covered through that program, and so we are going to provide the course focusing on the 5-8 age group which is not covered by Ivy Tech. The other substitution stems from concerns that there was over-representation of math and science and so removing a math course allowed for the inclusion of a course on teaching in a multicultural environment. Another question that arose was regarding the process to address curricular changes down the road? E. Tillema explained that this is an agenda item at this week's committee meeting.

**Comes as a Motion from IUPUI Committee on Teacher Education**  
**Second: Jackie Rizzi**

**Abstention:** none

**Result:** *Approved Unanimously*

**Proposal to revise Elementary Education Program (Columbus campus) (18.14)**

J. Conner-Zachocki explained some of the changes. We've removed some of the options students had to choose from under content courses because some of the course were not offered on a regular basis. In math, we removed one of the statistics courses and added a finite course. Students now have the choice of one statistics course, one finite course and one calculus course. The bigger changes- right now students complete two student teaching placements, one in the third semester and one in the fourth semester and take 8 week intensive courses during the part of the semester that they are not student teaching. We would like to move the entire student teaching experience into a one semester experience with two 8 week placements in two different school settings. We also like to provide placement experiences with two different age groups and in two different districts when possible. We are making this change because we find that the quality of the intensive courses is compromised when all of our course content is compacted into 8 week intensive courses. Students aren't really getting the content that they need in these important classes. We also now have three 1 credit hour technology classes. One focuses on science and math, one has a literacy focus and one focuses on using technology in special education, UDL in particular. We would like to embed that content into our current content area courses. We have identified a number of courses that will have technology as an emphasis. Each of these courses will have 15% of the content of the course focused on integrating technology with an assignment embedded into each course worth 15% of the course grade, where students demonstrate this skill. We anticipate this will provide more technology content for students than they are receiving in our current structure. We would then like to add a course that focuses on working with English for new learners that will be required of all students. Right now only students who are getting an endorsement in ENL take such a course. Feedback regarding this need came from our Alumni meetings. Finally, the shift in student teaching timing will require that two of our courses be taught online. These are H340 (education and American culture) and M300 (teaching in a pluralistic society). During the student teaching semester we will require students to take a student teaching seminar, which will be a hybrid course. The content will focus on STEM, ENL, special education, and classroom management.

*Discussion:*

M. Nyikos asked about the existence of a course already on the book on supporting ENL students. Yes, there is a course, but it is not required for all teacher education students. M. Nyikos noted that it might be beneficial to remove any prerequisites from that existing course, if there are any. M. Nyikos also suggested that biliteracy be included as a part of that course. S. Power Carter asked about the focus on STEM over Social Studies, or Language and Literacy. J. Conner-Zachocki explained that the very small cohorts at IUPUC are now spread across 6 different endorsements, making class sizes so small that they are not sustainable. The decision was to focus on the endorsements that are of highest need in the Columbus region. This led to the focus on four endorsement options, ENL, special education, math and science. S. Power Carter asked about putting the diversity courses completely online when exposure to diversity is very important. Jennifer explained that there is a course taught fully in person, a multicultural education and global awareness. However, experience with M300 online this semester demonstrated that student discussion online is more thoughtful, sometimes almost confessional and more respectful than in the in person courses, allowing the course to go deeper into these topics than in the instructor's experience with the in-person version of the class. J. Rizzi, undergraduate representative, commented on her experience in a multiculturalism class she is currently taking and the value of having a diverse student body that engages in face to face discussion on these challenging topics. It would be difficult to imagine an online course having the same impact. J. Conner-Zachocki

noted that Columbus has a student teaching placement in a very diverse school. Also, these courses are not the only courses where these important discussions take place, the topic is embedded into all courses. These types of discussions occur in many different places throughout the program.

