

**AGENDA  
POLICY COUNCIL  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

February 21, 2007

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

School of Education

IUB - Room 2140

IUPUI - Room 3138E

I. Approval of the Minutes from January 24, 2007 Meeting ([07.20M](#))

II. Announcements and Discussions  
Dean's Report

Agenda Committee

III. Old Business

IV. New Business

- a. Task force committee for Conceptual Framework for advanced program
 

Jacqueline Blackwell	Mary McMullen
Jack Cummings	Bob Osgood
David Flinders	Susan Smith
Luise McCarty	
- b. Guidelines for Involvement of Retired Faculty on Program and Research Committees
- c. Modifications of Language Education PhD program
- d. Proposal for Inquiry Methodology PhD program
- e. Charter School Task Force Report

V. New Course Requests

E201 – Multicultural Education and Global Awareness      3 credits      IUPUI/BL

This course examines educators' and students' responsibility(ies) in a complex and interdependent world. Students will be guided to develop the skills, knowledge and attitudes needed to live effectively in a world of limited resources, ethnic diversity, cultural pluralism and increasing interdependence and confidence with which to face the future.

F110 – Windows on Education      3 credits      IUPUI/BL

First year seminar to support incoming freshmen interested in teaching as a career. The course will facilitate students' efforts to navigate university life while making an informed decision regarding career choices. The F110 will serve as the First Year Seminar that may be linked to EDUC F200: Examining Self as a Teacher.

T515 – Interprofessional Collaboration in Urban Schools      3 credits      IUPUI/BL

An interdisciplinary seminar for graduate students designed to prepare professionals to work collaboratively by engaging students in a critical analysis of contemporary issues using a variety

of philosophical approaches and practice examples. The seminar focuses on the development of Interprofessional Practitioners through the Schools of Education, nursing and social work.

Justification: provides essential content knowledge and develops interpersonal skills necessary for success in the urban elementary/secondary education program.

]

Justification for Y courses below: New Inquiry Methodology Ph.D Program

Y515/H510 – Foundations of Educational Inquiry 3 credits BL/IUPUI

Examination of the nature and purpose of educational inquiry within focus on topics in social science/epistemology.

Y521 - Methodological Approaches to Educational Inquiry 3 credits BL/IUPUI

Introduction to the various methodological approaches to the conduct of social sciences inquiry in general and educational inquiry in particular. Focus on the epistemological implications of methodological choices.

Y525 – Survey Research Methodology 3 credits BL/IUPUI

This course introduces students to social survey research, with particular emphasis on questionnaire design. Specifically the educational goals the course include: (1) designing survey items that match research questions and plans for analysis, (2) understanding concepts, terminology related to questionnaire design and the fundamental steps of conducting survey research, (3) critical reading of survey research, (4) developing an awareness of current issues and important problems in questionnaire design, and (5) developing a theoretical and epistemological framework within which to understand the ambitions, limitations, and history and practice of survey research.

Y600 – Methodological Implications of Social and Psychological Theories 3 crs BL/IUPUI

Introduction to social and psychological theories that inform current methodological theory and practice including those developed by Freud, Piaget, Levi-Strauss, Webber, and Marx. This introduction forms the basis of an exploration of methodological concepts such as validity and inference in terms of their social and psychological foundations.

Y612 – Critical Qualitative Inquiry I 3 credits BL/IUPUI

P: Y520 or Y521. The first course in the sequence provides an introduction to critical social theory as it emerges through the context of qualitative research,. Students begin corresponding field work, including both data collection and analysis.

Y613 – Critical Qualitative Inquiry II 3 credits BL/IUPUI

P: Y612. This second course in the sequence continues the exploration of social theory and methodology by providing an opportunity for students to follow through on fieldwork and analysis started in Y612 and by examining some theory left implicit in Y612. The course will include opportunities to begin writing methodological texts.

Y625 – Latent Variables and Structured Education Modeling 3 credits BL/IUPUI

This course focuses on the study of latent variables and structural equation modeling. Extension of the regression model and factor analysis model are considered to introduce confirmatory

factor analysis and examine how these are joint in the study of linear relationship.

Y630 – Narrative Theory and Inquiry      3 credits      BL/IUPUI

P: Y611 or Y612. Examines narrative theory and its connection to narrative approaches to inquiry. Explores the use of narrative in qualitative inquiry, and practices methods of collecting and analyzing narrative data.

Y631 – Discourse Theory and Analysis      3 credits      BL/IUPUI

Examines the roots of the discourse analytic field in qualitative research. Explores current trends in discourse theory and analysis. Examines exemplars and provides opportunities to engage in discourse analytic methods.

Y637 – Longitudinal Modeling      3 credits      BL/IUPUI

The course will be based on multilevel models (also referred to as hierarchical (non)linear models, mixed effects models, and random coefficient models) with a major emphasis on modeling intraindividual change as a precursor to modeling interindividual differences in change. We will discuss latent growth curve models and their relation to multilevel models, as well as how both models can be considered special cases of a broader set of latent variable models.

Y638 – Multilevel Modeling      3 credits      BL/IUPUI

This course is designed to address the handling of data that are sampled from multilevel (hierarchical) structures, where data would otherwise violate the assumption of independence of observation—an assumption that is made with most statistical procedures.

Y639 - Categorical Data Analysis      3 credits      BL/IUPUI

This course deals with models in which the dependent variable is categorical, either binary, ordinal, nominal or count. Such models include probit, logit, ordered logit and probit, multinomial logit, poisson regression, negative binomial regression, and zero-inflated count modes.

Y660 – Affinity Research Group      variable 1 – 6      BL/IUPUI

Study and research support groups formed on the basis to mutual interests to generate new curriculum and research projects integrating previous coursework under the guidance of a faculty member. The work of these groups could continue over the course of several semesters to develop research papers, presentations, books or conduct empirical research as a team.

Y671- Knowledge, Reflection and Critique of Methodological Theory 3 credits BL/IUPUI

P: Y611 or Y612. This course examines the concept of reflection in epistemological theories as these have historically developed from Kant to the contemporary period. Kant's philosophy introduced reflection to the theory of knowledge through his development of transcendental logic. Less visible traditions in epistemology took Kant's insights in many different directions: hermeneutics, critical theory, psychoanalytic theory and the cognitive and moral development theories of Piaget, Vygotsky and Kohlberg. This history will be covered in the course, along with direct applications of reflection to research methodology.

Y672 – Communicative Action Theory      3 credits      BL/IUPUI

P: Y611 or Y612. This course focuses on both volumes of Habermas' the theory of

Communicative Action Volumes One and Two. The Theory of Communicative Action (TCA) has direct implications for all social research, both in methodological and substantive ways. Methodology, TCA provides a core theory of reason and validity, action and meaning and a bifurcated concept of the social (lifeworld and system) having implications for research design and data analysis,. Substantively, the theory of communicative action is suggestive for formulating research questions and determining the vocabulary through which to articulate findings.

#### Course Change Requests

L601 Theoretical Issues in the Study of Language and Literacies 3 crs BL/IUPUI

Explores traditional understandings of literacy, current theories of multiple literacies, and theoretical issues in research on diverse literacies. Particular attention paid to shifting theoretical perspectives and methodologies that have been employed to construct our current understandings of literacies from anthropological, sociocultural, and political perspectives.

Justification: L601 will be required for all PhD. Changing the course description and requiring our doctoral students to take a two course sequence L600-L601 will better prepare students to be effective stewards.

**Guidelines for Involvement of Retired Faculty  
On Program and Research Committees**

A retired faculty member may remain on program committees and research (dissertation) committees formed prior to retirement and continue to serve as member, chair or director.

A retired faculty member may not be appointed as chair of either a program committee or a research committee. However, a retired faculty member who continues to be actively engaged in research and in their professional field may serve as a member of a program committee, or serve as director or member of a dissertation committee, with the recommendation of the chair of the committee and approval of the department chair.

Appeals to this policy based upon extraordinary circumstances should be directed to the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies.

## Department of Language Education

### *Documentation for PhD Program Requirement Change & Course Name Change Request*

#### **Rationale for PhD Program Requirement Change**

The Language Education department is comprised of three related but quite different programs in Literacy/Reading, English Education and Second Language Education. Currently, only two departmental courses are required as part of the doctoral major (i.e. *L600 Issues in Language Education* and *L700 Seminar in Language Education Research*). We propose to add to these two a third required course (i.e. *L601* which will be re-titled: *Theoretical Issues in the Study of Language & Literacies*.)

The rationale for this change is to highlight the shared theory and knowledge base among the program areas and to add cohesiveness to the doctoral program. Students and the department will benefit from increased opportunities for collaboration and more cohesiveness in doctoral research across the areas. This change will not add to the total doctoral course credit requirements, though it will slightly limit student choice of courses in the major area. Department faculty approved re-titling, revising, and making *L601* a required companion course to *L600*.

#### **Rationale for Using *L601* as the third required course**

The following is the course description for *L601* from the current Graduate Bulletin:

##### ***CURRENT COURSE DESCRIPTION***

***Reading Research for Practitioners:*** *A seminar devoted to interpreting theoretical positions and research data for application to curricular and instructional planning. Current research literature is explored for varying research procedures, methodologies, data reporting techniques, and interpretation of conclusions. Focus is on consumer applications.*

*L601* was originally designed and approved for individuals doing graduate work in the department who intended to work as consultants to school districts and needed additional professional development. As such, they required practice in knowledgeably “consuming” education research and not in producing it. *L601* has not been offered in years, and EdS students who would have taken this course take *L700* instead.

As a department, we recognize that a one course introduction is inadequate to introducing doctoral students to research in language and literacy and to preparing them to become stewards of the field of language and literacy research. They need an understanding of the history and foundational ideas of the field, as well as the skills to assess, critique and to judge which ideas to keep and which to reject.

We propose re-titling *L601* to *Theoretical Issues in the Study of Language & Literacies*, changing the course description, and requiring our doctoral students take a two course sequence *L600-L601* to better prepare them to be effective stewards.

### **PROPOSED COURSE DESCRIPTION**

*Theoretical Issues in the Study of Language & Literacies: Explores traditional understandings of literacy, current theories of multiple literacies, and theoretical issues in research on diverse literacies. Particular attention paid to shifting theoretical perspectives and methodologies that have been employed to construct our current understandings of literacies from anthropological, sociocultural, and political perspectives.*

### **Faculty Staffing**

Literacy Education tenure-track faculty will teach *L601*. This course requires no extra staffing as it is simply a name change and course revision.

### **Integration with Existing Programs**

*L601* will be required for all PhD, available for EdS, and recommended for some advanced MS students.

### **Implementation Time Line**

*L601* is based on a course that was successfully taught as an elective *L630*. An undated pilot version of *L601* will be taught Spring 2007 as an elective for current graduate students.

### **Documented Program Faculty and/or Department Chair Review and Approval**

A sample syllabus, course description, and plan to require *L601* were reviewed in department meetings in Spring 2006 and approved in September 2006 at the Language Education Department meeting.

Mary Beth Hines, Chair of the Language Education Department, has signed the Course Change Request, thereby approving this change.

Please contact Peter Cowan ([pcowan@indiana.edu](mailto:pcowan@indiana.edu) or 856-8278) if you have any questions.

**Proposal for a Ph.D. Degree Program in  
Inquiry Methodology  
Indiana University  
School of Education  
Counseling & Educational Psychology Department  
Bloomington Campus  
December 2006**

Gerardo González  
University Dean  
School of Education  
Indiana University  
201 North Rose Avenue  
Bloomington, IN 47405  
812-856-8001

## Table of Contents

1. Program Rationale	3
2. Program Philosophy and Goals	4
3. Students Admitted to the Program	5
4. Program Description	6
5. Curriculum	7
6. Employment Possibilities	10
7. Admission Requirements and Student Characteristics	10
8. Financial Support	10
9. Description of Core Program Courses, Practica, and Internship	10
10. Related Courses	17
11. Qualifying Examinations	20
12. Dissertation	20
13. Program Faculty	21
14. Affiliate Faculty	21
15. Regional, State, and National Factors	23
16. Evaluation Plan	23
17. Additional Resources Needed	23

## 1. Program Rationale

There are currently pressing concerns, in the US and elsewhere, about the quality of educational research and about the scarcity of appropriately educated researchers (e.g., psychometricians). Such a scarcity was recently related in a New York Times article: “..the nation faces a critical shortage of people ... with the mathematical, scientific, psychological and educational skills to create tests and analyze the results. The problem has sent states, testing companies and big school districts [not to mention universities] into a heated hiring competition, with test companies offering salaries as high as \$200,000 a year or more plus perks” (Herszenhorn, 2006), including stock options and profit sharing. Similarly, the American Psychological Association deplores the extreme shortage of researchers with adequate understanding of statistics, measurement and methodology (Clay, 2005).

