

**AGENDA
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

January 30, 2013

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

School of Education

IUB - Room 2140

IUPUI - Room 3138E

- I. Approval of the Minutes from December 12, 2012 Meeting (**13.34 M**)

- II. Announcements and Discussions
Dean's Report

Agenda Committee
Spring Faculty Meeting—April 26, 2013 10:00 a.m.

- III. Old Business
Diversity Topic presenter -- Stephanie Power Carter

- IV. New Business
13.36 - IUPUI Proposal Allocation of Faculty time
13.37 - IUPUI Proposal for University Teaching of Graduate Students
13.38 - IUPUI Proposal for Faculty Annual Review
13.39 – IUPUI Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Voting Proposal
13.40 - Discontinue M.A.T. in Social Studies
13.41 - IUPUI Proposed change for Masters in Education – Technology Focus to
Masters in Elementary Education with the Focus on Technology and Masters in
Secondary Education with the Focus on Technology
13.42 - Proposal for Doctoral Minor in Adult Education
13.43 - Proposal from CoTE regarding Degree Closure Strategy

Proposed IUPUI Time Allocation and Load Policy

December 3, 2012

Current SoE policy (2003) specifies both allocation of faculty time and course load for IUB tenured and tenure-track faculty (see below). IUB's current practice is a 3-3 load.

The second SoE policy (2001) provides for administrative discretion to adjust course loads as long as adjustments are equitable over time and revenue neutral. The Dean's office is responsible for reviewing these for fiscal neutrality, individual equity and academic integrity.

	IUB Tenured/TT	IUPUI Ten/TT	IUPUI NTT
Research	40%/50%	40%	0%
Teaching (inc. scholarship of teaching)	40% =2 fall + 2 spr	40% =2 fall + 2 spr	70% = 7/academic yr
Service	20%/10%	20%	30%

Rationale: In crafting the policy it will be simplest to review the existing IUB load policy and extrapolate from there. With a simple, clean, consistent load policy in place, the second policy allows us to adjust load as appropriate (e.g., accounting for field experience responsibilities, administrative duties, service load, etc). Discussions should be grounded in available data. Since the SoE is required to review policy to ensure fiscal neutrality, individual equity and academic integrity, a review will allow us to examine current and past practices, determine which are appropriate and which we wish to revise. We could begin to codify these to some degree. In addition to examining course equivalence, the review should also examine differing service loads across the school. Achieving complete parity is not possible given the differing nature of programs, but a review can enhance equity and increase confidence that different programs and personnel are receiving similar treatment. Over time we should have greater clarity regarding course equivalents across the school. This information will improve the annual review process and increase confidence across the school that loads and expectations are comparable.

Steps: (1) review the existing IUB policy as a starting point for creating an IUPUI policy for course load for tenure/tenure-track faculty with discretion to adjust load; (2) create a parallel load policy for IUPUI non-tenure track faculty with discretion to adjust load; (3) review current practices for equity and revenue neutrality; and (4) where appropriate, begin to codify routine course reductions.

See the following page for a revised draft of the load policy.

IU School of Education, Indianapolis
Allocation of Faculty Time

January 2013

All full-time faculty members in the School of Education have responsibilities related to teaching, scholarship of teaching, and service to the school, university, profession and community. Tenured and tenure-track faculty have additional responsibilities related to research. The percentage of time allocated to each activity varies by type of appointment. The typical allocations are outlined below for tenured/tenure-track (T/TT) and non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty. In some circumstances, adjustments to the allocation may be approved provided the adjustments meet conditions of individual equity, fiscal neutrality, and do not compromise the academic integrity of programs. Such adjustments must be approved annually by the Executive Associate Dean.

Percentage of Effort by Area

Tenured/Tenure-track: 40% Research, 40% Teaching & Scholarship of Teaching, 20% Service

Non-Tenure Track: 70% Teaching & Scholarship of Teaching, 30% Service

Teaching Load

Tenured and tenure-track faculty with the allocation specified above will teach two (2) courses per semester in the fall and spring semesters for a total of 4 courses per academic year. Non-tenure track with the allocation specified above will teach a total of seven (7) courses per academic year (e.g., 3 fall/4 spring or 4 fall/3 spring). The load for both T/TT and NTT can be adjusted up or down depending on field experience responsibilities, administrative duties, service load, and other factors. All faculty are expected to contribute service to the school, university, profession and community.

Course Buy-out for Research, Teaching and Service

All course buy-outs must be approved by the Executive Associate Dean. Faculty cannot buy out more than two (2) courses per academic year. When faculty receive approval for a course buyout, the percentage of effort (10% per course) is reallocated into the appropriate areas (research or service). Faculty should note these adjustments in the personal statement prepared for their faculty annual review.

Approved by IUPUI Faculty and Budgetary Affairs, December 3, 2012.

Proposed Policy for University Teaching by Graduate Students

IU School of Education, IUPUI

To preserve the integrity of graduate education at the IU School of Education at Indianapolis, graduate students will not be permitted to serve as the primary or sole instructor of a graduate-level course. This policy does not prohibit graduate students from co-teaching graduate courses under the direct supervision of doctoral faculty, who will be the faculty of record. Co-teaching is strongly supported so graduate students can experience teaching graduate and undergraduate courses. Graduate students are permitted to serve as the primary instructor for undergraduate courses, provided that they have the appropriate background content preparation and experiences for the assigned course or courses.

