

**MINUTES**  
**POLICY COUNCIL**  
**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**  
 October 27, 2004, 1:00-3:01 p.m.  
 School of Education  
 IUB Room 2140  
 IUPUI Room 3138E

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

**Members Present:** Anderson, Berghoff, Carspecken, Delandshere, Dilworth, Flinders, McCarty, McClain, Stachowski. **Dean's Staff Present:** Gonzalez, Howard-Hamilton, Kloosterman, Lambdin, Murtadha. **Staff Representative:** Wyatt. **Student Representative:** Adams, Lotter, Zhang. **Alternates:** Cunningham, Galindo, Whiston. **Guests:** Cowan, Hines, Lesh, Kilarr, Pugh, Language Education student representatives.

I. Approval of Minutes

- A. Approval of the Minutes from September 22, 2004, Policy Council meeting  
[\(05.07M\)](#)

A motion was made, and seconded, to approve the minutes as written. The minutes for September 22, 2004, were unanimously approved.

II. Announcements and Discussions

- A. Dean's Report

Dean Gonzalez extended good news from the Chancellor that the School of Education's Commitment to Excellence proposal was ranked #5 among the 11 proposals that were submitted. The Dean reported that the President is going to recommend to the Board of Trustees that the School of Education's proposal be accepted, or at least the faculty component, which involves strengthening teacher education and developing eight new faculty positions to contribute to teacher education and the doctoral programs. The proposal also calls for establishing a P-16 center. Funding for the center was not recommended; however, the President and Chancellor are interested in the development of this center. Additionally, this P-16 center would provide outreach and partnerships within the School of Education, without weakening the faculty component. The amount of funding produced by this proposal is contingent on approval from the trustees and would be committed to funding faculty positions. The Dean stated that if the School of Education receives the full amount of funding requested by the faculty, the amount would be well over \$700,000 for about eight new faculty positions and some start-up costs. The Dean thanked the faculty members who contributed to the formulation of the Commitment to Excellence proposal and helped throughout the entire process.

The Dean reported that student enrollment for the Fall 2004 semester is down. According to a report compiled at the end of the first week of classes, the enrollment in the School of Education for undergraduate students decreased 9.3% and graduate enrollment is down 3.8% from the previous year. However, nondegree-seeking student enrollment has increased 6.1%. The Dean commented that some reductions in enrollment could provide relief to the School of Education, in terms of available space, but the budget depends on enrollment and this reduction in enrollment could be challenging for what is already a difficult budget. The Dean stated that if enrollment reductions continue, the School of Education will have to confront the cutbacks that have been previously avoided by using reserve money.

Dean Gonzalez encouraged faculty members to attend the Fall 2004 faculty meeting on October 29, 2004. The topic of discussion will be the School of Education's doctoral programs. In addition, an update of the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate will be provided by Dr. McCarty.

The Dean commented that the faculty meeting will provide an opportunity to have school-wide discussion about doctoral preparation within the School of Education. The timing for this discussion links nicely to a report submitted to and accepted by the President of the University concerning a different type of graduate school for IU. When this new report is implemented, the Graduate School will defer to the academic units the responsibility to appoint members to the graduate faculty and approve their own program revisions. The Graduate School will continue to review proposals for new degrees, and will institute graduate program reviews. The Graduate School has not been doing program reviews in the past and it is reasonable to expect that at some point in time one or more of the graduate programs within the School of Education will be selected for external review. Given the changes taking place in graduate education at the institution and nationally, our own review of graduate programs and initiatives, including the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate, should be a priority for the School this year.

B. Agenda Committee

Delandshere invited all faculty members to attend the Faculty Colloquium on Friday, October 29, 2004, at 3:00 p.m. Featured speakers will be Martha McCarthy and Russ Skiba.

III. New Business

A. Science Education Program change effective Fall 2005 [\(05.09\)](#)

Delandshere introduced the requested change from the graduate studies committee to increase Inquiry core credit hours from 12 hours to 15 hours. Noted

that courses listed under Measurement, Evaluation, and Design, P527 and P617, should actually be listed as Y527 and Y617.

Lotter reported that the graduate students in the Science Education program support this change.

Flinders expressed concern about the 400-level inquiry course (E404) listed as an option for a graduate level program.

Howard-Hamilton commented that according to the Graduate School Bulletin, 400-level courses, or even undergraduate courses, can be approved and students can take 400 level courses if they are approved by the graduate studies committee or by the associate dean. If a course is not on the core list, it can be added to the core list, any course is subject to substitution by a student's committee.

Delandshere commented that she is hesitant to have a document that lists a 400-level course as an Inquiry core approved by the school because this would drive the policy for the whole school.

Cunningham asked whether or not there was discussion as to why the Graduate Studies Committee had decided to include E404 to the list of required classes.

Howard-Hamilton responded that the overall discussion pointed to upper-level courses, primarily. Four-hundred level courses are rarely taken, but at times, there are doctoral level students who have taken that course and will be permitted to put that course on their program of studies. If this is something that shouldn't be on here, it can be taken to the GSC and ask them to take it off, but only for graduate courses that are required and on a case-by-case basis.

Delandshere commented that it is not necessary to send it back to graduate studies.