At the same time that concerns over the quality of research and over the number of well-trained researchers have been mounting, an international qualitative research community has been growing at an accelerating rate. The first International Congress on Qualitative Research was held at the University of Illinois two years ago, attracting large numbers of researchers from all over the world. Qualitative research journals have been increasing in number and many schools of education now claim qualitative research to be most commonly used by their students in producing dissertations. Good qualitative researchers need extensive education in applied social theory but this is unavailable in many, perhaps most, schools of education despite the popularity of this approach. There is consequently a gap, nationally, between the demand for good training in qualitative research and the typical offerings provided in schools of education.

This current national and international landscape provides a great opportunity to create a graduate program that can prepare future researchers capable of contributing to the dialogues surrounding the meaning of educational research. This is an opportunity that the inquiry methodology faculty at Indiana University wishes to act on at this time. The School of Education at Indiana University can produce an exemplary program in both qualitative and quantitative research at an opportune moment historically, if organizational changes can be made to facilitate this.

The Inquiry Methodology program is currently a specialization in the Learning and Development Sciences degree program. The current specialization typically attracts students interested in the study of research methodologies and methods that are used in the study of social phenomena including educational processes and practices. In the last several years, students from outside of the area of Learning and Development Sciences (previously Educational Psychology) have been interested in studying inquiry methodology but the current program structure and requirements in Learning and Development Sciences are mostly geared toward the preparation of educational psychology generalists interested in learning and development theories, and toward graduate students throughout the school that rely on the inquiry methodology coursework to develop their understanding of research. Many students who wish to pursue research

methodology need a strong grounding in education-related fields, but do not necessarily need to focus specifically on learning and development theories. In fact, a broader exposure to educational theories and philosophies is likely a better preparation for someone interested in studying research methodology in the social sciences. This new program will bring to IUB a new group of students who would probably not have applied for a degree in Learning and Development Sciences or Educational Psychology.

The creation of this new degree program will have minimum negative impact on the PhD in Learning and Development sciences, as this program has a relatively large group of established graduate students moving through the program on a regular basis. In fact, the creation of a separate new degree will allow PhD students in Learning and Development Sciences to double-major in Inquiry Methodology—which is currently impossible for them (although, ironically, all other majors in the School of Education can do so) because Learning and Development Sciences and Inquiry Methodology are currently two specialization within the same degree program. Thus, the creation of this new degree program will actually help students in Learning and Development Sciences create a stronger program of studies if they wish to double-major.

For these reasons, and to address the extreme scarcity of appropriately educated research methodologists the faculty proposes the creation of a new Inquiry Methodology doctoral program that would confer its own degrees and accommodate students with a wide range of substantive and methodological research interests. This new program would also be an opportunity to update and expand the current course offerings and provide more in depth research preparation and experiences for students in the new major.

## **2. Program Philosophy and Goals**

The Inquiry Methodology Program at Indiana University is dedicated to the advancement of social and behavioral research by critically evaluating, improving, and developing methodological theory and methods so that phenomena of interest can be more soundly investigated and better understood.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Inquiry Methodology Program faculty consists of quantitative and qualitative methodologists, making the Indiana University program unique with regard to the types of methodological approaches addressed in the program and the educational opportunities it provides students. Students can choose to focus on a quantitative, qualitative, or an integrated program of study. The program is designed to be flexible enough to handle a wide variety of student interests (e.g., statistical modeling, measurement, advanced psychometrics, methodological theory, evaluation, ethnography, philosophy of social science, hermeneutic-reconstructive analysis, discourse and narrative analysis, critical ethnography and feminist research), but rigorous so as to ensure that its graduates can meaningfully contribute to the study of social and behavioral research.

The Inquiry Methodology Program seeks to put into dialogue the theoretical and substantive aspects of inquiry so that the complex ways in which theory and practice interact are not taken for granted, but are themselves examined. For example, without theories to guide research, an area of inquiry may wander and lose sight of its goals. This mutual accountability is one of the many ways in which the bridge between theory and practice is being explored and developed in the Inquiry Methodology Program at Indiana University. The faculty and students in the Inquiry Methodology Program are dedicated to ensuring that meaningful research approaches are used to answer the complex questions that arise in social and behavioral research.

This program would compare very favorably to other research methodology programs at other institutions which tend to focus exclusively on quantitative methods (e.g., Michigan State University, University of Wisconsin). Students would greatly benefit from a conversation across the traditional boundaries that have been established between quantitative and qualitative research, a conversation that could only take place when these different inquiry perspectives are being considered at the same time and place. Students in the current program are already engaging in these cross-boundaries conversations when they are taking courses organized to represent different research traditions—a course of study that is strongly encouraged by the faculty. The Inquiry Methodology Program will considerably expand opportunities for these dialogues as we strongly believe, along with other leading methodologists that we need to move beyond simplistic dualisms that have stifled many research efforts. Consequently this new program will be at the cutting edge in the field and prepare scholars who will take a leading role in the national and international conversations regarding the theories and practices of inquiry methodology affecting social and behavioral research and will develop methodologies that will contribute to better inform public debates about education.

### **3. Students Admitted to the Program**

In the last ten years the students admitted to the Inquiry Methodology Program have had a wide range of undergraduate experiences with baccalaureate degrees in psychology, mathematics, biology, chemistry, business, social work and law from reputable institutions in the US and abroad. Their undergraduate GPAs have ranged from 3.0 to 4.0 (or their equivalent in the case of international students), with typically combined (verbal + quantitative) GRE scores around 1200-1300. Students are expected to spend at least one year in the program as a full time student taking courses, participating in seminars and research projects. We also examine all prospective students' application files to determine the appropriateness of fit for the students and the program. The new program will seek to recruit students who demonstrate a great degree of engagement in their learning and are interested in exploring issues beyond a simple methodological tool kit approach.

## 4. Program Description

Students in the program will develop understandings of the philosophical and theoretical foundations of inquiry and the implications these have for the methodological choices we make as well as in depth understandings of inquiry methodologies and methods and how these relate to the substantive theories (e.g., psychological, sociological) used in educational research. Students will have the opportunity to develop these understandings in their particular area of interest through coursework but also through their participation in research groups and projects. And although students will focus on a particular track of study (i.e., qualitative, quantitative or integrated) cross-track experiences will be required. Program of studies are developed for individual students to ensure a logical and balanced sequence of coursework and experiences.

Many aspects of the current program will be retained. When a student enters the program, a faculty member is assigned as advisor to help with planning the first year's course of study. Before the beginning of the second year, the student establishes an advisory committee, of which an Inquiry Methodology faculty member serves as the chairperson. Working with the committee chairperson, a minimum of two additional faculty members are selected, one of whom must be an Inquiry Methodology faculty member, and the other member represents the minor area. The student works with the committee to develop a program of studies that meets personal needs, interests, and goals. After course work has been completed, written and oral qualifying examinations and procedures are completed. After these examinations have been successfully passed, work begins in earnest on developing the dissertation. The research committee is comprised of four members. The dissertation director is the faculty member with expertise in the problem area. At least two committee members are Inquiry Methodology faculty. An Inquiry Methodology faculty member serves as the committee chairperson, and frequently is the dissertation director. The dissertation director may be from any department or program. A member from outside the program represents the minor specialization. In some cases, the outside member from the minor may be replaced by a member from another discipline who has greater expertise about the dissertation problem. At least half of the committee members must be Full members of the Graduate Faculty.

Program faculty historically has been involved in professional organizations (e.g., Division of Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics, American Psychological Association, American Statistical Association, Psychometric Society, Division of Measurement and Research Methodology (Division D), American Education Research Association, National Council on Measurement in Education, American Anthropological Association, The Comparative and International Education Society (CIES), Oxford Education and Ethnography group, and Qualitative Inquiry Interest Group.

The Inquiry Methodology students will also be encouraged to participate in local, state and national conferences as well as in internships in their area of interests. Students will benefit from the program by taking the initiative to become involved in projects of interest and in professional organizations.

## 5. Curriculum

A minimum of 90 hours are required for this degree program. No more than thirty semester hours of graduate credit can be transferred from another university.

The ninety (90) hours are allocated as follows:

Inquiry Core/ InquiryMethodology (Major)	39 hours
Foundations of Education	9 hours
Minor	12-18 hours (to be used for substantive area of interest)
Electives	6-15 hours
Dissertation	15 hours

These hours represent minimum requirements and fulfill the requirements of the IUB Research and the University Graduate School as well as the School of Education Graduate Program.

### **Inquiry Core (9 hours)**

<b>Y515/H510</b>	Foundations of Educational Inquiry
<b>Y521</b>	Methodological Approaches to Educational Inquiry
<b>Y600</b>	Methodological Implications of Social & Psychological Theories

All inquiry methodology students are required to take 9 hours of foundational courses to provide them with the philosophical and theoretical base necessary to understand the implications and assumptions of their methodological choices. These courses are: Foundations of Educational Inquiry, Social & Psychological Theories and the methodological implication, and Methodological Approaches to Educational Inquiry. At some point in their program students need to develop understandings of the reasons why they engage in particular study and practice of inquiry, their purposes and the assumptions that they make in the process. Without strong philosophical and theoretical foundations it would be impossible for students to articulate coherent and credible rationales for what they do or to question the new orientations they may want to consider.

### **Inquiry Methodology (Major) (39 hours including 9 hours Inquiry Core)**

Inquiry methodology students can then opt for a qualitative, a quantitative or an integrated track combining both qualitative and quantitative courses. For the qualitative and quantitative tracks the students must select a reasonable sequence of courses (30 hours minimum) from among the list below or their equivalent in other IUB schools or departments. At least 18 hours have to be selected from the track of emphasis and at least 2 courses must be taken in the opposite track. For an integrated track students must select at least 12 credit hours in the qualitative track and 12 credit hours in the quantitative track. (See Section 9 for course descriptions)

<b><u>Qualitative</u></b>	<b><u>Quantitative</u></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Qualitative Inquiry in Education</li> <li>● Critical Qualitative Inquiry</li> <li>● Narrative Theory</li> <li>● Discourse Theory and Analysis</li> <li>● Semiotics</li> <li>● Knowledge, Reflection &amp; Critiques in Methodological Theory</li> <li>● Communicative Action Theory</li> <li>● Selected Seminar Topics (e.g., feminism, postmodernism, critical race theory)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Descriptive &amp; Inferential Statistics</li> <li>● Computer Laboratories<sup>(1)</sup></li> <li>● Measurement</li> <li>● Experimental &amp; Quasi-Experimental (Univariate GLM)</li> <li>● Applied Multivariate Statistics</li> <li>● Psychometric Theory</li> <li>● Latent Variables &amp; Structural Equation Modeling</li> <li>● Advanced Measurement (latent variable/class models)</li> <li>● Categorical data analysis</li> <li>● Longitudinal Modeling</li> <li>● Multilevel modeling</li> <li>● Computational statistics</li> <li>● Selected Seminar topics</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="824 974 1365 1062">[(<sup>1</sup>) can count toward the 30 hours required but not toward the minimum of 12 or 18 hours required in the different tracks]</p>

<b><u>Common to both tracks</u></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Program Evaluation</li> <li>● Survey Research</li> <li>● Action Research</li> <li>● Mixing Methodologies/Methods in Social &amp; Behavioral Research</li> <li>● Affinity Research Group (9 hours maximum)</li> <li>● Other Selected Seminar Topics</li> </ul>

**Foundations of Education (9 hours minimum)**

Doctoral students are required to take courses outside their major and minor areas within the School of Education. These courses may be taken in areas such as the history of education, philosophy of education, sociology, and anthropology of education, curriculum studies etc. No more than 6 hours should be taken in the same area.