Annual Performance Review Policy for Faculty at Indiana University School of Education at IUPUI

Approved by School of Education at IUPUI Faculty and Budgetary Affairs

Committee 4/24/2012

Revised and Approved 1/23/2013

Overview

IUPUI observes a mandated annual review policy for all faculty with at least a 50% appointment in the School of Education and/or those with a tenure line in the SOE at IUPUI. As part of the annual faculty review process, each faculty member is asked to submit an Annual Report in early January of each year. The Faculty Activity Report (FAR) defines the time period from January 1 - December 31.

The Annual Report will consist of:

1. An updated electronic copy of one's vita;
2. An electronically submitted Faculty Activity Report (FAR) report on activities related to teaching, research, and service, including electronic attachments;
3. Copies of publications (including those in press);
4. Copies of all teaching evaluations; and
5. Personal statement describing productivity (2 page max, single spaced)

The annual faculty review is designed to render a fair and comprehensive assessment of faculty performance in each of the three areas of teaching, research and service during a given calendar year for:

1. Providing information to faculty and administrators about faculty productivity.
2. Allowing an opportunity for the department chairs and faculty to assess, on a regular and systematic basis, the quality and quantity of faculty accomplishments in the teaching, research, and service categories.
3. Engaging key School administrators and individual faculty members in discussion and agreement on expectations for future performance and to stimulate the supporting mechanisms for continuous faculty development.
4. Providing guidance for those eligible for tenure and/or promotion and long-term contract. (Reappointment for all faculty is considered annually until tenure or long-term contract.)
5. Providing the principal basis for determining salary increases.

Annual Review Committee and Process

A committee of faculty, comprised of five nominated and elected members (to include at least one full-time non-tenure-track faculty at the doctoral level with a long-term contract) will conduct the annual review and recommend to the Executive Associate Dean (EAD) the merit rating in each area (research, teaching, and service, or teaching and service for non-tenure track ranks), along with an overall rating, for each faculty member. The review committee will make recommendations for ratings based on the Annual Performance Review Values and Guidelines.

The EAD, working with the Associate Dean for Research and Academic Affairs (ADRAA), will arrive at a final merit rating. The ADRAA and/or Chairpersons will communicate in writing the

final ratings for each faculty member. In the event a rating is different from the one made by the review committee, the reasons for changing the rating will be communicated by the EAD back to the review committee.

Procedures, Responsibilities, and Timeline for the Annual Performance Review

Procedures

The following sequence of activities must be carried out by faculty and administrators. It is essential to conduct the reviews in a fair and thorough manner. The quality and quantity of faculty performance are perhaps the key factors in evaluating the School and University, and provide a system of accountability for our public university. An excellent review process conducted consistently and professionally, strengthens our performance. The involvement of faculty in this process is an integral responsibility of faculty governance.

1. The faculty member's Annual Report, including all required attachments, will be used as the primary documents in the review process. The Annual Review Committee will use the Annual Reports to conduct the review. Faculty should refer to the suggestions for documentation of teaching, research, and service in the School's Promotion and Tenure Policy, as well as the Annual Performance Review Values and Guidelines. Without the basic evidence of performance contained in the Annual Report, an overall recommendation cannot be higher than unsatisfactory. Information added to the report after the committee makes their recommendation to the EAD will not be considered. Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in a rating of unsatisfactory.
2. For faculty members with assignments in two Schools, departments, or units, the review committee should consult, as needed, with the other key administrators involved.
3. The Annual Review Committee and faculty members have the option to discuss in person the faculty member's report.
4. All non-tenured, tenure track faculty must meet with their Chairperson or the ADRAA to discuss the written summary of the merit review.
5. It is possible for a faculty member to be exempted from being rated in one of the three general performance categories – teaching, research, or service. Reasons for such exemptions might include specific assignments and other special circumstances. However, the exemption cannot be used as an excuse for poor performance, or no performance, in a category of expected effort. Any exemption must be based on a negotiated, documented agreement between the faculty member and ADRAA concerning the special circumstances and expectations for performance upon which the exemption is based. The foundation for this discussion should be the policy on allocation of faculty time. Exemptions will not be made for non-tenured faculty members because progress toward promotion and tenure may be jeopardized without documentation of satisfactory progress in all three areas.
6. The EAD, in partnership with the Dean, will consult with the Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee prior to determining salary raise differentiations within categories.

Ratings

The faculty review committee will make recommendations for ratings for each faculty member based on their appropriate classification (non-tenure track or tenured/tenure track). The ratings

follow the established campus and school criteria for tenure and long-term contract:

Outstanding: Truly exceptional performance.

Exemplary: Distinguished performance; readily acknowledged as a model to be followed.

Meritorious: Appreciably better than satisfactory but less than exemplary performance.

Satisfactory: Meets normal and expected professional standards.

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet the normal and expected professional standards.

New Faculty Member: Faculty in their first year of service do not receive an overall rating and are recommended for a raise equal to the average raise.

To receive a rating of *Meritorious* or higher, research active tenure and tenure-track faculty should provide evidence of at least one publication or substantial progress on a major project such as a book or longitudinal study.

Although exact percentages may vary from year to year, the faculty review committee should recommend no more than 10% Outstanding and 40% Exemplary ratings.

Appeals of Annual Review Rating

Faculty may appeal a merit rating to the EAD. If still not satisfied, the faculty member may appeal the rating to the Dean. The Dean may refer the appeal to the Faculty Affairs Committee for a recommendation. Subsequent appeals can be made to the Dean of Faculties. Appeals must be submitted within *two weeks* of receipt of the Annual Performance summary letter.