**Comes as a Motion from IUPUI Committee on Teacher Education**

**Second:** M. Nyikos

**Abstention:** none

**Result:** *Approved Unanimously*

**Proposal to change PhD in History Philosophy and Policy (18.15)**

**Proposal to change PhD Minor In Education Policy Studies (18.16)**

P. Sutton informed Policy Council members that the changes proposed here have been unanimously approved by both the ELPS department and the Graduate Studies Committee. The department has been looking at this track for some years and conducted both internal and external reviews. The changes are modest and focused on a change in one course. An introductory overview course on education policy is being added. This change is needed because our existing policy core courses are very advanced and would benefit from an introductory course. An introductory course would also allow non-majors access to a policy course. We are also requesting some modifications to course titles and descriptions to reflect the skills of new faculty. The change in the program is to drop a 1 credit departmental seminar that was required to be taken three times and replace it with this new course. Over time the seminar course has lost its usefulness. We are now offering the professional development previously provided in this course informally through the department. Similar changes with similar rationale apply to the proposal for change in the doctoral minor.

*Discussion:*

There was a brief discussion clarifying that the new introductory course will replace one of the two core policy courses only for the minor. Both policy core courses will still be required for the major. K. Barton asked why the seminar wasn't popular with students. P. Sutton explained that the course never quite achieved its intended purpose. P. Ober explained that he had taken the course. As a new Ph.D. student, it was difficult to present on original research. It was also difficult to bring faculty in to engage with students due to faculty schedules. The course never quite fulfilled the desired goals.

**Proposals Come as a Motion from Graduate Studies Committee**

**Second:** D. Estell

**Abstention:** none

**Result:** *Approved Unanimously*

**Proposed changes to IRB Review – EdD (18.17)**

**Proposed changes to IRB review – PhD (18.18)**

B. Chung explained that he would like to discuss 18.17 and 18.18 together, because they involve the same proposed changes but for EdD and PhD programs respectively. There are three changes. One is editorial, updating the language. One major change is about the submission of the IRB acceptance form together with the nomination form for the research committee. In the past students have been required to have IRB approval before turning in the nomination form for the research committee. This does not make sense because students should have nominated their research committee first, then have their dissertation proposal approved, and then apply for IRB approval based on what the committee approved. Barry consulted Dean Daleke from the University Graduate School. It turns out

that this is not a consistent requirement across units because of how prospectus is defined. Dean Daleke prefers that the research committee nomination form is submitted as soon as possible. As a result, we would like to provide two options to students. One is to submit the IRB approval with the nomination form, or submit the IRB approval together with the dissertation proposal approval form. This is a helpful milestone to make sure the IRB approval form is submitted. The last change is minor. The old way is that students need to get IRB confirmation even if the study does not require IRB review. This seems like an unnecessary step. The proposed process would allow the advisor to determine whether human participants are involved. The advisor could check a box on the dissertation proposal approval form that indicates the study does not involve human participants so the student does not need to go to IRB for confirmation. This is different from an exempt category in IRB. The last sentence in the proposed language is to avoid confusion about exemption from IRB review versus the exemption category from IRB full-board review.

