Minutes from Meeting
9:00am-10:30am
Rooms 2102 (Bloomington) and 3138E (Indianapolis)

Members Present: Danielle DeSawal, Beth Berghoff, Elizabeth Boling, Katie Cierniak, Thu Suong Thi Nguyen, Robin Hughes, Susie Sloffer, Ghangis Carter, Valarie Akerson, and Ray Haynes

Absent: Kylie Peppler (on leave for the semester), Luise McCarty (on sabbatical), Jesse Steinfeldt, and Martha Nyikos
Staff: Avital Deskalo

Presenters: Curt Bonk, Danielle DeSawal, Barbara Bichelmeyer, and Keith Barton

I.   New Business[1]
   A. New Course Request: R678- Curt Bonk presented this agenda item to the committee. This course was first taught as a topical seminar on the IUB and IUPUI campus in coordination with Dr. Ken Haye. Bonk briefly commented on the evolution of the course; he explained that the course initially focused on cognitive perspectives in using technology in science, reading, and math. Then in the early 90s, this course evolved to focus on e-learning and blending learning. Finally, it is now expanding to include various types of technology, such as Second Life Wikis, digital books, and e-books. This course will be offered in person and online. Bonk considers this course learner-centered; he offers a variety of options to students so they can pursue what they want. For example, if students want to focus on K-12 and look into the use of iPads and how to integrate them into science classes, they have the means to explore that topic in this class.

   Next, he discussed the rationale for the course. Bonk indicated that now that the course will be official, rather than a topical seminar, students are more likely to get enrollment approval from their professors. This aspect is important because students from different programs (CLIS, Telecom, Informatics, and ELPs) enroll in this course. Additionally, Bonk reported that with the course title Emerging Learning Technologies, more students were signing up because this title exists on another campuses. Therefore, students can teach this course on other campuses in the future. Bonk also mentioned that since the EdD program is online, R678 will be an important class for these students.

   The committee opened up the floor for questions and comments. Robin Hughes asked if this would be good for a two-course sequence given all the readings in the 64-page syllabus, although some aren't required. Bonk stated that he's not expecting the students to read more than 5-10% of the syllabus. Everyone reads three articles a week and four "Tidbits," which Bonk includes to show that everyone (i.e., New York Times

---

[1] New courses R678 and R563 were approved by the IST Faculty committee on May 3, 2012.

and other news sources) is talking about technology. Students are also required to provide a summary on the "Tidbits." The syllabus is long to accommodate different student interests; there is not that much more work, just more choice. Next, Thu Suong Thi Nguyen mentioned that the syllabus does not reflect the R678 course number. Danielle DeSawal indicated that a few items on the course request form needed to be changed as well, such as adding web-based to the instructional mode under item #20 and adding percentages to ESI #5.

Before the committee voted, Bonk asked the IUPUI members if they knew whom he could contact to offer his courses at IUPUI. Monique Simms is the new person to contact at IUPUI. Also, DeSawal offered to help because she teaches a class in video-conference mode with students from IUB and IUPUI. Bonk thought it would be a good idea to meet with her.

> ➢ *Susie Sloffer motioned to approve new course request EDUC- R-678 with the following changes: Curt Bonk will go back to add additional instructional modes to #20 to reflect the online nature of the course, he will change ESI 5 to include percentages for the assignments listed, and he will make the change on the syllabus so it reflects the right course number, R-678.*
> ➢ *Ray Haynes seconded the motion.*
> ➢ *All in favor.*

B. **Graduate Program Review Process** – Danielle DeSawal provided a brief overview of the subcommittee's role in developing the Graduate Program Review Process. The subcommittee spent some good time over the spring and summer drafting up the process. DeSawal explained that the subcommittee used other schools' program review processes as a model, but created the draft unique to the SOE. DeSawal also mentioned that the draft includes the institution's mission for excellence, the guidelines from the graduate school, and specific guiding questions for the department to look at their strategic direction. The process is supposed to be flexible in allowing programs to create their own graduate program review process, so there are some guiding questions for each program to look at that issue or topic within the area in which they are doing the review. At the very end of the draft, there is a timeline that EXB has worked on with departments to see what the program review process will look like over the next 5 years. Departments have been involved in that conversation at this point, so the review process has not been a surprise. After the committee votes on this draft, it will be sent to Policy Council for further approval.