Timeline for Performance Reviews

The review committee is expected to implement the review process in January-February. Recommendations will be forwarded to the EAD in February. A final rating will be communicated to the faculty in March of each year.

Appendix A

(Supplemental information – Not considered part of the Policy)

Annual Performance Review Values and Guidelines

Tenure-line and Tenured Faculty

4-25-2012 DRAFT

The faculty review committee will make recommendations for ratings for each faculty based on their appropriate classification (non-tenure track, tenure track). The ratings follow the established campus and school criteria for tenure and long-term contract:

Outstanding: Truly exceptional performance.

Exemplary: Distinguished performance; readily acknowledged as a model to be followed.

Meritorious: Appreciably better than satisfactory but less than exemplary performance.

Satisfactory: Meets normal and expected professional standards.

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet the normal and expected professional standards.

New Faculty Member: Faculty in their first year of service do not receive an overall rating and are recommended for a raise equal to the average raise.

Research

- The Indiana University School of Education at Indianapolis *Values Concerning Scholarship* document describes our commitment to translational, transformative scholarship and its dissemination in a variety of outlets.
- Scholarly publications are counted only in the year that they are published.
- To receive a rating of *Meritorious* or higher, faculty should provide evidence of at least one publication or substantial progress on a major project such as a book or longitudinal study.
- Presenting scholarship at peer reviewed national/international conferences is valued and it is expected that presentation papers are disseminated in professional journals, chapters, and books.
- Invited and keynote speeches at national conferences reflect the growing recognition of scholarship and are highly valued.
- Credit for externally funded grants will be applied in the first year of an award. Credit awarded in subsequent years comes from disseminated scholarship (publications and presentations).

Teaching

- It is important that student evaluations are positive and consistent. One metric includes an average mean 4.0 or above on a 5 point scale on the Global Items (outstanding professor and outstanding class), along with evidence that faculty use student evaluations to improve practice.

- Engaging students in research, advising master's students, and serving on PhD program and dissertation committees is an expected and important contribution to the teaching mission in our school.
- Evidence of critical reflection in the form of course development and/or modification is expected.
- Peer reviews of teaching, preferably by persons holding a higher rank or FACET members, are strongly encouraged.

Service

- Faculty are expected to attend faculty meetings (IUPUI SOE and Core Campus), faculty annual retreats, and other all-faculty functions.
- National service to the discipline is expected as evidenced by membership in disciplinary organizations. Roles may include serving as a reviewer (journals or conference), on committees or boards, and attending annual conferences.
- Faculty are expected to serve on at least one IUPUI faculty governance or ad hoc committee, serve on one IU School of Education core campus committee, and actively contribute to the work of their program.
- Securing elected or appointed leadership roles in disciplinary national and international organizations is valued.
- Faculty taking on uncompensated leadership positions with the unit, school, or campus will be recognized for their additional service.

Annual Performance Review Values and Guidelines

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

The faculty review committee will make recommendations for ratings for each faculty based on their appropriate classification (non-tenure track, tenure track). The ratings follow the established campus and school criteria for tenure and long-term contract:

Outstanding: Truly exceptional performance.

Exemplary: Distinguished performance; readily acknowledged as a model to be followed.

Meritorious: Appreciably better than satisfactory but less than exemplary performance.

Satisfactory: Meets normal and expected professional standards.

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet the normal and expected professional standards.

New Faculty Member: Faculty in their first year of service do not receive an overall rating and are recommended for a raise equal to the average raise.

Teaching

- The Indiana University School of Education at Indianapolis *Values Concerning Scholarship* document describes our commitment to translational, transformative scholarship and its dissemination in a variety of outlets.
- It is important that student evaluations are positive and consistent. One metric includes average means around 4.0 out of a 5-point scale on the Global Items (outstanding professor and outstanding class), along with evidence that faculty use student evaluations to improve practice.
- Engaging students in research and service is valued as an important contribution to the teaching mission in our school.
- Evidence of critical reflection in the form of course development and/or modification is expected.
- Peer reviews of teaching, preferably by persons holding a higher rank or FACET member, are strongly encouraged.
- All faculty are expected to engage in scholarly work (Guidelines document, p. 17):
http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/_Assets/docs/promotion%20and%20tenure/PTGuidelinesCHANGES.pdf

In some instances, and particularly for the lecturer and clinical ranks, publication may not be the most effective or feasible means of disseminating the results of effective teaching practices or pedagogical research. When other forms of dissemination are more appropriate, this fact should be explained and those evaluating the candidate's work at the primary, unit, and campus levels should consider this alternative form of dissemination.

Evidence of scholarship includes:

- Publications, including peer reviewed publications
- Presentations at local, state and national conferences (involving students, if possible), and professional development workshops

- Curriculum development products and formats, including online
- Grants for program/curriculum development and innovation
- Books and book chapters
- Other forms of dissemination (e.g., webcasts, videos)
- Scholarly products will only be counted in the year of dissemination and all accepted or in press work will be counted in the subsequent year(s).