*Discussion:*

G. Pike noted the absence of archival secondary data analysis in proposed language. B. Chung noted that if identifying information is included, IRB approval is necessary. S. Power Carter expressed concern about faculty's ability to correctly determine when IRB approval is not necessary. Will there be examples, or information shared to ensure faculty know the distinctions? D. Estell agreed that it will be important to have faculty double check with IRB if there are any questions. It would be a shame if a student thought they did not need approval, and it turns out they did. J. Anderson noted that the IRB email indicating no need for IRB approval is an important paper trail for the researcher. M. Boots noted that in the past, this would slow down the research if they don't have the documents, but after this step, the next benchmark is the defense announcement, and if IRB is not submitted before the defense, that will really hold things up. D. Estell noted that proposals are likely to be tweaked by the committee and so going back to IRB after changes can be cumbersome. It makes sense to go to IRB after the proposal is done. This process will also help avoid concerns about timing with the six-month requirement between nomination of research committee and final defense. E. Boling noted that when faculty sign off on student projects, they take a lot of risks. It would be beneficial to have some language in the document encouraging advisors to check with IRB if they are unsure if IRB approval is necessary or not. The first part of the proposed change expediency is probably a positive, but in the second part, expediency looks like more risk. If an advisor makes the wrong determination, it's a terrible situation for the student, but it's a dreadful risk for the institution. Research can be shut down. S. Power Carter asked if there are other ways to address the concern without incurring such risk. D. Estell asked if there is a safeguard currently in place for faculty who decide they don't need to go for IRB approval for their own research. B. Chung noted that perhaps adding additional language on the dissertation proposal approval form describing the type of data that may not need IRB approval, including some examples and encouraging the faculty to contact IRB if they are unsure. K. Barton asked for clarification about whether one section of the IRB Review description is being removed completely. M. Boots explained that the content of the first section is not being completely removed, the sections are being condensed into one section. B. Chung clarified that the motion now being considered will include language on the dissertation proposal approval form to indicate when in doubt contact IRB and have some examples for studies that clearly don't need IRB review.

**Motion made by:** G. Pike that we accept the policy as amended

**Second:** J. Rizzi

**Abstention:** none

**Result:** *Approved unanimously*

Referring back to the Dean's Report, B. Chung asked about the title Director of Diversity rather than Associate Dean of Diversity, as was in the proposed plan. E. Boling noted that the Dean's office is working with the intent of the proposal keeping in mind budgetary constraints. B. Chung asked if this would be a faculty position? E. Boling responded that this would be akin to a center director position. It would be a tenure track position where the person would have an academic administrative appointment, and be reviewed periodically like any other administrator. Discussion ensued about where the emphasis would be- hiring on the credentials of a director of diversity, or hiring on academic credentials. We want to make sure that the committee responsible for identifying someone for this position includes broad representation. We don't know who we may identify and where their appointment may be within the school. It would be an external search. S. Power Carter noted that it may be a challenge to get an associate or full professor to take on the position with a director title.

#### IV. New Course/Course Changes

The following new course or course change proposals have been reviewed and approved by the Graduate Studies Committee, the Committee on Teacher Education or the Undergraduate Studies Committee. These course proposals will be forwarded to the next level of approval unless a remonstrance is received within 30 days.

##### *New Courses*

**EDUC-L 300 Spanish for Educators IUPUC 2 Cr**

Doc# 64881252

This course is designed for educators of child, adolescent, and adult learners for whom Spanish is their primary language and who have no or low proficiency in English. The course introduces the basics of Spanish grammar, familiarizes educators with cultural aspects of various Spanish-speaking countries, and supports educators' abilities to effectively communicate with Spanish-speaking students and family members. The course infuses all of the National Foreign Language Standards goals known as the 5 Cs: Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons

*Justification:* IUPUC is proposing a new degree program, a B.S. in Community Health Advocacy. Spanish for Educators (L300) will be a required course for this new degree. Hispanics are the largest minority population in IUPUC's service region; the percentage of people in our service area population who speak Spanish as their first/primary language has increased steadily over the past several years.

**Educ-D 415 Adult Literacy and Basic Education IUPUC 3 Cr**

This course focuses on instructional supports that can be used to help meet the needs of low literate or functionally illiterate adults in various education venues. The course opens with an exploration of the social contexts and aims of literacy teaching and learning. It goes on to describe two contemporary approaches to adult literacy pedagogy: a functional approach and a critical approach. The course takes a "multiliteracies" perspective, which aims to expand the definition of literacy to encompass today's multimodal communications, and the diversity of literacies across different social and cultural contexts.

*Justification:* IUPUC is proposing a new degree program, a B.S. in Community Health Advocacy. Adult Literacy and Basic Education (D415) will be a required course for this new degree.

Meeting Adjourned 2:33 PM