Elizabeth Boling mentioned that the committee would include Joyce Alexander's comments in the draft that we approve today. She opened up the floor for comments and suggestions. Several committee members raised a few questions regarding the draft and review process.

Robin Hughes asked if this is the program review process for IUB programs. DeSawal said yes, but down the road the Urban Education program, which will be a program at IUPUI, will be included in the program review process. Hughes also inquired if Boling or DeSawal will take on an advisory role for programs? Boling and Joyce Alexander

might take on advisory roles. Currently, the GSO is working with ETS to gather data on departments so they can give that information to the departments, which will help with the review. Boling mentioned that the departments take the guidelines and answer them according to the uniqueness of their respective programs. She is unsure if this is a process with so much mandated consistency; ultimately UGS is requiring the review process. Boling reiterated that the departments are leading the review processes.

Ray Haynes raised the issue that since the mandate is coming from UGS, we should know the required components for the self-study portion of the review. Boling responded by stating that the main questions that are put forward by UGS are incorporated in the process. This is a campus policy and UGS is simply requesting for the policy to be implemented consistently. However, Ray Haynes still wondered if UGS might send the review back and request more information. Because of this potential problem, he explained, we might want to ask UGS to make sure we are including everything. Boling asserted that we might want to consult UGS down the road, but for now, we probably won't get much attention from that question.

Next, Thu Suong Thi Nyugen inquired about the timeline and if the EdD in ELPS exists. Nyugen was correct and the EdD in ELPS needs to be removed. She also asked if the EdD is supposed to say PhD. Boling will check and see if the PhD in ELPS should be added to that section. Also concerning the timeline, Boling briefly mentioned that Joyce Alexander requested for the Learning Sciences and Human Development programs to be reviewed separately. As indicated in the comment section, Human Development should be reviewed in year 3, and Learning Sciences in year 5. The comment is attached to MSEd but applies to the PhD too.

Nguyen asked about the financial support on page 8, where it is indicated that IUB programs will be budgeted at a maximum of $2500 per review. Does this apply to IUB and IUPUI? We can ask if Joyce Alexander wanted to approve the financial support for both campuses, or talk to Pat Hogan to see what can be budgeted at IUPUI. The only program that is not core campus is Urban Education. Joyce Alexander will touch base with IUPUI regarding the plan for Urban Ed.

Next, the committee members provided some changes for the draft. Susie Sloffer suggested adding the word alignment on the 1st page under 7h, replacing the word compliance. Haynes made a comment about enrollment trends on page 3 under item D. He indicated that the committee might want to include a marketing plan related to identifying populations that the SOE programs aren't reaching. Haynes further explained that if the SOE commits to a marketing plan and starts brainstorming, the next step is to produce some tangible strategy. Boling agreed with Haynes' suggestion, and she also recommended incorporating recruitment as a term in this section, which would be consistent with the framing question section on recruitment and yield.

Ghangis Carter suggested said to add Enhancing to the title of Diversity on page 11, under item 3. Haynes agreed, and stated that it is important to include active statements. Also in regards to diversity, Haynes recommended adding a framing question asking if departments have taken advantage of extra efforts to recruit

students, to align with graduate school and university-wide policies. The committee members brainstormed different ideas, and they finally agreed with adding the following 5th framing question (or something similar): does the unit take advantage of mechanisms in place to align the efforts to increase diversity with university and graduate school policy initiatives?

- ➢ *Susie Sloffer motioned to approve the graduate program review process with the following changes: replace "compliance" with "alignment" under 7h on page 1; eliminate ELPS EdD. on the timeline and check if the ELPS PhD should take its place in year 2; incorporate recruitment under D on page 3; add "Enhancing" to the Diversity component, item 3 on page 11; and add a 5th framing question to the Diversity component, this question or something similar: does the unit take advantage of mechanisms in place to align the efforts to increase diversity with university and graduate school policy initiatives? We will get the changes put into draft and then send it to the committee for one final check before sending to PC. We will make sure that the committee can view it one more time before it heads to PC, to ensure that all comments from meeting are represented.*
- ➢ *Katie Cierniak seconded the motion.*
- ➢ *All in favor.*

C. **New Course Request: R563** - Barbara Bichelmeyer presented the rationale for the new course request R563. This course was previously titled Business and Economic Dimensions of Training and Performance Improvement and primarily taught by James Pershing. The point of the course was to explain the overarching relationship between training and performance improvement, but James Pershing was trained as an economist so he taught the course from an investments standpoint. Bichelmeyer took over the course and offered it as an umbrella with three areas of focus: instructional technologists, instructional design, and human performance effectiveness. She indicated that the most important feature of this course was probably to see the relationship between design and human performance. In short, instead of focusing on return on investment and economic equations, this course will focus on human performance in terms of the principles of instructional design. Given this change, there is a fair amount of modification in regards to the structure and presentation of the course. This is a core course for WLPI (Workplace Learning and Performance Improvement) students. There are also students from C&I who enroll in this course.