### **Minor (12-18 credit hours)**

Students will select a minor field of study to complement their study of inquiry methodology. Because inquiry methodology interfaces with substantive areas of study it is important for students in inquiry methodology to develop understandings in at least one such area so that they grasp the complexity of methodology in use. The minor serves to develop students' substantive area of interest. Typical minors include Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, Educational Policy, Comparative Education, Philosophy of Education, Learning & Development Science, Philosophy, History, and Political Science. Specific course (and in some fields, qualifying examination) requirements are under the direction of the minor department.

### **Electives (6-15 credit hours)**

Educational research is multidisciplinary in nature and students have a broad range of research interests and career plans which requires flexibility for their programs of studies. The program, therefore, enables students to tailor their electives in consultation with their Advisory Committees. Electives may be taken in fields inside or outside the School of Education. Students may take electives in any area of interest to complement their program of study. Affinity Research Group (maximum 9 hours) should be included as an elective if taken on a pass/fail basis.

### **Doctoral Minor**

A minor in Inquiry Methodology may also be taken by doctoral students majoring in other disciplines. Minor students must take 12 credit hours of research course work and take a qualifying examination. Minor courses may not be double-counted with the minimum courses in Inquiry that are typically required by all departments in the School of Education.

### **Qualifying Examinations**

Doctoral students specializing in Inquiry Methodology must take an examination in Inquiry Methodology. This examination is tailored to the student's program of study. All students with a minor in education must also take a minor qualifying examination. Some departments outside of the School of Education waive the minor qualifying examination, under certain conditions.

### **Dissertation (15 hours)**

Students take a dissertation preparation seminar or independent study course to work on developing the dissertation proposal. They then take 12 hours of dissertation credit to complete the thesis.

## **6. Employment Possibilities**

The demand for qualified research methodologists is at the highest it has been in a long time. Faculty positions in this area go unfilled because of the very small pool of candidates nationwide and the fierce competition between institutions to recruit the best candidates. Graduates from the program are employed as faculty members in higher education offering research methodology courses and researching methodological issues, as consultants to educational researchers, and as research specialist in research centers and laboratories, testing organizations, and state education agency.

## **7. Admission Requirements and Students Characteristics**

Students entering the program must have a bachelor's degree. We expect similar standards for the new PhD program. We do not have absolute minimum requirements although students with less than a 3.0 undergraduate GPA and a combined (Verbal + Quantitative) GRE scores below 1100 with an essay below 4.5 are generally not admitted unless they can demonstrate other indicators of academic excellence. The program is challenging and academically rigorous, and admission is selective. We recruit students with a commitment to the study of important educational issues and their methodological implications. We anticipate enrolling about four to six students each year. Additional students from other programs in the School of Education as well as from other schools and departments in the university will participate in the program coursework.

## **8. Financial Support**

All doctoral students are eligible to apply for fellowship and assistantship. In recent years, most doctoral students have received financial support within the first year or upon admission into the program in the form of stipends, tuition coverage, and health insurance. Most assistantships are either working on research and development projects or serving as an associate instructor.

## **9. Description of Core Program Courses, Seminars & Apprenticeship**

### **Inquiry Core**

#### **Y515/H510** *Foundations of Educational Inquiry*

Examination of the nature and purpose of educational inquiry with a focus on topics in social science epistemology.

#### **Y521** *Methodological Approaches to Educational Inquiry*

Introduction to the various methodological approaches to the conduct of social science inquiry in general and educational inquiry in particular. Focus on the epistemological implications of methodological choices.

**Y600** *Methodological Implications of Social and Psychological Theories*

Introduction to social and psychological theories that inform current methodological theory and practice including those developed by Freud, Piaget, Levi-Strauss, Weber, and Marx. This introduction forms the basis of an exploration of methodological concepts such as validity and inference in terms of their social and psychological foundations.

**Inquiry Methodology**

**Qualitative Track**

**Y611** *Qualitative Inquiry in Education*

Examination of qualitative approaches to educational inquiry e.g., case study, naturalistic inquiry, educational anthropology, educational connoisseurship and criticism. Exploration of methods for collecting and analyzing qualitative data, criteria for field studies, and approaches to writing up field studies. (Prerequisites: Y520 or Y521)

**Y612** *Critical Qualitative Inquiry I*

This first course in the sequence provides an introduction to critical social theory as it emerges through the context of qualitative research. Students begin corresponding field work, including both data collection and analysis. (Prerequisites: Y520 or Y521)

**Y613** *Critical Qualitative Inquiry II*

This second course in the sequence continues the exploration of social theory and methodology by providing an opportunity for students to follow through on fieldwork and analysis started in Y612 and by examining some theory left implicit in Y612. The course will include opportunities to begin writing methodological texts (taught previously under Y750). (Prerequisites: Y612)

**Y630** *Narrative Theory and Inquiry*

Examines narrative theory and its connection to narrative approaches to inquiry. Explores the use of narrative in qualitative inquiry, and practices methods of collecting and analyzing narrative data. (Prerequisites: Y611 or Y612)

**Y631** *Discourse Theory and Analysis*

Examines the roots of the discourse analytic field in qualitative research. Explores current trends in discourse theory and analysis. Examines exemplars and provides

opportunities to engage in discourse analytic methods (taught previously under Y500). (Prerequisites: Y611 or Y612)

**Y671** *Knowledge, Reflection & Critique in Methodological Theory*

This course examines the concept of reflection in epistemological theories as these have historically developed from Kant to the contemporary period. Kant's philosophy introduced reflection to the theory of knowledge through his development of transcendental logic. The contribution this made to epistemology was lost in the growth of "positive science" from its beginnings in the 19th century to the paradigmatic status it attained in sciences of all types by the early 20th century: a status it retains to this day. Less visible traditions in epistemology took Kant's insights in many different directions: hermeneutics, critical theory, psychoanalytic theory and the cognitive and moral development theories of Piaget, Vygotsky and Kohlberg. This history will be covered in the course, along with direct applications of reflection to research methodology (taught previously under Y650). (Prerequisites: Y611 or Y612)

**Y672** *Communicative Action Theory*

This course focuses exclusively on both volumes of Habermas' *The Theory of Communicative Action* Volumes One and Two. The Theory of Communicative Action (TCA) has direct implications for all social research, both in methodological and substantive ways. Methodologically, TCA provides a core theory of reason and validity, action and meaning, and a bifurcated concept of the social (lifeworld and system) having implications for research design and data analysis. Substantively, the theory of communicative action is suggestive for formulating research questions and determining the vocabulary through which to articulate findings. It also provides a framework for ascertaining the significance of research findings. These statements are true for all types of social research, quantitative as well as qualitative, having a micro as well as a macro or combined focus (Taught previously under Y650). (Prerequisites: Y611 or Y612)

**Quantitative Track**

**Y500** *Computer Laboratory for Educational Statistics*

This laboratory course is designed to accompany courses in educational statistics. Use of statistical software, interpretation of analysis results, and conceptual discussion of statistical concepts and principles are included in this laboratory. The management and use of large data sets may be included in some laboratory offerings.

**Y502** *Intermediate Inferential Statistics*

Review of descriptive statistics and presentation of univariate inferential statistical methods (including *t*-test, correlation, simple regression, analysis of variance, and chi-square goodness of fit and test of independence). Relationship between research questions and appropriateness of statistical methods are discussed throughout the course. Null hypothesis significance testing, effect size estimation, and confidence interval formation are considered throughout the course. (Prerequisites: Y520 or Y521)

**Y527** *Educational Assessment and Psychological Measurement*

Theoretical and historical foundations of measurement and assessment of educational and psychological constructs with an emphasis of the overarching concept of validity. Introduction of the basic concepts of measurement in social and behavioral research including methods for estimating reliability, providing empirical support for validity of test score inferences; and developing scales. Critical issues in educational and psychological assessment are also addressed. (Prerequisites: Y502)

**Y603** *Statistical Design of Educational Research*

Topics covered include various experimental and quasi-experimental designs suitable for educational research, linear models and assumptions underlying these designs, statistical power, sample size, effect size reporting, principle of randomization. (Prerequisites: Y502)

**Y604** *Applied Multivariate Statistics*

This course covers multivariate applications of the general linear model including multiple regression, multivariate analysis of (co)variance, discriminant function analysis, as well as extension of the GLM such as exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. Other topics such as canonical correlation, structural equation modeling or finite mixture modeling can also be included. (Prerequisites: Y502 or Y603)

**Y617** *Psychometric Theory*

This course focuses on the study of psychometric theories including Classical Test Theory, Generalizability Theory and Item Response Theory. (Prerequisites: Y527 and Y604 or instructor's consent)

**Y625/S651** *Latent Variables & Structural Equation Modeling*

This course focuses on the study of latent variables and structural equation modeling. Extension of the regression model and factor analysis model are considered to introduce confirmatory factor analysis and examine how these are

joint in the study of structural linear relationship. (Prerequisites: Y604 or equivalent)

**Y627** *Advanced Measurement*

This course focuses on the theoretical and mathematical models underlying Item Response Theory (IRT). Applications of IRT will be considered (e.g., computer adaptive testing, test equating, item banking) as well as procedures for estimating parameters. Statistical developments as they apply to measurement (e.g., multidimensional models, multilevel, and latent class models, etc.) will also be discussed. (Prerequisites: Y617 or equivalent)

**Y637** *Longitudinal Modeling*

This course is designed to introduce students in the social and behavioral sciences to methods of longitudinal data analysis and issues involved with the analysis of repeated measures data. Longitudinal data analysis is concerned with modeling the trajectories of individuals that have been repeatedly measured on one or more variables across time. The course is largely based on multilevel model and latent change curves with a major emphasis on modeling intraindividual change as a precursor to modeling interindividual differences in change (Taught previously under Y750). (Prerequisites: Y604 or equivalent)

**Y638** *Multilevel Modeling*

This course is designed to address the handling of data that are sampled from multilevel (hierarchical) structures, where the data would otherwise violate the assumption of independence of observations---an assumption that is made with most statistical procedures. (Prerequisites: Y604 or equivalent)

**Y639/S650** *Categorical data analysis*

This course deals with models in which the dependent variable is categorical, either binary, ordinal, nominal or count. Such models include probit, logit, ordered logit and probit, multinomial logit, Poisson regression, negative binomial regression, and zero-inflated count models. (Prerequisites: Y604 or equivalent)

**Common Course Selection**

**Y510** *Action Research I*

An introduction to the basic philosophy and methods of action research. Students will design an action research project, write a proposal, and learn how to conduct action research. The course emphasizes the selection of an area of focus,

collection of data, organization, analysis and interpretation of data as well as decision about the appropriate actions to take based on findings.

**Y525** *Survey Research Methodology*

This course introduces students to social survey research, with particular emphasis on questionnaire design. Specifically the educational goals for the course include: (1) designing survey items that match research questions and plans for analysis, (2) understanding concepts, terminology related to questionnaire design and the fundamental steps of conducting survey research, (3) critical reading of survey research, (4) developing an awareness of current issues and important problems in questionnaire design, and (5) developing a theoretical and epistemological framework within which to understand the ambitions, limitations, history and practice of survey research (Taught previously under F500). (Prerequisites: Y520 or Y521)

**Y535** *Evaluation Models & Techniques*

An overview of evaluation as an inquiry process, including a discussion of the history of evaluation and the state of the art. Frameworks and models for planning evaluation studies are discussed and applications are demonstrated. Criteria for evaluating studies, steps for writing evaluation proposals and reports, and techniques for the collection of information are discussed. (Prerequisites: Y520 or Y521)

**Y635** *Methodology of Educational Evaluation*

Multidisciplinary methods for organizing, collecting, and processing evaluative information; presentation of problems in evaluation methods of inquiry, and use of methods from other disciplines to alleviate these problems. Emphasis will be on the transfer of appropriate methods and techniques to evaluation problems. (Prerequisites: Y535)

**Common Course Selection**

**Y510** *Action Research I*

An introduction to the basic philosophy and methods of action research. Students will design an action research project, write a proposal, and learn how to conduct action research. The course emphasizes the selection of an area of focus, collection of data, organization, analysis and interpretation of data as well as decision about the appropriate actions to take based on findings.

