Minutes from Meeting
10:00am-11:30am
Rooms 2102 (Bloomington) and 3138B (Indy)

Members Present: Danielle DeSawal, Kylie Peppler, Valarie Akerson, Elizabeth Boling, Amy Trauth-Nare, Rob Helfenbein, Susie Sloffer, Ghangis Carter, Martha Nyikos, and Ray Haynes

Absent: Luise McCarty, Lara Lackey, Thu Suong Thi Nguyen, and Samantha Paredes Scribner
Staff: Avital Deskalo

Presenters: Joyce Alexander, Mary Waldron, Marjorie Manifold, Carmen Medina, and Josh Smith

I.   New Business
   A. **New Course Request P685-** Mary Waldron provided a brief overview of course P685. She explained that this topical seminar fills in the gaps of the students' training and covers theoretical advances in the field that are not covered in the other courses. The students are required to attend monthly mentoring sessions that cover the same topics that will be discussed in the seminars; therefore, the students will now receive credit for the mentoring session they were required to attend. Waldron then discussed the structure of the course. One of the aspects of the course is to give the students an opportunity to present their research in various stages. Further, there will be written assignments based upon readings and pop quiz style assignments to prepare the students for qualifying exams.

   The committee members raised a few questions about the course. Martha Nyikos asked if P685 would follow the inquiry set of courses? Waldron responded that this course is a separate course and she explained that it was developmental research methodology. Nyikos then asked if there was a similar course already offered and Waldron said there wasn't a similar course in educational psychology. Waldron continued that it is already required that students attend a group mentoring but now they will get credit for it. Ray Haynes asked what developmental means? Waldron explained that it was a broad term that encompassed longitudinal, multi-method, family research from the tradition of developmental science, such as the diathesis-stress model. Additionally, the course is meant to help the students develop as researchers. Nyikos asked how long the students have to complete the 6 credits? Waldron said they have 3 years and can take the course up to 6 times. She also said that there is a handbook that will be finalized that spells out when they take the credits.

   Next, Kylie Peppler stated that her program had a one credit pro-seminar and then switched the course to a three credit pro-seminar. Peppler found that one credit didn't allow for flexibility so she inquired what Waldron's rationale was for the one credit pro-seminar. Waldron indicated that the program chose one credit for practical reasons; for example, the faculty are already teaching all the courses allowed, and it is a small program with three full-time faculty members, and creating a course with that much contact over three years with three credits would be really challenging. Before the discussion ended, Danielle DeSawal informed Waldron that her program would have to submit a revised program of study and bring that to the GSC.

> ➢ *Martha Nyikos motioned to approve new course request EDUC-P685 as presented.*
> ➢ *Kylie Peppler seconded the motion.*
> ➢ *All in favor.*

B. **New Course Request Z535**- Marjorie Manifold presented the new course request for Z535. Manifold explained that Z535 is an elective course and it is the first course that she's seen on methods in dealing with online studio art. She continued that more professors have to move to online teaching and studio art can be performed online. Z535 is going to be paired with a field experience (built into the content) in which students from M135 will see how online art is conducted. Additionally, this course can be broadened to other C&I students as more courses in science and social studies include studio components. There were no questions or concerns regarding the course. Before the committee voted, Danielle DeSawal mentioned that Z535 was just an elective so it's not required and there won't need to be any changes to the curriculum.

> ➢ *Valarie Akerson motioned to approve new course request EDUC-Z535 as presented.*
> ➢ *Susie Sloffer seconded the motion.*
> ➢ *All in favor.*

C. **Course Change Requests L545 and L549-** Carmen Medina presented the course change requests for courses L545 and L549. She indicated that these courses were changing due to the Department of Education (DOE) requirement and new Teacher Education standards for transitions in literacy courses. Medina continued that L545 and L549 were both renamed to include reading in the title. The other change is related to the title and content, which is a re-distribution of content across the two courses. Additionally, it is easier and more effective to have one course emphasis on intermediate literacy and writing and one course on primary literacy and writing. Next, Susie Sloffer inquired how the course would look on a student's transcript with the truncated titles, which currently reads ADV STDY IN TCHING RDG and LA: INTERMEDIATE (L545) and ADV STDY IN TCHING RDG and LA: PRIMARY (L549)? Sloffer continued that since elementary is no longer in the title, would it be obvious that primary and intermediate are related to elementary? Kylie Peppler suggested that it could it say K-3 instead of primary and 4-6 instead of intermediate. Martha Nyikos suggested adding a slash or ampersand and removing the "and," which would save a little space. Before the committee voted, Rob Helfenbein mentioned that the DOE is still making more changes. Medina said she was aware but her program needs to make these first round of changes now.