Cunningham motioned to accept the request to increase Inquiry core credit hours from 12 hours to 15 hours and to delete E404 from the list of approved Inquiry courses in Science Education.

Carspecken seconded the motion.

The motion to approve the request to increase Inquiry core credit hours and to delete course E404 from the list of approved Inquiry courses in Science Education was unanimously accepted.

B. Learning Sciences specialization program – Don Cunningham ([05.10](#))

Delandshere noted that Learning Sciences is a new specialization within Educational Psychology. The Learning Sciences specialization began to be

discussed a few months ago when several faculty from IST moved to Educational Psychology. The program as described in document [05.10](#) would be offered initially as a specialization within Educational Psychology, which now includes Learning and Cognition, Inquiry, Human Development, and School Psychology. Delandshere noted that Don Cunningham was present to answer questions related to the Learning Sciences specialization.

Cunningham introduced Richard Lesh, director of the Learning Sciences specialization.

Cunningham commented that the Learning Sciences specialization has some unique characteristics, including an apprenticeship model. The specialization provides a lot of direct involvement, in that students receive research experiences in fields of the Learning Sciences very early in the program as well as mentoring with professors in the field. The specialization will have required coursework, but its focus for coursework is one in which students are involved in practical experiences and advancing one's own interests and career. If you look at the way the courses and the way experiences within are laid out, you will notice that the specialization was developed with the same spirit as that of the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate.

McCarty noted that the Learning Sciences specialization is a model program in terms of the national debate that has been going on in terms of reforming the doctoral program. In the Learning Sciences specialization, there is heavy emphasis on research at the theoretical and practical levels, along with mentoring and apprenticeship. All the elements of Learning Science are cutting edge in terms of the national debate and the Learning Sciences have put a lot of effort in developing the program against the traditions that has been held regarding course-driven doctoral programs.

Flinders asked whether some of the Learning Sciences courses would be open to a mix of students.

Cunningham explained that this is a doctoral program that exists within, and celebrates the fact that it does so, the School of Education. The program very much wants students involved in and tied to the life of other faculty members and students within the School Education. One of the great strengths for having the Learning Sciences specialization within the School of Education, as opposed to a Psychology department, is the connections that it could bring between programs.

Flinders asked what the electives of the specialization are.

Cunningham responded that there are not very many electives in the specialization right now, and that is one of the weaknesses. However, in terms of the flexibilities of the apprenticeship, where students can choose their own paths, this aspect can take up a lot of credits in the 90-hour degree.

McCarty noted that the specialization did a realistic job of creating a 90-hour degree. The specialization is innovative, such that students are able to create their own research agenda and have the freedom to choose their own research groups. She commented that the minor, which is 12 hours, can be a discipline outside of the School of Education, but it does not have to be, and the specialization committee decides what a coherent minor would be.

Cunningham responded that the Learning Science specialization is also collaboration with the Informatics and Cognitive Sciences programs.

Dean Gonzalez commented that he is surprised not to see any specific reference to the use of technologies in teaching and learning.

Cunningham responded that the use of technology is embedded within the seminar and apprenticeships. It would be difficult to avoid contact with technology. But use of technology is not prescriptive. It is based more on a student's interests. Furthermore, the use of technology is based on the research experiences rather than being a prescribed course.

Dean Gonzalez also commented that another concern he had regarding the program, is that the specialization has built in summer courses. Some students may not have fee remission during the summer, because of the way fee remission is awarded.

Cunningham responded that the specialization tries to follow a science model, in that all or most of the students receive some form of support or funding. The faculty will aggressively seek grants and contracts in order to be able to fund assistantships.

Delandshere asked whether or not Y520 was required as a prerequisite.

Cunningham noted that the specialization assumes that the students will already have had undergraduate preparation in psychology or social science where they would already have had an introduction to research.

Cunningham motioned to approve the Learning Sciences specialization as described by document 05.10.

McCarty seconded the motion.

The motion to approve the Learning Sciences specialization was unanimously approved.

- C. Request to change Department Name – Mary Beth Hines ([05.11](#))

Discussion was held regarding Language Education's request to change name of department.

A memo from graduate students in Language Education regarding their concerns about this change was also presented ([05.11](#)).

Dean Gonzalez commented that there seems to be a misunderstanding in the actual process of changing a department's name. He noted that he would like for those involved in this process to return to Policy Council after meeting within their department to further discuss this issue.

Peter Cowan explained the department's reasoning for a name change.

International students in Language Education also offered their perspectives on this issue.

Delandshere noted that this concern came to Policy Council prematurely. Suggestions were provided for what measures the members of the Language Education department should take before returning this item to Policy Council.

Dean Gonzalez thanked the graduate students for their courage in bringing this issue to the attention of himself and the Policy Council.

#### IV. Old Business

##### A. Survey questions of five-year review of Dean Gonzalez

Discussion was held concerning the five-year review survey for Dean Gonzalez and suggestions for modifications to the previous survey were discussed.

Some changes were made to a couple of the survey questions.

Flinders motioned to accept changes made to the five-year review survey for Dean Gonzalez.

McCarty seconded the motion.

The motion to accept changes made to the survey was unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:01 p.m.