**Y525** *Survey Research Methodology*

This course introduces students to social survey research, with particular emphasis on questionnaire design. Specifically the educational goals for the course include: (1) designing survey items that match research questions and plans for analysis, (2) understanding concepts, terminology related to questionnaire design and the fundamental steps of conducting survey research, (3) critical reading of survey research, (4) developing an awareness of current issues and important problems in questionnaire design, and (5) developing a theoretical and epistemological framework within which to understand the ambitions, limitations, history and practice of survey research (Taught previously under F500).

**Y535** *Evaluation Models & Techniques*

An overview of evaluation as an inquiry process, including a discussion of the history of evaluation and the state of the art. Frameworks and models for planning evaluation studies are discussed and applications are demonstrated. Criteria for evaluating studies, steps for writing evaluation proposals and reports, and techniques for the collection of information are discussed.

**Y635** *Methodology of Educational Evaluation*

Multidisciplinary methods for organizing, collecting, and processing evaluative information; presentation of problems in evaluation methods of inquiry, and use of methods from other disciplines to alleviate these problems. Emphasis will be on the transfer of appropriate methods and techniques to evaluation problems.

**Y650** *Topics in Inquiry Methodology*

Advanced study of research and theory on selected topics in qualitative or quantitative. (Prerequisites: instructor's consent)

**Y660** *Affinity Research Group*

Study and research support groups formed on the basis to mutual interests to generate new curriculum and research projects integrating previous coursework under the guidance of a faculty member. The work of these groups could continue over the course of several semesters to develop research papers, presentations, books or conduct empirical research as a team. (Prerequisites: instructor's consent)

**Y590** *Independent Study in Inquiry Methodology*

Individual research or study with an Inquiry faculty member, arranged in advance of registration. A one- or two-page written proposal should be submitted to the

instructor during the first week of the term specifying the scope of the project, project activities, meeting times, completion date, and student products. Ordinarily, Y590 should not be used for the study of material taught in a regularly scheduled course. (Prerequisites: instructor's consent)

**Y690** *Advanced Independent Study in Inquiry Methodology*

Independent research on an advanced methodology topic with an Inquiry faculty member who has approved the specific scope of the projects and student accomplishments.

**Y750** *Topical Seminar in Inquiry Methodology: variable title*

Study of selected advanced methodological topics encountered in educational research and exploration of recent developments in inquiry methods. Prerequisites: Nine hours of pertinent 500 and 600 level inquiry courses and instructor's consent)

**Y795** *Dissertation Proposal Preparation*

This course is for the development of a dissertation proposal in Inquiry Methodology. Students must have the consent of a dissertation director, or prospective director to enroll. They should be finished or nearly finished with program course work.

**Y799** *Doctoral Thesis in Inquiry Methodology*

Credit in this course may be earned over a period of several semesters. The thesis may be an organized scientific contribution or a comprehensive analysis of theory, practice or methodology in a specific area.

## **10. Related Courses**

A number of new courses in statistics are currently under development in collaboration with the Statistics Department. In addition a number of relevant courses in other schools and departments are available to inquiry methodology students.

### **E606 – Anthropology, Research Methods in Cultural Anthropology**

This graduate level course explores fundamental issues and approaches in anthropological field research. Examines social scientists' field experiences as well as ethical, theoretical, and practical problems inherent in the conduct of ethnographic research. Primary topics to be covered include: the genesis of modern ethnography, current ethical dilemmas and proposals for activist approaches, research proposal and design, forms of documentation, archival research, life histories, technology, spatial analysis, survey and interview techniques, multi-sited ethnography, and the ongoing reconceptualization of "the field."

### **E 648 – Anthropology, Power, Subjectivity and the State**

This seminar will explore the relationships among culture, power, subjectivity, and state formation through close readings of theoretical and ethnographic texts. Examines how distinct theoretical approaches (Marxism, structuralism, post-structuralism, and feminism) have defined and analyzed these contested terms. Instead of assuming that culture, power, the subject, and the state are given concepts, we will study how their meanings have changed over time. How do cultural beliefs and outlooks organize the production, distribution, and even definition of power? How are power and subjectivity mutually constitutive? How do states structure power relations, define subjectivity, or shape cultural attitudes and expectations? Developing insights from Marx and Engels, Weber, Gramsci, Althusser, Bourdieu, and Foucault, we will compare ethnographic works and their efforts to integrate various theoretical approaches with anthropological data.

### **C506 - Communication and Culture, Methods of Media Research**

This course is designed to provide students in media studies with an introductory overview of qualitative research approaches, and with training in writing a research proposal. In the first section students will become familiar with a variety of methodologies in order to promote a critical understanding of the research process. These methodological techniques will include archival research/document studies, participant observation, interviewing, ethnography, and textual analysis. In the second part students will conceptualize and write a research proposal.

### **C507 - Communication and Culture, Methods of Ethnographic Research in Communication and Culture**

The course explores ethnographic research methods in the study of communication and culture. It is designed explicitly to connect the three departmental “topoi” – performance, public discourse, and media – under the rubric of ethnography. We address a range of theoretical and methodological issues involved in constructing ethnographies of performance, text, public discourse, and media. The course begins by considering current questions related to ethnographic research practices, including ethnographic authority, ethics, intersubjectivity, and time and space. Through a series of case studies, we then look at how various communicative practices ranging from live performances to multimedia events have been approached ethnographically.

### **C 619 - Communication and Culture, Feminism and Rhetorical Theory**

Grounded in a rhetorical perspective, this course aims to engage an interdisciplinary range of critical work about corporeality. Although this course will begin by recalling some of the more powerful legacies about the body in western culture, and will dedicate most of the seminar to exemplary contemporary engagements with the political, cultural, and epistemological questions evoked by corporeality.

### **C 650 - Communication and Culture, Ethnography and Social Theory (Topic: Genealogies of Empathy and Emblems)**

This course will explore the role of empathy and emblems in forming communities and nations and how performance forms – ritual, music, dance – come to stand for communities of varying sizes. Readings will range in focus from dyadic relations all the way up to national icons. The first half of the course focuses on empathy—how people imagine they connect with others in a one to one relationship, and whether this is a basis for forming communities, moral and otherwise. The second half of the course analyzes how people and objects come to represent neighborhoods, ethnicities, regions, and nations. Beginning with Herder and Adam Smith, we juxtapose theoretical perspectives with ethnographic case studies. Other theorists include Agamben, Levinas, Strathern, and Zizek.

### **L605 – English, Critical & Interpretive Theory**

This course undertakes a survey of Marxist literary criticism written in English in the 20th century. Along with providing an overview of some of the major developments in criticism and theory during this period (including the New Criticism, poststructuralism, and cultural studies) this course investigates two sorts of questions that today appear more pressing than ever: 1) what is history and does it have a privileged relation to literature (or literature to it)?; and 2) what is the standing of criticism itself (including the profession of English): is its own discourse a species of knowledge, speculation, a work of interpretation, a social-political intervention, or some combination of these?

### **L 663 – English, Introduction to Feminist Critical Studies**

This survey opens with classic texts in the history of feminism: Virginia Woolf's *A Room of One's Own* and her *Three Guineas*, excerpts from Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex*, and often cited essays by Audre Lorde, Tillie Olsen, Alice Walker, and Adrienne Rich. Then we will read a cluster of feminist scholars attempting to redefine literary history and the canon. With a little help from intellectual historians, we will look at the work of influential feminist thinkers in psychology and anthropology like Nancy Chodorow and Gayle Rubin as well as such French theorists as Hélène Cixous and Luce Irigaray. Then we will approach the impact of post- structuralism on American feminism through short texts by Judith Butler, Joan Scott, and Donna Haraway. In the second half of the course, we will focus on recent scholarship on gender in critical race, post-colonial, sexuality, trauma, masculinity, and cultural studies.

### **S 652 – Sociology, Topics in Qualitative Methods: Ethnography**

In this course we will consider ethnography as a method of social research as routinely practiced in sociology and anthropology. Ethnography is both a method and a theoretical orientation in that one's approach to ethnography reflects a particular conception of culture and social structure. We will concentrate primarily on more interpretive approaches to ethnography and culture with a focus on collective processes of

negotiation, action, and interpretive understanding. The particular ethnographic methods we will read about, evaluate, and employ are routinely utilized in a range of research areas in sociology (as well as anthropology, education, folklore, and psychology).

### **S652 – Sociology, Topics in Qualitative Methods: In-depth Interviewing.**

The goal of this course is to introduce students to the practical activities of in-depth individual and group interviewing.

### **S 660 – Sociology, Political Culture**

“Political culture” is a poorly defined yet virtually indispensable concept within political sociology. This course surveys recent strategies for defining and operationalizing elements of political culture. As such, it builds upon basic premises and concepts within the sociology of culture and applies them to substantive topics central to the study of politics, such as power, conflict, and inequality.

## **11. Qualifying Examinations**

Student will take a comprehensive written examination on theoretical and methodological issues. Part I of the written examination will focus on general understanding of important concepts and arguments relevant to inquiry methodology. Part II will focus on the student’s specific area of concentration. Students will also have a comprehensive oral examination conducted by the student’s advisory committee. During the oral examination all areas of the student’s program will be opened for questioning and students will present a case for their research agenda and theoretical perspective in preparation for their dissertation work. Qualifying examination procedures for the minor will be designed and under the discretion of the minor advisor. Following completion of all coursework requirements and successfully passing the qualifying examinations the student will be nominated to candidacy.

## **12. Dissertation**

Following nomination to candidacy, the student forms a research committee, consisting of at least four members, two of whom are Inquiry Methodology faculty members and one of whom serves as chair of the committee. A member of the minor area is included on the committee, and the fourth member may be from any area that is pertinent to the dissertation topic. Usually, the committee chair also directs the dissertation, but another member can direct if it is more appropriate to that member’s area of expertise. Any member of the committee may serve as the director of the dissertation. The committee is responsible for approving the proposal, guiding the student during completion of the study, conducting an oral defense of the final thesis, and recommending conferral of the degree when all requirements, including the internship, are completed. Most often, this process takes one to two years.

### **13. Program Faculty**

**Phillip F. Carspecken**, Professor, Inquiry Methodology (Ph.D., Aston University, U. K. 1987; appointed 2001). Scholarly work on the philosophy of science and methodological theory, social theory, methodology and the nature of knowledge in the various sciences.

**Ginette Delandshere**, Professor and Program Director, Inquiry Methodology (Ph.D., University of California, Los Angeles, 1986, appointed 1994) – Research interests: foundations of inquiry; social and behavioral research methodology; measurement & psychometrics; new forms of assessment with particular focus on the socio-political practice of research and assessment.

**Gary Ingersoll**, Professor of Counseling and Education Psychology and Professor of Pediatrics, Inquiry Methodology and Human Development (Ph.D., The Pennsylvania State University, 1970, appointed in 1970) - Research interests: adolescent health endangering behaviors, evaluating teacher education programs. An NCATE Board of Examiners member and has served as chair of several visits including the first international accreditation team in the United Arab Emirates.

**Kenneth Kelley**, Assistant Professor, Inquiry Methodology (Ph.D., University of Notre Dame, 2005, appointed in 2005) and adjunct professor of statistics – Broadly defined research interest concerns the development, evaluation, and improvement of quantitative methods as they apply to the behavioral and educational sciences. Research areas consist of the optimal design of research studies, models and methods for longitudinal data analysis (linear and nonlinear models), computational statistical methods, and general latent variable modeling. Teaching areas consist of intermediate and multivariate statistical methods, research design, and longitudinal data analysis (all course at the graduate level).