Next, the committee was invited to ask questions or provide suggestions for this course. Since the course is required for some students, #27 on the course request form should be changed to "yes." Besides the change under #27, there were no other questions or comments regarding R563.

- ➢ *Susie Sloffer motioned to approve new course request EDUC-R563 with the following changes: #27 will move from "no" to" yes," and Barbara Bichelmeyer will make sure that #9a and b aligns with the syllabus title.*
- ➢ *Valarie Akerson seconded the motion.*
- ➢ *All in favor.*

D. **Discontinuing the Masters of Art in Teaching Social Studies** – Keith Barton presented this agenda item. This particular program began 10-15 years ago as a grant funded professional development program. When the grant ran out, the program continued. Barton explained that in every place in the country, MAT is a certification program, but not here at IU. There have been very few student applicants, and this program caused a lot of confusion because students wanted a certificate and that was not what this MAT degree program offered. Over the past two years, only two students have applied, and both of these students would have been served just as well with a Master's in social studies. In short, Barton indicated that the program is redundant.

Danielle DeSawal asked if there were any consequences associated with the elimination? Barton could not think of any, since there is already a graduate certification program that would otherwise serve the function of this degree. Ray Haynes inquired if the degree needs to be cleared with the gradate school since they own the degree. Elizabeth Boling asserted that this was an interdisciplinary degree, so it belongs to the SOE and UGS, so UGS will have to agree to get rid of the degree, but Boling does not foresee any objection from them. Additionally, they don't have to agree before the committee votes. Barton reiterated that students could accomplish the same thing by enrolling in the Masters in Social Studies; they will still take courses in the College of Arts and Sciences and the SOE, which is similar to the course requirements for the degree that is being eliminated. There was no specific course work for the MAT in Teaching Social Studies; students were required to take 24 credits in the College of Arts and Sciences and 12 credits in the SOE, with their advisors' approval. Because the students could choose which courses they took in the college and SOE, the integrity of the program depended on the advising.

Given that there is no specific coursework for this degree, DeSawal asked if Barton wanted to clarify on the memo that no courses will be discontinued as a result of the discontinuation of this program. Barton and the committee agreed. There were no further suggestions or questions.

 ➢ *Valarie Akerson motion to approve the proposal to discontinue the MAT in Social Studies with the addition of the statement that no courses will be discontinued as a result of the discontinuation of this program.*
 ➢ *Ray Haynes seconded the motion.*
 ➢ *All in favor.*

II. **Review/approval of minutes from September 6, 2012**
 ➢ *Valarie Akerson motioned to approve the minutes from September 6th, 2012, with the following change: add Ray Haynes to the presenters list.*
 ➢ *Ray Haynes seconded the motion.*
 ➢ *All in favor.*

III. Old Business
    A. **New Course Request: R551-** The committee put this course on hold so the instructor could check with two of her colleagues who have similar courses, to ensure there was no significant overlap. The instructor reported that there was no significant overlap between the three courses. Also, now that the three instructors know what each of the classes offer, they can help advise students on which course the students should take. There were no changes to the course request form for R551, so the instructor did not have to attend this meeting.
        ➢ *Susie Sloffer motioned to approve new course request EDUC-R551 as presented.*
        ➢ *Ray Haynes seconded the motion*
        ➢ *All in favor.*

IV. Discussion
    A. **Changing 4th meeting date:** Danielle DeSawal is unable to attend the November 29th meeting, and the committee wanted to ensure that the new member, Jesse Steinfeldt, could attend one of the meetings, so the fourth meeting date will be changed. Avital Deskalo will send out a scheduling poll.
    B. **Committee Assignments:** The committee members volunteered to join the Beechler Award Subcommittee. Valarie Akerson will chair the subcommittee, and Ray Haynes and Ghangis Carter will take on member roles. Danielle DeSawal will look into another department representative for this subcommittee. At the next meeting, the committee will form the Dissertation of the Year Award Subcommittee.