Service

- Faculty are expected to attend faculty meetings (IUPUI SOE and Core Campus), faculty annual retreat, and other all-faculty functions.
- Service to the discipline is required as evidenced by membership in local, regional, and national disciplinary organizations. Service may include being a reviewer (e.g., journals or conference) and serving on committees or boards.
- Faculty are expected to serve on at least one IUPUI faculty governance or ad hoc committee and provide professional service with K-12 school and/or community entities.
- Consistent service to the unit is expected in such forms as curriculum development and alignment, field-based support, developing and scoring program assessments, and coordinating functions.
- Faculty taking on uncompensated leadership positions with the unit, school, or campus will be recognized for their additional service to the school.

Appendix B

Materials Submitted as Attachments in FAR

Tenure-Line

Personal Statement—(2 page, single-spaced max)

- a) Position Description – List areas of research expertise and/or areas of excellence for promotion/tenure (pre-tenure only). Document your contracted teaching load, the actual teaching load for the year, and describe any formal administrative or program responsibilities that changed your contracted teaching load. Describe any summer courses taught and/or if you taught an overload.
- b) Research—Discuss the scholarship you worked on this year. Include a discussion of the number of pieces submitted, accepted, and published. Describe grant writing activities, conference presentations, and other scholarship activities in progress. Reference the page(s) on your CV or attachments where the presentations and/or articles appear.
- c) Teaching—Point out course innovations, collaborative efforts, and course improvements made based on your reflections from the previous semester/year. Cite attached syllabus, lesson plan, or related materials. Describe any pieces of scholarship of teaching and learning and reference the page(s) on your CV or attachments where the presentations and/or articles appear.
- d) Service—Describe service to the unit, school, campus, and field. Be sure to list your role and approximate time commitment. Reference the page in your CV where the service appears.

Curriculum Vitae - The CV should follow the IUPUI campus format.

Student Evaluations for all Courses. These should be consolidated into a single document.

One Course Syllabus and 1-page reflection. Submit 1 course syllabus that demonstrates changes or new course developments. Include 1-page reflection that demonstrates evidence of reflective practice; describe innovations, improvements, and collaboration. Point out where in the syllabus these are actualized (assignment, objectives, readings, etc.)

Copies of All Manuscripts. Submit PDF of all published, in press, and accepted work you reported in your personal statement.

Peer Review of Teaching (if conducted). Please ask your peer reviewer to complete the peer review and submit the SOE university recommended format.

Non-tenure Track and Visiting Faculty

Personal Statement - (2 page, single-spaced max)

- e) Position Description – Document your contracted teaching load, the actual teaching load for the year, and describe any formal administrative or program responsibilities that changed your contracted teaching load. Describe any summer courses taught and/or if you taught an overload.
- f) Teaching—Describe your accomplishments as they relate to teaching. Point out course innovations, collaborative efforts, and course improvements made based on your reflections from the previous semester/year. Cite attached syllabus, lesson plan, or related materials. Describe any pieces of scholarship of teaching and learning and reference the page(s) on your CV or attachments where the presentations and/or articles appear.
- g) Service—Describe service to the unit, school, campus, and field. Be sure to list your role and approximate time commitment. Reference the page in your CV where the service appears.

Curriculum vitae - The CV should follow the IUPUI Campus Format.

Student Evaluations for all Courses. These should be consolidated into a single document.

One Course Syllabus and 1-page reflection. Submit 1 course syllabus that demonstrates changes or new course developments. Include a 1-page reflection that demonstrates evidence of reflective practice; describe innovations, improvements, and collaboration. Point out where in the syllabus these are actualized (assignment, objectives, readings, etc.)

Copies of All Manuscripts/Presentations. Submit PDF of all published, in press, and accepted work you reported in your personal statement. If you presented at a conference, submit the abstract(s).

Peer Review of Teaching. Please ask your peer reviewer to complete the peer review and submit the SOE university recommended format.

Service Documentation. Provide any documentation of Service activities in a single consolidated document entitled (Last Name Service. doc) – e.g., relevant emails, formal letters of invitation, thank you notes for service, letters/certificates, etc.

IU School of Education, IUPUI

Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee

**Recommendations to Change the 99.18 Document
Regarding Non-Tenure Track Faculty Voting**

1. Non-tenure track faculty are not eligible to be program chairpersons, associate dean, or dean. They cannot vote in promotion and tenure decisions, including third year reviews, for tenure-track faculty.
2. Non-tenure track faculty (excluding visiting faculty) are eligible to participate and vote on faculty affairs committees, search committees, annual review committees, and non-tenure track promotions as long as the constitution of the committee is at least 60% tenured/tenure track faculty.



INDIANA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Office of Graduate Studies
Bloomington

13.40

To: Jack Cummings
Chair, Policy Council of the School of Education

From: Elizabeth Boling
Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, School of Education Bloomington
On behalf of the Graduate Studies Committee, School of Education

Date: 11/26/2012

On October 4, 2012, the Graduate Studies Committee (GSC) of the School of Education considered and passed unanimously a proposal brought forward by Dr. Keith Barton representing the Curriculum and Instruction Department to discontinue the Social Studies MAT program. The rationale for this proposal is copied below from Dr. Barton's memo to the committee.

GSC verified that the Curriculum and Instruction faculty reviewed and approved this proposal, and on behalf of the GSC I verified with Dean David Daleke of the University Graduate School that we are using the appropriate procedure to discontinue this program. We took this step because the MAT is granted by the University Graduate School even though, unlike all other MAT degrees at IUB, it is housed in the School of Education and not in the College of Arts & Sciences.