**Barbara Korth**, Clinical Assistant Professor, Inquiry Methodology (Ph.D., University of Houston, 1998, appointed in 2001) – Interested in Methodological Theory and Philosophy, Qualitative Methodological Practices, Criticalism, and Feminism.

**Joanne Peng**, Professor, Inquiry Methodology (Ph.D., University of Wisconsin, 1979, appointed in 1982) and adjunct professor of statistics – Logistic regression, missing data methods, experimental designs, and statistical computing.

### **14. Affiliate Faculty**

**William Corsaro**, Robert H. Shaffer Professor of Sociology. Research interests: Sociology of Childhood, Ethnography, Sociology of Education. Ph.D., University of North Carolina, 1974.

**Donna Eder**, Professor of Sociology. Has written numerous articles and books involving qualitative interviewing methodology with cultural storytellers. She has contributed to the field by honing qualitative methods and ethnographic approaches appropriate for use with

children. Research interests: Sociology of Education; gender; race; and language. Ph.D., University of Wisconsin, 1979.

**Elizabeth Ann Houseworth**, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Biology and Statistics. Research interests: Probability, Statistics, and Statistical Genetics. Ph.D., Mathematics, University of Virginia, 1992.

**Bradley A. Unger Levinson**, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Director, Indiana Project on Latin American Cultural Competency, Adjunct Professor of Anthropology and Latino Studies, Affiliated Professor of Latin American Studies. Research interests: Ethnographic studies of youth and student culture in secondary schooling; civic and citizenship education; the culture and politics of educational policymaking; transnational (im)migrant education; and teaching and learning processes in spiritual traditions, such as Vipassana Buddhism. Ph.D. Anthropology, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill.

**Scott Long**, Chancellor's Professor of Sociology. Research interests: Sociology of science; research methods; Statistics; Health & Aging. Ph.D., Sociology, Cornell University, 1977.

**David MacKay**, Professor of Marketing and Geography. Research interests: probabilistic scaling algorithms and choice models for application to complex stimuli. Ph.D., Northwestern University, 1971.

**Christopher S. Peebles**, Professor of Anthropology, Special Advisor for Centers and Institutes, Director, Glenn A. Black Laboratory. Research interests: Prehistory of Eastern North America and northern Europe; Culture Change; History and Philosophy of Archaeology; Computation and Cognition. Ph.D., Anthropology, University of California Santa Barbara, 1974.

**Anya Peterson Royce**, Chancellor's Professor of Anthropology. Ph.D. Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, 1974.

**Marvin D. Sterling**, Assistant Professor, Department of Anthropology. Research interests: Contemporary Japan, African Diasporic Culture, Critical Race Theory, Performance Theory, Transnationalism, Post-Colonial Theory. Ph.D., University of California at Los Angeles, 2002.

**Beverly Stoeltje**, Associate Professor, Department of Anthropology. Research interests: Performance and identity politics; gender; nationalism & symbolism; popular culture.

**Margaret Sutton**, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. Research interests: Gender studies; education and development; learning and global society. Ph.D., International Development Education, Stanford University.

**Bob Toutkoushian**, Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. Research interests: Economic applications to K-12 and higher education, econometric and other quantitative research methodologies, K-12 education finance, faculty compensation and labor market issues, higher education finance, student demand for education. Ph.D., Economics, Indiana University, 1991.

**Stanley Wasserman**, Rudy Professor of Psychology, Sociology, and Statistics in the Departments of Statistics, Sociology, and Psychological and Brain Sciences. Research interests: Mathematical psychology and sociology, applied statistics, and social networks. Ph. D., Statistics, Harvard University, 1977.

## **15. Regional, State, and National Factors**

Although coursework in research methods are offered at other universities in Indiana no other school of education offers a PhD program in Inquiry Methodology. The current program, subsumed under the Learning and Development Science degree program, is less noticeable and marketable than a stand-alone degree would be. The demand for highly qualified educational research methodologists far exceeds the available pool in Indiana and across the nation. Recipient of such a degree are highly marketable.

## **16. Evaluation Plan**

The Ph.D. program is constantly monitored by program and departmental faculty, the department chairperson, and the School of Education Office of Graduate Studies. In the first five year of the program the department will monitor the numbers of students admitted into the program as well as the quality of their credentials and experiences. Students' programs of studies and progress will be closely monitored by the program faculty to ensure that students are fully benefiting from the program and that courses are being offered to meet students' requirements. During these first years adjustments will be made to the program to meet students, faculty and department needs. After this transition period the admissions, graduations and placement will be monitored continuously and the program will be reviewed regularly.

## **17 Additional Resources Needed**

The proposed program is an extension of the current program which is already supported by the University and the School of Education and many of the courses are already being offered. As the number of students enrolled in the program increases additional faculty lines may be required to ensure that courses are offered on a more regular basis. In the current situation, however, the School of Education is committed to hiring a new research methodologist with a specialization in psychometrics, large scale assessment and quantitative methods. This individual, along with the existing faculty, will be able to fulfill the current needs for the quantitative track of the program.

## References

- Clay, R. (2005). Too few in quantitative psychology. *Monitor on Psychology*, American Psychological Association, 36(8), 26. Retrieved 5/23/2006  
<http://www.apa.org/monitor/sep05/quantitative.html>
- Herszenhorn, D. M. (May 5, 2006). As test-taking grows, test-makers grow rarer. *The New York Times*. New York, NY: The New York Times Company.

# **Indiana University's Role In The Indiana Charter School Movement: Revisited**

**A Report Submitted to the Policy Council of the  
Indiana University School of Education**

**February 2007**

**Charter School Task Force**

**Barbara Korth (co-chair)  
Jonathan Plucker (co-chair)  
Leonard Burrello  
Joby Copenhaver  
Stuart Green  
Diana Lambdin  
Charles Little  
Charles Reigeluth  
Jose Rosario  
Neil Theobald  
Anne Trotter**

## Introduction

Indiana University has a long-standing tradition of supporting K-12 public education within the state. The University's mission, *to provide high quality educational opportunities for men and women from Indiana and throughout the world through a community of scholars actively engaged in teaching, research and public service*, aligns with some degree of involvement in the charter school movement.

Currently, Indiana University is involved with charter schools through two main ways. First, a group of university faculty and students are working with a charter school in the Decatur Township school district in Marion County. Second, The Center for Evaluation and Education Policy is studying charter schools through several externally-funded projects in a range of states, with two of the projects funded by the Indiana Department of Education to provide evaluation technical assistance for the Department's charter school office. Other IU faculty and programs are considering other ways to support charter schools in Indiana, such as offering coursework in charter school management and finances, although these efforts are early in their development.

### The 2002 IU Charter School Task Force

Indiana University was first asked to consider sponsoring charter schools in 2002. A Task Force was convened to study the prospect. In its report, submitted to the Indiana University Board of Trustees, the 2002 Charter School Task Force recommended that Indiana University not participate in sponsoring charter schools. The Task Force noted multiple reasons for this recommendation, namely:

- The Task Force concluded that the costs IU would incur in meeting sponsorship requirements would likely outweigh the legislatively-determined administrative fee the university could receive to offset these costs.
- The Task Force projected that the cost of rejecting charter school proposals could become prohibitive, resulting in the need to seek additional revenue sources to subsidize involvement.
- The Task Force had reason to believe that sponsorship could result in negative effects on IU-school corporation relations, particularly since charter schools potentially create consequences for the school corporations in which they operate, such as the closing of buildings; the firing of teachers, administrators, and staff; and forced redistricting. Any negative impacts on the IU-school corporation relationships could impede the university's ability to perform its other missions with that school corporation.
- The Task Force was concerned that initiating IU sponsorship of charter schools posed questions about duplication of effort and mission centrality, since Ball State University currently had accepted the authority (of five institutions of higher education who had the authority) to sponsor charter schools throughout the state.

For these reasons, the 2002 Task Force recommended that Indiana University work proactively to assume leadership for establishing a consortium on K-12 issues. It was proposed that the consortium consist of the five four-year, public universities in the state, so that it could draw

upon the unique attributes of each institution and thereby provide a broad range of services and information about the operation and effectiveness of charter schools. It was imagined that the consortium would, ideally, facilitate the coordination of resources and strengths of each participating institution while avoiding duplication of services. The official coordination of activities did not occur.

### **Purpose of the Current Task Force**

In 2002, several public school superintendents strongly discouraged IU from becoming a charter sponsor. However, due to changing political and financial conditions, many of these same superintendents (predominantly in urban districts) suggested to Dean Gonzalez that Indiana University reconsider the possibility of sponsoring LEA-based charter schools. The superintendents gave several reasons for requesting this reconsideration of policy:

- Significant changes in Indiana charter law have minimized the negative financial impact of charter schools on traditional schools.
- Implementing innovative reforms would be less difficult than in traditional schools due to the regulatory flexibility available to charters.
- Charters could reverse enrollment declines by creating attractive, nontraditional education options for students living outside of a district or who are attending a private school or being homeschooled.<sup>1</sup>

In November, 2005, the Indiana University School of Education Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) voted unanimously to revisit the question of Indiana University's role in the Indiana charter school movement with specific attention to the question of whether or not Indiana University should sponsor such schools. On the recommendation of the LRPC, the School of Education Policy Council formed a Charter School Task Force and charged the group with gathering information and making a recommendation in answer to the question "Should Indiana University become a sponsoring agent of charter schools?"<sup>2</sup>

### **Methods**

The Task Force met eight times during the months of January-April 2006 and corresponded extensively over e-mail. Members set four main goals at the initial meeting: 1) To make sure accurate information concerning this issue was available to faculty, specifically by creating a list of Frequently Asked Questions for dissemination that would address, for example, any misconceptions about Indiana's charter school law (See Appendix A); (2) To gather information from external stakeholders via brief letters and interviews addressing perceived costs and benefits of Indiana University sponsorship (See Appendix B); (3) To gather faculty reactions to the possibility of sponsorship; and (4) To answer the questions "What would be the costs and benefits for IU of sponsoring Charter Schools?" and "Should IU become a sponsoring agency?"

---

<sup>1</sup> In the absence of statewide open enrollment, students cannot enroll in an LEA-sponsored charter school if it does not serve their corporation of legal settlement.

<sup>2</sup> The Board of Trustees alone has the authority to decide that IU will become a sponsoring agency; as such, the goal of the Task Force was to decide whether to recommend that the School request that the Trustees revisit their earlier decision not to sponsor charter schools.

## Gathering Information from External Stakeholders

Major stakeholders throughout Indiana were contacted to elicit their responses to the issue. Primarily these responses were elicited through letters, although several individuals shared their comments during face-to-face interviews or phone conversations. The chart below illustrates those stakeholders and an indication of whether or not they responded with feedback.

**Table 1: Input from Indiana Stakeholders**

Stakeholder	Responded?
Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents	Via e-mail
Indiana Urban Schools Association	Via e-mail, letter, and meetings
Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction	Via interview
Indiana Department of Education, Division of Educational Options	Via e-mail and interview
Indianapolis Charter Schools, Office of the Mayor	Via e-mail
Ball State University Office of Charter Schools	Did not respond to several requests
Indiana State Teachers Association	Via letter
Indiana Association of School Business Officials	Did not respond
Indiana State Senators	Via interview
Charter School Association of Indiana	Via e-mail
Greater Educational Opportunities Foundation	Via interview and phone conversation
Superintendent of area school corporation	Via interview

At the request of Dean Gonzalez, the Task Force gathered information on whether other Big Ten universities are legally allowed to sponsor or operate charter schools (Table 2). A number of IU's Big Ten peers are legally permitted to sponsor, but no other Big Ten main campuses sponsor, although two University of Wisconsin regional campuses are involved in charter sponsorship.