> ➢ *Ray Haynes motioned to approve EDUC- L549 with the following changes: under item # 9a and 9b, remove "and", replace it with a slash, and remove primary, and replace it with K-3.*
> ➢ *Martha Nyikos seconded the motion.*
> ➢ *All in favor.*
> ➢ *Martha Nyikos motioned to approve EDUC- L545 with the following changes: under item #9a and 9b, remove "and", replace it with a slash, and remove intermediate, and replace it with 4-6.*
> ➢ *Amy Trauth-Nare seconded the motion.*

> ➤ *All in favor.*

D. <u>**Course Change Request E594-**</u> The only change is the credit hours from fixed at 3 to variable from 1-3 to add flexibility to this course. Susie Sloffer has checked to make sure everything else is accurate and there were no concerns. The committee did not have any questions or concerns regarding the course change.

> ➤ *Martha Nyikos motioned to approve EDUC- E594 as presented.*
> ➤ *Susie Sloffer seconded the motion.*
> ➤ *All in favor.*

E. <u>**Matching Course Request Y604-**</u> Before some questions were raised about Y604, Danielle DeSawal briefly specified that the Carmin system is indicating that Y604 is a new course, but it is really a matching course that is just being replicated on the IUPUI campus. Everything else on the form is identical to the course form at IUB. Next, Susie Sloffer asked why the form indicates that there is an equivalent course (STAT52800) for Y604? Josh Smith, who is presenting the matching course request, said he wasn't sure and inquired how is that handled typically? Sloffer suggested that this would need a faculty level approval. Inquiry faculty need to vet the course and say it is roughly equivalent to the STAT52800 so Sloffer will know that this course will count under the inquiry core. If STAT52800 is equivalent, then students can take that course instead of Y604. Given this fact, Elizabeth Boling asked Smith if he would want to include STAT52800 as an equivalent course? Smith indicated that someone advised him to include it as equivalent because STAT52800 is the same course as Y604. Smith also stated that this course and a course in medicine would count if Y604 were not offered. He chose not to put the equivalent course in medicine because it is not offered frequently.

Danielle DeSawal recommended taking the equivalent course out of the document. If the equivalent course issue is brought up during remonstrance, Smith can think about creating an equivalent course list as the program develops on the IUPUI campus to ensure that students can fulfill the inquiry requirement. However, then Boling raised the concern that even if the equivalent course is taken out, someone might inquire why two exact same courses are offered if there is no course description on the form indicating they are different. Smith responded that in order for the program to be approved, the Commission of Higher Education required that the program add Y604 as the second statistic course. DeSawal added that leaving the equivalent course on the form could lead students to self-select the STAT course if it is more convenient. Smith agreed to remove the equivalent course from the document. The committee also recommended that Smith add the course description to the document so everyone will know that the two courses (Y604 and STAT52800) are not exactly the same.

> ➤ *Ray Haynes motioned to approve EDUC-Y604 as a matching course for the IUPUI campus with the following changes: remove equivalent course under item #17, STAT 52800, and under item #16, populate the course description with the exact wording of Y604 that is listed in the bulletin currently in Bloomington.*
> ➤ *Susie Sloffer seconded the motion.*
> ➤ *All in favor.*

Follow-up after the committee meeting: Josh Smith was unable to fill the course description box (item #16) within the Carmin system.

F. <u>**Certificate in Technology for Learning-**</u> Joshua Smith provided a brief overview of the certificate. He explained that this certificate is likely to be the first of several certificates. It is a 15-credit hour certificate, which has a core of courses that introduce blended courses in hybrid and on-line settings. Smith continued that the certificate is particularly relevant for high school teachers, in light of the superintendent's decision to require students to enroll in at least one online course. Additionally, the second part of the certificate allows for some flexibility. Furthermore, the admission requirements are similar to requirements at IUPUI and the learning assessment outcomes are listed. Also, all the courses are offered on campus and the faculty has been working with Rob Helfenbein and Joanna Ray, who is the director of technology programs at IUPUI.

Next, the committee raised several questions about the program. Danielle asked if the W505 is a variable title? Susie Sloffer said yes, but we might want to get new course numbers for the course because students can only take W505 a certain number of times. However, for now, there is no problem with using the current course numbers. Then, Kylie Pepper asked if Smith could expand on the certificate because there is some overlap with the title and other certificate courses. The other certificates were described first. Elizabeth Boling explained that the Computer Educator's License Technology (CELT) certificate is very precisely aimed at teachers who want to take technology positions. She continued that the certificate includes a leadership course, perhaps R530, but she isn't sure. Boling then explained that the IST certificate is a 15-credit certificate and is essentially the core courses in the IST as a Master's program plus an elective. She continued that this certificate is for a broader audience of students who are looking to teach online. The certificate helps them to acquire the basic principles in technology. Peppler discussed that the certificate in Learning Sciences, Media and Technology (LSMT) is more into theories and more for graduate study than for continued professional development. Haynes expressed similar concerns regarding the overlap; he isn't sure what the course W520 covers nor is there enough information to distinguish between the IST and LSMT certificates and Technology for Learning certificate. Boling expressed that the certificate is going to the state level and one of things the state requires is that there are no duplicate programs. However, she mentioned that there can be some overlap but there needs to be clear distinctions too.