CC: Danielle Desawal, Chair, Graduate Studies Committee; Jane Kaho; Keith Barton; Lara Lackey; Avital Deskalo

Rationale:

- The program title and structure are misleading. In common usage, "MAT" refers to a degree that leads to teacher certification, but this program does not; it's simply a masters program that a student who is otherwise seeking certification (through Transition to Teacher or Community of Teachers) may simultaneously pursue. As a result, nearly every student who applies to the program does so in error, and they then have to be contacted to let them know that they really should have applied to one of our certification programs.
- As a masters program, the MAT duplicates other programs. Students seeking certification in social studies through T2T or COT can also enroll in the Masters in Social Studies Education, Masters in Elementary Education, or Masters in Secondary Education.
- Very few students enroll in the program—only two in the last four years. Both these students could have taken the same set of courses and received a masters degree in Social Studies Education rather than an MAT in Social Studies.
- Because the M.A.T. is "owned" by the Graduate School, but "housed" in the School of Education, there are a number of administrative complexities that make administering this program unduly complicated.
- No courses will be discontinued as a result of the discontinuation of this program.

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Graduate Studies Committee
 Danielle DeSawal, Chair of GSC
 Elizabeth Boling, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies

From: IU School of Education at IUPUI
 Beth Berghoff, Interim Coordinator of Online Programs

Date: December 28, 2012

Re: Advising Sheets for *Masters in Science in Elementary Education with a Focus on Technology* and *Masters in Science in Secondary Education with a Focus on Technology*

In 2011, the School of Education at IUPUI requested and received Policy Council approval of a packet of masters degree advising sheets redesigned to reflect three tracks (subplans) for the *Masters of Science (MS) in Elementary Education* and *MS in Secondary Education*. These tracks were in *Urban Education*, *Technology*, and *Early Childhood*.

It has come to light that the advising sheet for the *Focus on Technology* track did not reflect the fact that students would earn either a degree in *Elementary Education* or *Secondary Education*. The single advising sheet included in the packet was incorrectly headed as a *Masters in Education with a Focus on Technology*. It should actually have been two separate advising sheets—one for the *MS in Elementary Education with a Focus on Technology* and one for the *MS in Secondary Education with the Focus on Technology*.

To rectify this situation, we request approval of the two attached advising sheets.

Additional Notes

Once we have accurate, approved advising sheets for these existing residential programs, we will file a Request for New Subplans to the *Graduate Affairs Committee (GAC)* at IUPUI. Once approved, these subplans will be printed on students' transcripts and allow accurate tracking of students in our data bases.

The *MS in Elementary Education* will include the subplans of:

- General
- Focus on Urban Education
- Focus on Technology
- Focus on Early Childhood

The *MS in Secondary Education* will include the subplans of:

- General
- Focus on Urban Education
- Focus on Technology



Masters of Science in Elementary Education
with a focus on TECHNOLOGY
Indiana University School of Education at IUPUI

Name _____
ID # _____
Advisor _____

Email _____
Admission Date _____
Last Reviewed _____

APPROVED PROGRAM OF STUDY

Student should make an appointment with assigned Faculty Advisor soon after admission to the program.

Faculty Advisor must approve all courses taken in the program of study.

At the time of graduation, no course-work may be more than seven (7) years old.

No more than nine (9) credits can be transferred from an accredited institution. Official transcripts for these courses must be submitted to Dee Outlaw, School of Education, and approved by the Faculty Advisor.

Courses accepted by the Faculty Advisor as substitutions or transfers should be noted on this form.

Students should complete an *Intent to Graduate Form* when registering for their last class in program.

<http://education.iupui.edu/soe/forms/applications.aspx>

Faculty Advisor will submit this completed Program of Study to Dee Outlaw when student is in final course of the program.

COHORT DESIGN

Students join a cohort and take all the courses in a planned sequence. New cohorts start each spring semester.

Students take 2 courses (6 credit hours a semester). The program takes 2 years to complete.

Students in this cohort program may transfer only up to six credit hours of previously completed coursework that is similar or equivalent to courses in this program. Courses and course substitutions must be approved by the advisor in writing.

PROGRAM OF STUDY		Sem. Credit
INQUIRY (9 credits)		
EDUC Y520 Strategies for Educational Inquiry		3
EDUC Y510 Action Research (Prerequisite Y520)		3
EDUC T590 Independent Study in Urban Education		3
INCLUSIVE PEDAGOGY (12 credit hours) Effective teaching and learning in relationship to the content demands of today's standards and assessments.		
EDUC T531 Organizational Change in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Schools		3
EDUC P507 Assessment in Schools		3
EDUC T524 Diverse Perspectives on Families		3
EDUC J500 Instruction in the Context of Curriculum		3
TECHNOLOGY (15 credit hours) Effective infusion of technology in instruction, networking, and communication in an increasingly global society.		
EDUC W531 Computers in Education		3
EDUC W540 Computers in the Curriculum		3
EDUC W550 Research in Instructional Computing		3
EDUC W520 Instructional Technology		3
EDUC W515 Technology Leadership		3



Masters of Science in Secondary Education
with a focus on TECHNOLOGY
Indiana University School of Education at IUPUI

Name _____
ID # _____
Advisor _____

Email _____
Admission Date _____
Last Reviewed _____

APPROVED PROGRAM OF STUDY

Student should make an appointment with assigned Faculty Advisor soon after admission to the program.

Faculty Advisor must approve all courses taken in the program of study.

At the time of graduation, no course-work may be more than seven (7) years old.