**Table 2: Big Ten University Sponsorship**

State	Institution	Allowed to Sponsor or Operate Charters?	Does the University Currently Sponsor?
IL	University of Illinois	Cannot sponsor, can operate	Not applicable
IL	Northwestern University	Cannot sponsor, can operate	Not applicable
IN	Purdue University	Can sponsor and operate	No
IA	University of Iowa	Cannot sponsor or operate	Not applicable
MI	Michigan State Univ.	Can sponsor and operate	No
MI	University of Michigan	Can sponsor and operate	No
MN	University of Minnesota	Can sponsor and operate	No
OH	Ohio State University	Cannot sponsor, can operate	Not applicable
PA	Penn State University	Cannot sponsor, can operate	Not applicable
WI	University of Wisconsin	Only some universities can sponsor, but all can operate	UW-Madison doesn't sponsor and has no interest in doing so UW-Milwaukee has sponsored

			UW-Parkside in development
--	--	--	----------------------------

### Gathering Information from Indiana University Faculty<sup>3</sup>

The Long Range Planning Committee had solicited perspectives from faculty regarding the question of sponsorship; this information was given to the Task Force. This information indicated variation across faculty regarding knowledge about Charter school practices, legislation, and so forth. As the Task Force was beginning its activities, Policy Council asked department chairs to gather initial questions and concerns from faculty at their next department faculty meeting. Initial feedback from department meetings was that most discussion centered around questions regarding charter schools in general and Indiana's charter law in particular.

Based on this preliminary feedback, the Task Force decided it was important to provide information about Charter Schools to the faculty prior to gathering feedback on the question of sponsorship. Toward that end, the Task Force developed a draft list of Frequently Asked Questions which was circulated to faculty via email with a request for comment. After incorporating faculty input, questions were finalized and the responses to those questions were developed. The document of "Responses to Frequently Asked Questions" was emailed out to faculty.

The Task Force identified three mechanisms for generating feedback from faculty:

- (a) soliciting feedback via individual email messages to all faculty,
- (b) holding two faculty forums with video conferencing connections to all campuses, and
- (c) requesting that department chairs provide responses representative of their faculty perspectives.

Faculty response was small to moderate in each case. The Task Force deliberated on the information provided through these various means and decided to invite one more response from faculty. The following note was emailed April 25, 2006:

*The Charter School Task Force is interested in identifying faculty members who would like to be involved in work with Charter Schools in some capacity. If you are interested, we would appreciate it if you would send Barbara Korth a response to the following questions at [bkorth@indiana.edu](mailto:bkorth@indiana.edu). We need your responses quickly. As always, thanks for taking time in your busy lives to provide us with important information. Remember that we only need you to respond if you would actually be interested in working with Charter Schools in some capacity.*

1. *In what way(s) would you be interested in working with Charter Schools in the state of Indiana? What do you envision yourself doing?*
2. *How do you envision this affecting your current work or workload?*
3. *What resources do you imagine yourself needing?*

Finally, input was gathered from stakeholders before, during, and after the Center for Evaluation and Education Policy's October 31, 2006, Policy Chat event on charter schools in Indiana.

---

<sup>3</sup> Faculty always refers to all IU System education faculty.

## Findings

The findings are presented in two subsections. First, we provide a summary of the findings related to responses from external stakeholders. Second, we review and analyze the responses from faculty.

### Summary of the Findings Related to Responses from External Stakeholders

Most external stakeholders who responded to our query supported the idea of IU becoming a sponsoring agency of Charter Schools. In this section, we provide summaries of the responses from each group of stakeholders. The Task Force decided not to include copies of responses or interview summaries in an appendix, primarily because many of the stakeholders provided us the courtesy of speaking very frankly and directly, and also because this topic is highly politicized and some of the stakeholders were worried about the political implications of some of their observations and opinions. Therefore, the decision was made not to provide the detailed feedback in a public document. The Task Force co-chairs will share the feedback with interested members of the IU Community upon request and when relevant.

Elected officials and other governmental policymakers. Each policymaker and governmental employee emphatically stated that she or he (1) was not making a formal recommendation to IU and (2) hoped that IU would sponsor “for the right reasons.” Some interviewees were concerned that the urban superintendents wanted to use charter schools (and, therefore, IU) as a way to avoid NCLB or PL221 accountability sanctions or otherwise act “not in the spirit of charters.” The Task Force, after extensive discussions with IUSA and individual superintendents, determined that superintendents were aware that converting traditional schools to charters did not obviate NCLB or PL221 classifications. Furthermore, the Task Force became convinced that the urban superintendents have truly come to believe that charter schools provide a unique opportunity for school reform.

Of the elected officials who were interviewed, several concerns were raised about IU sponsorship. However, other than the “I hope IU would do this for the right reasons” concern mentioned above, nearly all of the remaining issues dealt with implementation and were not directly relevant to the Task Force’s mission. Indeed, a few policymakers (from both parties) specifically noted that they would welcome IU sponsorship, which is how the Task Force generally interpreted policymakers’ collective feedback.

Public school superintendents. Feedback from superintendents was mixed but generally positive: Urban superintendents are unquestionably supportive of IU sponsorship, hence their request that resulted in the formation of this Task Force. Yet Dr. John Ellis, the executive director of the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents, indicated that not all superintendents share the urban superintendents’ enthusiasm for charter schools.<sup>4</sup> However, Task Force members noted that urban superintendents traditionally have felt as though they had the most to lose with

---

<sup>4</sup> Dr. Ellis also noted that Ball State has paid a price for their sponsorship activities among superintendents regarding participation in research, collaboration with BSU, etc.

the expansion of charters in Indiana; that pessimism has turned to optimism. For this reason, the Task Force gave more weight to the urban superintendents' recommendation than to the general superintendent concerns, although Task Force members noted and agreed with Dr. Ellis' recommendation that a decision to sponsor charter schools be clearly communicated to school leaders around the state.

The other major sponsors. The former head of Mayor Peterson's charter office was cool to the idea of IU sponsorship, questioning the need for another major sponsor. Ball State did not reply to several attempts to gauge their opinion on this matter, but it is assumed that both major sponsors would prefer that IU not become a sponsor – in part because both sponsors have worked behind the scenes to oppose legislative attempts to widen the number of potential sponsors. The Task Force sees this opposition as primarily a concern about competition, one that is not consistent with the idea of charter schools: How can one oppose competition when that concept is used as a reason for authorizing charter schools?

The charter community. The Task Force received input from two politically-active members of the Indiana charter community. Both people enthusiastically endorsed IU sponsorship, with one providing a detailed (and impassioned) case for the addition of a new sponsor. This person noted that although the two major sponsors are doing an acceptable job, there is always room for improvement. Also, this person noted that even if the two major sponsors were perfect, there is no guarantee that their support for charters will continue indefinitely. The Task Force concluded that support within the charter community for IU sponsorship is strong, with few qualifications.

### **Review and Analysis of Responses from Faculty**

As noted above, faculty members were provided numerous avenues through which to provide feedback. There was a distinct difference in the responses of faculty across IU's campuses. Bloomington faculty were, by and large, willing and interested in being involved in the sponsorship of charter schools, while faculty at other campuses did not express this same level of willingness and excitement.

Most respondents were faculty at IUB. Several full professors expressed their interest in working with charter school sponsorships. Other faculty also stated that charter school sponsorship could provide important opportunities for research and development of educational innovations in their particular fields of expertise. There were two waves of response from IUB faculty. Initially, a number of concerns were lodged – many of these were the effect of misconceptions. Once misconceptions were addressed, a largely new body of faculty began responding. These responses ranged from positive to exuberant.

Two broad sets of reasons for supporting IU sponsorship were articulated. First of all, IUB faculty responses had everything to do with faculty articulating a vision of possibilities for their research and expertise, innovations for public schools, and effects for their students. Faculty identified very specific ways they imagined themselves involved with charter schools through sponsorship and the Task Force was impressed with the breadth of commitment and interest, spanning research, teaching, and service. Secondly, faculty valued opportunities for engagement with public school movements for political and ethical reasons. There was a keen sense of

responsibility expressed by faculty to play a part in major educational efforts across the state, promoting best practices and democratic social ethics. For example, faculty expressed both reservations and optimism over the possibility that public charter schools could further a social concern for diversity and social justice. These seemingly divergent perspectives were informed by a common moral commitment – namely, faculty identified an important role they thought IU should hold in relation to informing and studying Indiana public school movements, like the Charter School movement. Being involved in studying schooling practices toward the aim of better understanding and informing educators and law makers was considered an important responsibility. By and large, IUB faculty saw the sponsorship of public charter schools as an important and potentially powerful way to accomplish this.

Important conditions surfaced through faculty input. Faculty were resistant to any possibility of sponsoring public charter schools in a rubber-stamp fashion. IUB clearly saw faculty as its greatest potential contribution and it was the view of faculty that sponsorship ought to facilitate faculty involvement in charter schools so faculty members clearly opposed the idea of sponsoring as a solely administrative task. Also, faculty members voiced the need to secure adequate institutional support for both the administration and the faculty involvement in sponsorship. This would require budget support from Indiana University. Without adequate financial support, faculty involvement would be restricted and this, in turn, would diminish what faculty saw as the strength of sponsorship.

The responses from faculty at other IU sites were not so positive. Faculty at other sites expressed concerns about being overworked with resources already stretched thin. They do not want to be forced either to work with charter schools or to be involved in the sponsorship, though they were quick to add, “If Bloomington wants to do that, that’s okay – so long as all of our campuses don’t have to do it.”

The Task Force honors campus variation in faculty commitment and interest through the particular specifications of its recommendation. The recommendation tries to capture the enthusiasm and vision put forward by IUB faculty while acknowledging the differential constraints experienced by faculty at other IU campuses which serve to limit their interest in charter school sponsorship.

### **Recommendation**

The 2006 Charter School Task Force offers the following general recommendation to the Policy Council. Given a specific set of conditions, Indiana University should consider sponsoring charter schools. First of all, this decision is based on the conclusion that the reasons for the 2002 Task Force’s recommendation have changed. Specifically:

- Sponsorship would have negative effects on IU-school corporation relations: Given the improving attitude toward charters among educators and the fact that superintendents are the impetus behind the request for IU sponsorship, adverse reaction to such sponsorship is no longer a major concern.

- Sponsorship would duplicate the efforts of Ball State: This concern was valid at a time when the number of charters within the state was capped, but this is no longer the case. Furthermore, there is no major sponsor of LEA charter schools, which the Task Force members suggest should be the focus of any IU sponsorship activities (see below).
- Sponsorship is not consistent with IU's mission: The stark majority of faculty believes this is no longer the case. Concerns about conflicts of interest with the School's charter research activities were not judged to be insurmountable.
- Sponsorship would be financially prohibitive: This remains the Task Force members' major concern about sponsorship. The urban superintendents were confident that they could find ways to keep sponsorship costs low, but this is admittedly speculative. Moreover, the Task Force had no way to assess the financial attributes of sponsorship because no data on finances were collected.

In addition to the above arguments against sponsoring charter schools, the current Task Force was positively persuaded that the university's obligation for involvement in significant movements affecting public schools required some engagement with the state's charter schools. This engagement should be aligned with the university's mission, promote inquiry, and extend the impact of IU's School of Education in very particular ways. It was concluded that sponsorship could provide the administrative and communicative infrastructure necessary to facilitate the involvement of faculty with charter schools.

Furthermore, the Task Force believes sponsorship is only plausible under the following conditions:

- Sponsorship should be properly resourced by the university. This would require Indiana University to make a commitment to supporting the costs of sponsorship. The Task Force recommends against attempts to use soft monies for the purposes of financing sponsorship. One possibility is to house sponsorship activities at an existing, well-known center, such as the Center for Urban and Multicultural Education at IUPUI or the new P-16 Center at IUB.
- The sponsoring process should be piloted, with an initial cap on the number of charters sponsored each of the first two years. The Task Force suggests that no more than three charter schools be sponsored during this pilot period, with no more than two per year.
- Any approved charters should be innovative in order to enhance Indiana University's reputation as an advanced research university in the area of educational improvement. Approving run-of-the-mill charter schools would be contrary to the purpose of charter schools and IU's reputation for innovation. The Task Force agreed that faculty of Indiana University is its biggest resource with respect to sponsorship and, thus, charters should draw on the expertise of Indiana University faculty.
- The charters should be limited to LEA-organized charters. There is increasing evidence that LEA charter schools are as effective as non-LEA charters, if not more so, in increasing student achievement. However, the growth in charters within Indiana has largely occurred through an increase in non-LEA charters. In the judgment of the Task Force (and several stakeholders), there is reason to believe that the Indiana charter system needs more district-organized schools, and that the lack of a major Indiana sponsor of district-organized charters is a reason for the slow growth of these schools. LEA charters

are also underdeveloped in most other states, providing IU with a unique opportunity to become a national leader in a promising area of education that is growing in importance.