Next, Danielle DeSawal asked the committee for a recommendation of action for this certificate? Sloffer suggested that perhaps conversations about the similarities of the certificates would need to take place before the certificate is approved. Furthermore, DeSawal indicated section 8 should be delineated so there is a clear understanding of what this certificate offers and provide some illustration on how the certificates are different. Additionally, DeSawal noticed that the first paragraph of section 8 *(The 15 credit hours in this program will all count toward a master's degree in the existing Education in Elementary and Secondary with a Focus on Technology program)* could flag for the state because that program hasn't been approved yet as an online delivery Master's program. DeSawal continued that this is important because 15 credits of that program already could put the Master's close to 50% of courses offered online, and if 50% or more of courses are

offered online, the Master's program will need to be approved as online delivery. Also, Peppler suggested that it should be made clear in section 2 that a student can only choose one column.

Then, Smith asked if someone could send him some information on the other certificates and information on enrollment, capacity, how are these courses marketed, and who is attracted to these courses? Boling said that would be fine and indicated that our marketing is through IUconnectED, and Smith should get in touch with Beth Smith who works with IUconnectED. At this point, Haynes expressed that IUconnectED is competing for students and there should be a future discussion about IUconnectED's online strategies, how it plans to use IUPUI as opposed to IUB, and how it can move forward in the current environment. Smith recommended that a discussion about IUconnectED should be an agenda item in the spring. Then, DeSawal suggested that Beth Smith and Josh Smith should have a discussion about the current certificate programs and create a grid that encompasses what certificates Smith created and how the certificates are aligned with current certificates. At the end of the discussion, Smith said that he was going to send Danielle the list of certificates that have been approved at IUPUI and currently need approval at the school level. Also, Smith will meet with Tom Brush, Kylie Peppler, and Ray Haynes to talk about the certificate. The GSC/RAFA committee did not take any action on the Technology for Learning certificate.

II. **Review/approval of minutes from November 22, 2011**
   - ➢ *Susie Sloffer motioned to approve the minutes from November 22, 2011.*
   - ➢ *Amy Trauth-Nare seconded the motion.*
   - ➢ *All in favor.*

III. Discussion Items
   A. **Developing process for graduate program reviews-** Joyce Alexander attended the meeting to discuss creating a process for graduate program reviews. She requested of the committee, or a sub-committee of the GSC/RAFA, to create a structure to help the School of Education conduct the program reviews. Alexander continued that the sub-committee would set parameters for the program reviews, such as determining how many reviewers, where they would come from, should there be internal and external reviewers, what the sub-committee would accept as a good review, the type of questions that should be asked of the programs, and setting a timeline for every program.

   Next, the committee raised several questions. Danielle DeSawal asked which programs would be reviewed? Alexander stated all programs would be reviewed that were not on the NCATE or APA list. Elizabeth Boling asked if certificate programs would be reviewed; Alexander said no. Then, Martha Nyikos asked if programs with both Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees would be reviewed? Alexander responded that if they are the same program they might be reviewed concurrently. She added that all core campus Master's, Ed.D., and Ph.D. programs would be reviewed. Furthermore, Alexander stated that the sub-committee should ask the program if they would like to have the degrees reviewed together. Next, Nyikos inquired if there was a sample document of the questions for the program review. Alexander answered that the only one in the past is Learning Sciences, but it did not include questions about learning outcomes. Ray Haynes suggested that the new document

encompass questions about learning outcomes, perceptions of program, etc. Alexander added that the sub-committee would need to devise a plan by the end of the school year because the first programs will go under review next year. Next, DeSawal asked if the document should go to Policy Council; Alexander said yes. Then, Rob Helfenbein asked if the Urban Education Program would go under review? Alexander responded that the Urban Education program would be reviewed down the road. Before the discussion ended, DeSawal asked the committee to think about who would be interested in joining the sub-committee.

B. **Committee assignments: Beechler, Dissertation of the Year Award, Fellowships, and graduate program review process-** Martha Nyikos, Elizabeth Boling, and Danielle DeSawal volunteered to participate on the sub-committee to create a process for graduate program reviews. Martha Nyikos tentatively volunteered Luise McCarty to be on that sub-committee as well.

The committee meeting ended at 11:45 am. The next committee meeting will take place on Tuesday, January 31st, at 10am.