No more than nine (9) credits can be transferred from an accredited institution. Official transcripts for these courses must be submitted to Dee Outlaw, School of Education, and approved by the Faculty Advisor.

Courses accepted by the Faculty Advisor as substitutions or transfers should be noted on this form.

Students should complete an *Intent to Graduate Form* when registering for their last class in program.
<http://education.iupui.edu/soe/forms/applications.aspx>

Faculty Advisor will submit this completed Program of Study to Dee Outlaw when student is in final course of the program.

COHORT DESIGN

Students join a cohort and take all the courses in a planned sequence. New cohorts start each spring semester.

Students take 2 courses (6 credit hours a semester). The program takes 2 years to complete.

Students in this cohort program may transfer only up to six credit hours of previously completed coursework that is similar or equivalent to courses in this program. Courses and course substitutions must be approved by the advisor in writing.

PROGRAM OF STUDY		Sem. Credit
INQUIRY (9 credits)		
EDUC Y520 Strategies for Educational Inquiry	3	
EDUC Y510 Action Research (Prerequisite Y520)	3	
EDUC T590 Independent Study in Urban Education	3	
INCLUSIVE PEDAGOGY (12 credit hours) Effective teaching and learning in relationship to the content demands of today's standards and assessments.		
EDUC T531 Organizational Change in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Schools	3	
EDUC P507 Assessment in Schools	3	
EDUC T524 Diverse Perspectives on Families	3	
EDUC J500 Instruction in the Context of Curriculum	3	
TECHNOLOGY (15 credit hours) Effective infusion of technology in instruction, networking, and communication in an increasingly global society.		
EDUC W531 Computers in Education	3	
EDUC W540 Computers in the Curriculum	3	
EDUC W550 Research in Instructional Computing	3	
EDUC W520 Instructional Technology	3	
EDUC W515 Technology Leadership	3	

Proposal for Approved Doctoral Minor in Adult Education

The Minor in Adult Education provides a 12 credit hour Minor designed to meet the needs of doctoral students in all areas of the IU School of Education and other doctoral degrees on campus. The below courses represent the minimum requirements for a Minor. The student's Minor advisor will work with the student to develop a question suitable for the qualifying exam format. Students will be provided with the question and will be given two weeks to a month to complete and turn the response into the Minor advisor. A student cannot use work that was written for a course (e.g. a course paper) to fulfill the minor qualifying exam requirement.

I. Core Adult Education (Choose 9 hours)

D500 Introduction to Adult Education Theory	3 hrs.
D505 Adult Learning through the Lifespan	3 hrs.
D506 Program Planning in Adult Education	3 hrs.
D512 Seminar in Forms and Forces in Adult Education	3 hrs.

II. Advanced Courses in Adult Education (Choose 3 hours)

D600 The Teaching/Learning Transaction in Adult Education	3 hrs.
D613 Adult and Continuing Education in Collegiate Settings	3 hrs.
D625 Topical Seminar in Adult Education	3 hrs.
Other Electives approved by AE Faculty Committee Member	

Doctoral Minor in Adult Education

Name: _____

SIDN: _____

Email: _____

Major department: _____

You need to file this form with the IST office when you decide to minor with us. You need a minor advisor within a year of beginning your minor in Adult Education. Return this form with your advisor's signature to ED 2276.

Minor Advisor: _____

(Signature)

Date

Program of Studies for minor

Core Adult Education (Choose 9 hours)

Course	Hours	Title
D500	3	Introduction to Adult Education Theory
D505	3	Adult Learning through the Lifespan
D506	3	Program Planning in Adult Education
D512	3	Seminar in Forms and Forces in Adult Education

Advanced Courses in Adult Education (Choose at least 3 hours)

Course	Hours	Title
D600	3	Teaching/Learning Transaction in Adult Education
D613	3	Adult and Continuing Education in Collegiate Settings
D625	3	Topical Seminar in Adult Education
<i>Other advanced adult education elective may be approved by AE advisor</i>		

Teacher Education Degrees Proposed for Elimination or Consolidation

TO: SoE Policy Council

FROM: Robert Kunzman, Associate Dean for Teacher Education, IUB

DATE: 23 January 2013

RE: IUB Teacher Education Degrees Proposed for Elimination or Consolidation

Changes below were in response to a request from the IHEC, and were approved by the IUB Committee on Teacher Education on 17 January 2013.

Elimination:

13.1206 – B.S.Ed. in Kindergarten/Primary Education (no longer used)

13.1316 – B.S.Ed. in General Science/Earth-Space Science (students enrolled in that degree program will be moved to the new Earth Science major under the B.S. in Secondary Education)

Consolidation:

all secondary education subject-area majors (e.g., biology education, social studies education, etc.) will be subsumed by 13.1205 – B.S.Ed. in Secondary Education

a new degree in World Languages will be created, and the all-grades foreign language education majors (e.g., Spanish education, French education, etc.) will be included in it

MINUTES
POLICY COUNCIL
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
January 30, 2013
1:00-3:00 p.m.
IUB – Room 2140
IUPUI – Room 3138E

What follows is a summary of speaker contributions

Members Present: D. Cross, J. Cummings, J. Damico, D. DeSawal, S. Eckes, E. Galindo, N. Flowers, K. King Thorius, C. Morton, D. Winikates **Alternate Members Present:** Y. Cho, D. Danns **Student Members Present:** O. Hopf, M. Remstad **Dean's Staff Present:** J. Alexander, E. Boling, G. Gonzalez, R. Kunzman, P. Rogan, R. Sherwood **Visitors Present:** B. Berghoff, J. Blackwell, T. Brush, S. Power-Carter

I. Approval of the Minutes from December 12, 2012 Meeting (13.34M)

D. Cross moved to approve the minutes as presented, and D. DeSawal seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

II. Dean's Report

G. Gonzalez discussed an initiative on the Bloomington campus to undertake a study of faculty productivity with Academic Analytics. This service aggregates publicly accessible data regarding number of publications, citations, grants, awards, etc. The data are broken down in a number of ways, including by program and department. Their data allow universities to compare this information both internally and with data from other institutions.