- Indiana University should appoint an official charter “point person” to oversee IU involvement in charter schools. In addition to overseeing sponsorship activities, this person would be responsible for maintaining communication with the charter community, ensuring the consideration of charter issues during discussions of teacher preparation, research, etc. These activities occur infrequently yet should occur regardless of the final decision regarding sponsorship. This point person would ideally be housed in a system-wide center, such as the new P-16 Center, or an established campus center with a reputation for excellence in urban education, such as the Center for Urban and Multicultural Education at IUPUI.

This limited piloting of charter school sponsorship would provide Indiana University with the opportunity to determine fiscal impact, examine the effectiveness of policies/procedures, identify needs for infrastructure, and evaluate impact on K-12 schools, IU faculty, and the university more broadly.

## Appendix A

### Feedback on Frequently Asked Questions

#### **Questions about the 2006 Task Force Activities**

##### *1. Why did Indiana University decide not to sponsor charter schools in 2002?*

In their report submitted to the Indiana University Board of Trustees, the 2002 Charter School Task Force did not recommend that Indiana University sponsor charter schools. Reasons included:

- The costs sponsors would incur in meeting sponsorship requirements would likely outweigh the legislative administrative fee they would receive.
- The cost of rejecting charter school proposals could become prohibitive. University sponsors would thus need to seek additional revenue sources to subsidize their involvement.
- Since charter schools potentially create consequences for the school corporations in which they operate, such as the closing of buildings; the firing of teachers, administrators, and staff; and forced redistricting, the school corporation's attitude toward the university may be negatively affected and may impede the university's ability to perform its other missions with that school corporation. (Several superintendents strongly discouraged IU from becoming a sponsor during the first Task Force's deliberations.)
- Sponsorship by Indiana University could raise questions about duplication of effort and mission centrality, since Ball State University currently has the authority to sponsor throughout the state. It was stated that it would be better for Indiana University to have a role that complimented, but did not replicate, Ball State's role.

As a result of these perceived issues, the Task Force recommended that Indiana University work proactively to assume leadership for establishing a consortium on K-12 issues. The consortium would consist of the five four-year, public universities in the state and would draw upon the unique attributes of each institution to provide a broad range of services and information about the operation and effectiveness of charter schools. Ideally, the consortium would allow coordination among the universities to pool the resources and strengths of each while avoiding duplication of services. The official coordination of activities has yet to occur.

##### *2. Why is IU sponsorship of charter schools being revisited?*

Several urban public school superintendents have requested that Indiana University consider sponsoring LEA-based charter schools. Reasons for this change of heart are numerous and include:

- Indiana charter law has changed significantly, with most changes minimizing the negative financial impact of charter schools on traditional schools.
- Implementing innovative reforms would be less difficult than in traditional schools due to the regulatory flexibility available to charters.

- Charters would reverse enrollment declines by creating attractive, nontraditional education options for students living outside of a district or who are attending a private school or being homeschooled.

Faculty have asked the following related questions:

*2a. Is it likely that sponsorships will be sought for failing schools, the most problematic schools?*

Sponsorships may be sought for a wide range of schools; we wouldn't know what types of schools until the applications were received. Many of the superintendents appear to be considering the creation of new, unique schools (i.e., not conversion schools), but again this is no guarantee of the types of schools that will be proposed.

*2b. Why don't school districts sponsor their own charter schools?*

Districts currently have the legal authority to charter their own schools. When the superintendents have been asked about this point, they have provided several reasons for seeking IU sponsorship. The major reasons appear to be (1) the considerable experience and resources for school improvement that exist at IU and (2) the strong reputation of Indiana University, which would bring some legitimacy to the charter schools.

*3. What would IU sponsorship of charter schools entail?*

At a minimum, sponsorship would include the follow responsibilities:

- Creation, implementation, and use of a charter application process.
- Creation and use of negotiated, binding charters between IU and the school organizers.
- Monitoring of accountability provisions included in the charter.

Additional potential activities and responsibilities are discussed in response to Question 12.

### **Background Questions**

*4. How are charter schools different from other public schools, including traditional public schools and public magnet schools?*

Charter schools are automatically exempt from Indiana's education regulations, with the exception of the regulations listed in the following table.

#### **Statutes and Rules Applicable to Charter Schools<sup>5</sup>**

IC 5-11-1-9	Audits by state board of accounts
IC 20-35	Special education

<sup>5</sup> For a complete listing of statutes and rules applicable to charter schools, refer to Indiana School Laws and Rules. (2005-2006). IC 20-24-8-5.

IC 20-26-5-6	Subject to laws requiring regulation by state agencies
IC 20-33-2	Compulsory attendance
IC 20-33-8-16	Firearms and deadly weapons
IC 20-34-3	Health and safety measures
IC 20-30-3-2	
IC 20-30-3-4	Patriotic observances
IC 20-31	Accountability for school performance and improvement
IC 20-32-(4, 5, 6, 8)	All statutes related to standardized assessment (ISTEP+)

It is worth noting that some of these waivers are available to traditional schools, although the district must apply for the waivers (i.e., they aren't automatic as is the case with charter schools). Pending legislation in the General Assembly would extend many of the waivers (and many, many others) to all traditional public schools. It is uncertain how this wave of deregulation would impact charters, traditional public schools, or superintendents' interest in creating charter schools.

Prior to 2001, charter funding was structured in a way that did take money away from the child's local, traditional public school. However, this led to a situation in which districts were paying for students who had never attended public schools to attend charter schools. For example, many homeschooled and private school students in Indianapolis attended charter schools. IPS was required to shift the local share of revenue for these students to the charter schools, which was problematic given that the students never attended IPS schools. For this reason, both the state and local share of education funding for charter schools is paid by the state.

*5. Do charter schools follow the same rules and guidelines as public schools?*

Yes and no. Charter schools are public schools that are nonsectarian and nonreligious and operate under charters. They are exempt from some state and school district regulations and tend to have more autonomy than a traditional public school. Although charter public schools are exempt from some state and district regulations, they are held to extremely high levels of accountability. In addition to meeting state accountability requirements, charter schools must also meet the requirements set out in their charter and agreed to by their sponsor. A sponsor may revoke a school's charter at any time if the school is not producing results or fulfilling its charter. Like traditional public schools, charter schools must have open enrollment policies and cannot discriminate based on disability, race, color, gender, national origin, religion, or ancestry. Indiana law requires that any teacher in a charter school must hold a license to teach in a public school in Indiana. However, a charter may also employ a teacher who is in the process of obtaining a license under the state's transition to teaching program. Such a teacher must complete the transition to teaching program no more than three years after beginning to teach at a charter school (the ability to teach while participating in a T-to-T program is likely to be extended to all Indiana public schools during this legislative session).

6. *When and why did charter schools come on the scene?*

Charter schools first came on the national scene in the early 1990s. In Indiana, charter school law was passed in 2001, and the first Indiana charter school opened in 2002. As described in the Indiana Code, charter schools were created to provide innovative and creative educational choices for students and their parents. Indiana charter law has been modified in most subsequent legislative sessions, with major changes in 2003. The Center for Evaluation and Education Policy has written a report detailing these changes. Please contact the Center at [ceep@indiana.edu](mailto:ceep@indiana.edu) for a copy of this and other charter-related reports.

7. *How many charter schools currently exist in Indiana, and who sponsors them?*

28 charter schools currently operate in Indiana. These schools are spread throughout the state, with the largest concentration located around the Indianapolis area, where 17 schools currently in operation, or approved to begin operating in 2006-2007, are located. The following table includes the number of charters opened, approved, and closed by the sponsor.

**Charter Schools Authorized, Operating, and Closed by each Indiana Sponsor**

Sponsor	Schools Currently Operating	Schools Approved But Not Yet Operating	Schools Closed
Ball State University	14	4	1
Mayor's Office of Indianapolis	12	5	1
Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation	2	0	0
Metropolitan School District of Steuben County	0	0	0
Metropolitan School District of Decatur County	0	0	0
Carmel-Clay School District	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>

**Questions about Performance**

8. *How are Indiana's charter schools doing compared to other public schools?*

The state's charter schools have yet to be evaluated, although each sponsor evaluates its charter schools according to provisions in each charter contract (the Indy mayor's office is widely considered to have a very good accountability system above and beyond that of NCLB and PL221). The Center for Evaluation and Education Policy gathered ISTEP data roughly 18 months ago in response to a legislative request, and the data provided evidence that, at the school level, charter student achievement is similar to achievement by students in traditional public schools (i.e., some schools have excellent results, others bad results, with most in between).

9. *How are Indiana's charter schools doing compared to charter schools in other states?*

Research on achievement effects of charter schools is mixed. Recent media reports have sensationalized studies that provide evidence of strong positive or negative achievement effects, but most of these studies have significant limitations or design flaws. Several studies relying on random assignment of students to charter and traditional schools are underway, but results are not yet available.

Roughly 7% of charter schools nationally have closed, with the large majority of the closures due to financial and management problems. In Indiana, the data are nearly identical: 2 of 29 (7%) have closed due to financial and management problems.

10. *Can districts convert traditional public schools to charter schools to avoid sanctions under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)?*

No, districts cannot convert traditional public schools to charter schools to avoid sanctions under NCLB. A conversion charter school, for the purposes of Indiana's NCLB accountability system, is the same school it was before the conversion. Converting does not "buy time" or avoid sanctions.

### **Questions about Indiana University Involvement with Charter Schools**

11. *How is Indiana University currently involved with Indiana charter schools?*

Involvement has been limited. Charlie Reigeluth has led a group of IU faculty and students who have worked with the Decatur charter school. The Center for Evaluation and Education Policy has an Educational Choice and Options Team, co-led by Suzanne Eckes and Jonathan Plucker, that has received three externally-funded projects to study charter schools, two from the Indiana Department of Education and one from the Georgia Department of Education. It is unclear how this existing work would be impacted by IU sponsorship.

12. *What roles could Indiana University play in sponsoring charter schools (i.e., are there different levels of sponsorship, and if so, what are they)?*

The sponsor-organizer relationship is based on the charter, which IU would be able to (and would have to) design. This control would allow IU to follow a number of different paths, ranging from limited involvement, in which IU reviews applications and grants charters but does not provide any additional support, to high engagement, in which IU is involved in nearly every aspect of each charter school. Superintendents appear to favor the middle ground, in which IU and the districts work as partners (but with day-to-day operations the primary responsibility of the district).

Faculty have asked the following related question:

12a. *What financial considerations are involved in monitoring for compliance, etc. that must be undertaken by IU when sponsoring charter schools?*

Again, this depends on the conditions stipulated in the charters. Sponsors are allowed to take 3% of per pupil state funding for administration, which may or may not cover IU costs. Anecdotal reports suggest that is not enough to cover the costs (Current sponsors have not replied to the Task Force's repeated requests to talk about their charter experiences, fiscal or otherwise). Superintendents have responded to cost concerns by noting that they are more experienced at school administration than most current charter organizers, so administrative costs for the sponsor can be minimized. However, without sponsoring charter schools, there is no way to know if this will come to pass.

## Appendix B

### Letter to Stakeholders

#### **Template Letter to Stakeholders**

*January 18, 2006*

Dear (Stakeholder):

Recently, several public school superintendents approached Indiana University's School of Education with a request that IU reconsider the 2002 decision not to sponsor charter schools. In response, Dean Gonzalez and the School's Policy Council convened a Task Force to reexamine issues related to sponsorship of charter schools.