The School of Education was recently asked to confirm a list of all tenure-track faculty and research scientists to verify alignment with the official record in the school. Only a limited turnaround time was given, and there were problems with alignment between their record and program/degree affiliation for each faculty member. These issues are being resolved with the Office of Academic Affairs. The study is driven by the Trustees' interest in generating measures of academic productivity. This interest supports the current emphasis on systematic program reviews.

J. Alexander said that this study with Academic Analytics is only taking place in Bloomington at this time. The intention is not to create rankings but to provide comparative feedback. Departments can weigh scholarly contributions differently based on program-specific needs; for example, books can be given more weight than journal articles. This is a private company which contracts with universities to offer this service.

G. Gonzalez provided updates on the current State General Assembly session. During budget discussions, public comments so far indicate a strong interest in channeling more resources into K-12 education, which was cut severely during the recession. Further investment in higher education is also being explored. Some observers are skeptical because the amounts do not approach the amount of money previously cut, but this session may be the first time we will see an increase in state appropriations for education in several years.

Several committees have discussed or passed bills of concern to educators. The House Education Committee passed HB 1357, which eliminates the requirement that superintendents have a superintendent license or teaching experience. G. Gonzalez referred to a critical column by Dan Carpenter in the Indianapolis Star published that morning, who argued that this legislation would lower standards for education. Another bill under consideration (HB 1251) would remove the requirement that at least four members of the State Board of Education hold teaching licenses and be employed by Indiana school corporations. The bill would also eliminate the requirement that no more than six members of the board be from the same political party. The governor could appoint non-educators from the same political party to all ten positions. In addition, a bill has been introduced that would withdraw Indiana from the Core Standards, which have been framed by its opponents as a federal intrusion. Many other bills have been introduced relevant to education, and some of them may never make it past committee. Overall, the impact of many recently introduced education bills would be to minimize the role of educators in policy determinations and undermine the role of the new Superintendent of Public Instruction. Concerned parties should keep abreast of these developments and express their opinions as appropriate.

III. Diversity Topic

S. Power-Carter, Director of the Neal-Marshall Black Culture Center, presented the diversity topic. She discussed the Center's activities and goals. Its mission focuses on academic excellence, recruitment, retention, and community building. The Center sponsors many social activities, cultural activities, and community events. Staff are available to give tours to prospective students and provide advising to help students successfully make the transition to college. The Center is currently working on ways to build connectedness using online resources.

The Center and the School of Education sponsor the African-American Read-In. About 150 high school students attend and read about African-American experience, followed by a college panel intended to give students the opportunity to ask questions. S. Power-Carter initiated this annual event 11 years ago.

IV. New Business

J. Blackwell requested that the agenda be modified to present the IUPUI Faculty and Budgetary Affairs items in a more logical order.

a. IUPUI Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Voting Proposal (13.39)

J. Blackwell presented background information on this proposal to change the 99.18 School of Education policy regarding voting on committees by clinical faculty. The document as presented to Policy Council was the result of a great deal of deliberation and comes as an urgent request because the faculty annual review committees need to begin their evaluations to meet campus deadlines. The Faculty and Budgetary Affairs committee researched past policies, current IUPUI and university policy, and practices of other schools at IUPUI. In discussions between IUB's and IUPUI's FABA committees, the main area of disagreement centered on the percentage of non-tenure-track faculty permitted to vote on the committees affected by the changes. A 70/30 number was discussed, but IUPUI FABA is asking for a vote on 60/40.

J. Alexander and G. Gonzalez discussed the history of the 99.18 document and subsequent changes in IUB, IUPUI, and university policy. 99.18 restricts non-tenure-track faculty from voting on review committees, search committees, and faculty affairs committees. Both FABA committees agreed that portions of this document do not seem consistent with the current procedures and the Policy Council constitution; for example, 4 of the 12 voting faculty members on Policy Council may be clinical faculty. At the time 99.18 was adopted, the School of Education followed IUB policy in restricting the composition of the faculty to 80% tenure-track. Since that time, university policy places no restrictions on the composition of the faculty but mandates a 60% tenure-track requirement for voting on committees. The question at hand today was not the composition of the faculty overall but rather voting privileges on committees. The IUB FABA was generally in agreement that clinical faculty should vote in more capacities than specified by 99.18 but disagreed on the committee voting percentage.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding this proposal. Major topics of discussion included the following:

- There is a need to seek input from the faculty and further discuss the School of Education's 80/20 composition policy, which is a separate issue from voting privileges on committees. About 60% of IUPUI School of Education faculty are tenure-track, while the figure for IUB is 90%. The School of Education at IUB is unusual in its high percentage of tenure-track faculty compared to other units in Bloomington.
- The document could benefit from clarification on non-tenure-track faculty

participation on annual review committees. It was the intention that non-tenure-track faculty could participate on annual review committees, including those for tenure-track faculty. It was noted that these committees are advisory in nature. Concerns were raised regarding this specific proposal.

- The term “program chairperson” was discussed, as this role functions differently at IUPUI than at IUB. IUPUI currently has clinical faculty serving in this role but plans to transition away from this practice.

D. DeSawal proposed a friendly amendment to provide clarification in the document without making substantive changes. In paragraph 1, *participate* should be replaced with *vote*. The phrase *non-tenure track promotions* and the parenthesis *including tenure track faculty* should be removed in paragraph 2. The phrase *and non-tenure track promotions* should be added following *annual review committees*. The friendly amendment was accepted. As amended, the document reads:

1. Non-tenure track faculty are not eligible to be program chairpersons, associate dean, or dean. They cannot vote in promotion and tenure decisions, including third year reviews, for tenure-track faculty.

2. Non-tenure-track faculty (excluding visiting faculty) are eligible to participate and vote on faculty affairs committees, search committees, annual review committees, and non-tenure-track promotions as long as the constitution of the committee is at least 60% tenured/tenure-track faculty.

A vote was taken on the amended document, effective for IUPUI alone. *Outcome:* Passed with 7 in favor, 3 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

b. IUPUI Proposal for Annual Faculty Review (13.38)

J. Blackwell explained proposed changes to the faculty annual review policy at IUPUI. Most significantly, the document defines the composition of the annual review committee as three tenure-track faculty and two non-tenure track faculty at the doctoral level. The committee is asking for approval of the first three pages of the document. The appendices are supplemental material and still under discussion.

Questions were asked regarding the committee composition requirement given the results of the previous vote and the composition of the faculty overall. It was noted that IUPUI is moving toward increasing its percentage of tenure-track faculty. Various alternatives were proposed to the presented language which account for potential changes in the composition of the faculty. A friendly amendment was proposed to replace the two non-

tenure-track faculty requirement with “at least one full-time non-tenure-track faculty at the doctoral level with a long-term contract.” In addition, several minor changes were proposed. The abbreviation “ADRAA” should be written instead as “Associate Dean for Research and Academic Affairs.” References to Appendix A should be removed. Finally, on p. 3 of the document, the research criterion for a Meritorious rating should be revised to specify that it only applies to “research active tenure and tenure-track faculty.”

A vote was taken on the amended document. *Outcome:* Passed unanimously.

c. IUPUI Proposal for Allocation of Faculty Time (13.36)

J. Blackwell explained how this proposal was made to better specify and account for the role of non-tenure track faculty. The policy had been shared with the IUPUI Dean of Faculties, who had no objections. Each school is responsible for determining its own workload policies.

A minor correction was noted; the second sentence should only state “IUB’s current practice is a 3-3 load” (the first part of the sentence should be removed).

A vote was taken on the corrected document. *Outcome:* Passed unanimously.

d. IUPUI Proposal for University Teaching by Graduate Students (13.37)

J. Blackwell explained that this proposal allows doctoral students to co-teach courses.

There were no questions or comments. *Outcome:* Passed unanimously.

e. Discontinue M.A.T. in Social Studies (13.40)

E. Boling discussed this proposal to eliminate a redundant degree. The M.A.T. in Social Studies is the only degree owned by the University Graduate School but administered by the School of Education. This introduces unnecessary complexity, and no compelling reason exists for students to major in this program.

There were no questions or comments. A vote was taken on the original motion from the Graduate Studies Committee. *Outcome:* Passed with three abstentions.

f. IUPUI Proposed Change for Masters in Education (Technology Focus) to Masters in Elementary Education with Focus on Technology and Masters in Secondary Education with Focus on Technology (13.41)

B. Berghoff discussed this proposal to replace single advising sheets with two separate Elementary and Secondary Education advising sheets, each with a focus in technology.

G. Gonzalez asked why these advising sheets are identical. It was explained that the technology courses are identical, and approval of these sheets will allow IUPUI to request a technology subplan that will appear on students' transcripts. These do not represent separate degrees but an additional subplan in technology. Plans for an online program can move forward once these changes to the residential program advising sheets are in place.

A vote was taken on the original motion from the Graduate Studies Committee.

Outcome: Passed unanimously.

g. Proposal for Doctoral Minor in Adult Education (13.42)

T. Brush presented this proposal for a 12 credit online minor which consists of courses that have all already been offered in Adult Education. Any doctoral student in the School of Education may consider this minor.

P. Rogan asked about the current reliance on emeriti faculty and lecturers. T. Brush explained that the emeriti faculty are available as minor advisors, and J. Alexander said that the Adult Education program will have more tenure-track faculty in the future.

A vote was taken on the original motion from the Graduate Studies Committee.

Outcome: Passed with one abstention.

h. Proposal from CoTE regarding Degree Closure Strategy (13.43)

R. Kunzman discussed the ICHE's request that schools discontinue low enrollment degrees. The IUB Committee on Teacher Education proposes eliminating the Kindergarten / Primary Education degree, which is no longer used. In addition, several content areas will be consolidated into the Secondary Education degree, and a new degree in World Languages will be created. The new degree proposal is forthcoming. Total enrollment in these consolidated degrees will allow for continuation of the programs.

A vote was taken on the original motion from the IUB Committee on Teacher Education.

Outcome: Passed unanimously.

**** The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m. ****