The Task Force met earlier this month and, as part of its activities, decided to collect information from a wide range of potential stakeholders. The Task Force also established an ambitious timeline for this information gathering, in large part so that any recommendations can be considered by the end of the semester by Policy Council and, if a change in policy is recommended, the IU Trustees.

You are being contacted as a potential stakeholder in this matter, and your input is valued by the Task Force. If possible, we would like you to prepare a one- to two-page letter that addresses the perceived benefits and costs of Indiana University sponsorship of charter schools from your perspective. Please consider the benefits and costs from financial, political, and engagement perspectives. In addition, we would be interested in any other comments or issues you feel we should consider.

Our current plan is to include the solicited feedback verbatim in the appendix of the Task Force report. However, our primary goal is to obtain your input, so we can include your comments anonymously or not include them in the final report at all if you wish.

In order to move things along, we would appreciate receiving feedback by February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2006. You can e-mail your response to Jonathan Plucker at [jplucker@indiana.edu](mailto:jplucker@indiana.edu).

Thank you in advance for your input. We appreciate you taking time out of your busy schedule to participate in this process.

Sincerely,

The IU Charter School Task Force  
Co-chairs, Jonathan Plucker and Barbara Korth

**MINUTES  
POLICY COUNCIL  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

February 21, 2007

1:00 P.M.

School of Education

IUB Room 2140

IUPUI Room 3138E

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

**Members Present:** Bichelmeyer, Dilworth, Eckes, Helfenbein, Korth, Levinson, Lopez, Rosario. **Alternates Present:** Appelman, Cowan (Lewison), Hay. **Dean's Staff Present:** Gonzalez, Kloosterman, McMullen, Murtadha. **Staff Representative: Student Representatives:** Smith **Visitors:** Delandshere, Osgood, Plucker

I. Approval of the Minutes from the January 24, 2007 Policy Council Meeting  
[\(07.20M\)](#)

A motion was made by Korth and seconded by Eckes to approve the minutes from the January 24, 2007 Policy Council meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

II. Announcements and Discussions

a. Dean's Report

Dean Gonzalez reported that the Indiana House Appropriations Committee has recently approved a state budget, and it has been sent to the full House for consideration. This budget proposes a cap on undergraduate tuition at the cost of living. This proposal would put tuition increases significantly below what they have been in recent years, at approximately 2.5-3%. Dean Gonzalez feels this is below the level that is needed to maintain IU's competitiveness. This cap does not apply to graduate tuition, and this year the School of Education was invited to recommend differential graduate tuition. Compared to other Big Ten institutions, IU has the lowest tuition for graduate students in education. The School has submitted an aggressive, but reasonable proposal to increase graduate tuition at 11.5% this year and 13% next year. If this proposal would be approved, it could be a significant source of income for the School, but it would also mean that associated costs of financial aid would increase significantly. Murtadha commented that the IUPUI School of Education sent forward a proposal that would increase graduate tuition on the IUPUI campus by the same percentage of increase.

Another exciting opportunity emerging is that the House Appropriations Committee also recommended funding for the Pathways Initiative, as well as the IU Life

Sciences Initiative. However, they significantly cut the funding from the original proposal. We had requested \$5 million over each of the next two years, but the Appropriations Committee recommended about \$5 million over the entire two year period. This would be a major influx of new revenue that would allow the School to accomplish our P-16 initiatives. These initiatives would identify high need schools in Marion County, Lake County, and St. Joseph County and establish partnerships with these schools to address student achievement and college preparation among high-need populations. Dean Gonzalez commended the work of the Black Caucus in helping to get the Appropriation approved by the Committee. If the Pathways Initiative is funded, Dean Gonzalez believes there will be many opportunities for our faculty to engage with the schools involved.

Dean Gonzalez reported that a number of faculty searches are continuing on both campuses. He is excited to see the quality of candidates that have been attracted to IU. Kloosterman reported that six candidates have accepted positions, four offers have been made, two searches have been delayed until next year, and several other searches continue. Murtadha reported that two searches at IUPUI have been completed and three more are in progress.

#### b. Agenda Committee Announcements

At the last Policy Council meeting, the matter of amending the Faculty Constitution was discussed. As suggested at that meeting, this issue has been referred to the Long-Range Planning Committee. The committee has until January 2008 to suggest revisions to the constitution, looking primarily at committee structure and committee charges. Faculty Affairs committees on both campuses are also gathering related information on service load. For the present time, there is a possibility that some committees will join their efforts, because there is overlap in their committee work. For example, the Committee on Diversity and the RAFA Committee may combine efforts in the short term.

Levinson updated members on the Environmental Awareness campaign at IUB. Smith and Eckes recently discussed the campaign at a meeting of the Dean's Advisory Council. Levinson commented that the campaign will be kicking off shortly to encourage individuals in the School to reduce consumption, advertising recycling efforts, and evaluate placement and labeling of recycling bins. Eckes commented that one issue that emerged from the Dean's Advisory Council meeting was whether they could take a lead to devise a program to color-code the containers. Levinson encouraged the Dean's Advisory Council to bring new ideas to him or to the Dean's Office. Eckes commented that another issue is resources to do the labeling, printing, and laminating. Levinson suggested creating a small budget to help with the administrative costs of this campaign.

### III. New Business

#### c. Task Force Committee for Conceptual Framework for Advanced Programs

Levinson introduced the committee members that have been suggested by Mary McMullen, Bob Osgood, and the Agenda Committee to discuss the Conceptual Framework for Advanced Programs in the School of Education. The proposed committee consists of Jacqueline Blackwell, Jack Cummings, David Flinders, Luise McCarty, Mary McMullen, Bob Osgood, and Susan Smith.

A motion was made by Dilworth and seconded by Bichelmeyer to approve the committee as proposed. The motion passed unanimously.

d. Guidelines for the Involvement of Retired Faculty on Program and Research Committees [\(07.22\)](#)

Levinson introduced the Guidelines for the Involvement of Retired Faculty on Program and Research Committees. These guidelines were approved by the Graduate Studies Committee.

A motion was made by Korth and seconded by Eckes to approve the guidelines.

Lopez questioned what would happen when a retiring faculty member is a chair of a research or program committee. McMullen responded that if they were chair of the committee prior to retirement, they can remain as chair.

Bichelmeyer asked what the impetus for the creation of these guidelines was. McMullen indicated that she has responded to a number of questions regarding the roles that retired faculty members can take on program and research committees. McMullen felt that there needed to be a policy in place that would address what role retired faculty members can fill in regards to research committees. David Daleke from the Graduate School helped to form the guidelines. The Graduate Studies Committee felt that there needed to be a clause in the policy that allowed for appeals, because small programs may need retired faculty to serve as committee chairs.

Gonzalez recommended that if this policy passes, the various departments will need to think about how to measure the level of activity of the retired faculty members.

The motion was passed unanimously.

e. Modifications of Language Education Ph.D. Program [\(07.23\)](#)

Cowan reviewed the need for the proposed changes to the Language Education Ph.D. program. L601 is a course that is currently called "Reading Research for Practitioners," and was a seminar devoted to interpreting theoretical positions and research data for Ed.S. students. The course has not been offered recently, because Ed.S. students have been taking L700 in place of L601. The department is proposing to change the name of the course and keep the emphasis on interpreting theoretical positions of research data, but directing it toward new doctoral students. The new

L601 course will be offered during the spring semester and is intended to follow L600, which is required in the fall semester of the first year of the doctoral program.

A motion was made by Cowan and seconded by Korth to approve the proposed change to the Ph.D. program in Language Education. The motion passed unanimously.

f. Proposal for Inquiry Methodology Program [\(07.24\)](#)

Delandshere indicated that students wanting to pursue a degree in inquiry methodology actually receive a degree in Educational Psychology. That has caused problems for some students who desire to double major in inquiry methodology, as they must take qualifying exams in educational psychology. More importantly, students specializing in inquiry methodology have given feedback that they did not feel adequately prepared, because they have to split their coursework with educational psychology courses. The proposed Ph.D. program will give students a more complete education specifically in inquiry methodology. Delandshere pointed out that nationally, there is a need for well-trained methodologists in both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Additionally, new faculty members have a desire to work with their own graduate students in inquiry methodology, as opposed to only working with students in other programs. In writing the proposal, Delandshere researched degrees in research methodology from across the country. These programs are typically focused on quantitative research, and she found that it is very rare to have a program that combines qualitative and quantitative methodologies.

Under the proposed degree, students will select one of three tracks: quantitative track, qualitative track, or an integrated track. Students will be required to take nine hours in an inquiry core that are courses that are foundational in nature and will give the theoretical background of methodology. Students who choose to take the quantitative or qualitative track must take at least 18 hours in their selected track. Students who choose the integrated track must take 12 hours of quantitative and of qualitative courses.

Delandshere stated that although inquiry methodology doctoral students will need to take the newly developed course Y521, this does not mean all programs will be required to change from Y520 to Y521. Each program area may decide to make this change in their programs, but it is not necessary. Delandshere addressed differences between Y611, Y612, and Y613. Y611 is designed for students who desire to take only one course in qualitative inquiry. However, many individuals who take Y611 sometimes want to continue data analysis of qualitative data. Y612 and Y613 would be designed for students that want to take more than one qualitative course. Delandshere added that many of the “new” courses, such as Y613, Y671, and Y672 have been taught previously as Y750, a topical seminar.

A motion was made by Cowan and seconded by Eckes to approve the proposed Inquiry Methodology Ph.D. program.

Murtadha questioned the case made for the need of this program, and whether data had been collected to substantiate that this program is necessitated. Delandshere replied that conducting searches for inquiry methodology faculty have resulted in few qualified applicants for positions. Bichelmeyer agreed that careful documentation of need for a program is important when presenting the program to the Dean of Faculties and the Academic Leadership Council. Gonzalez responded that analysis appearing in the AERJ has documented a need for quantitative educational researchers and encouraged Delandshere to use this to build her case. He added that we need to understand that this is already an existing degree that we are expanding on. Data may be able to be collected about current educational psychology students and students who have a minor in inquiry methodology.

Levinson added that we may want to make a case that this degree will allow IU to capitalize on its strengths of having quality methodologists throughout the School and the campus. Helfenbein questioned whether there had been any consideration of IUPUI faculty teaching courses in this program. Delandshere said that this issue had not been discussed, but she said it was a possibility. Rosario added that this question is a broader issue, and in order to continue to strengthen the Core Campus, the role and participation of IUPUI faculty should be addressed in the development and implementation of new programs.

Gonzalez added that in the context of this new program, one of the questions that should be addressed is who qualifies as an inquiry faculty member. There are a number of faculty members who might want to affiliate with the program, and there needs to be clear criteria and a review process for approval of faculty members affiliated with the program.

Korth summarized what issues continue to need to be addressed. They were a stronger case for need using data, the addition of a prerequisite for Y525, and criteria for appointing faculty to the program area.

A motion was made by Helfenbein and seconded by Rosario to table the issue. The motion failed.

The motion to approve the general structure of the Ph.D. program (with the knowledge that the authors will take into advisement suggestions, and make the requested revisions) passed by a vote of 8 to 2 with one abstention.

g. Charter School Task Force Report [\(07.25\)](#)

Levinson reminded members that in 2005, the Long-Range Planning Committee asked the Agenda Committee to charge a task force to revisit the issue of IU's role in sponsorship of charter schools. Plucker responded that he felt it would be best to delay a discussion of the report until the next Policy Council meeting where a more in depth discussion can take place. Levinson commented that there is ambiguity about

what action needs to take place in regards to the results of this report. He encouraged members to thoroughly read the report before the next meeting.

#### IV. New Course Requests

New course requests were available for E201, F110, T515, Y515/H510, Y521, Y525, Y600, Y612, Y613, Y625, Y630, Y631, Y637, Y638, Y639, Y660, Y671, and Y672. A course change request was available for L601.

**Formatted:** Spanish (Mexico)

Levinson adjourned the meeting at 3:00 PM.