

Minutes from Meeting
3:00-4:30PM
Rooms 2102 (Bloomington) and 3138B (Indianapolis)

Members Present: Keith Barton, Elizabeth Boling, Susie Sloffer, Beth Berghoff, Ben Edmonds, Alex McCormick, Karen Wohlwend, Thu Suong Thi Nguyen, Katie Cierniak, Peg Sutton, Ghangis Carter, Luise McCarty, Terri Shockley, and Robin Hughes

Members Absent: Marjorie Manifold

Staff: Avital Deskalo

Presenters: Tom Brush, Elizabeth Boling, Gary Crow, Beth Berghoff, Samantha Paredes-Scriber, and Natasha Flowers

- I. Review and Approval of Minutes from January 14, 2014
 - *Alex McCormick moved to approve the minutes from January 14, 2014, as presented.*
 - *Luise McCarty seconded the motion.*
 - *All in favor.*

- II. New Business

- A. **Revised IST MSED**

Tom Brush and Elizabeth Boling presented this item. He began by explaining that the IST faculty members reviewed the IST MSED program and redesigned it to have three specialty areas for the 12 elective credits. The specialty areas were collapsed into special elective areas. There are still 15 required credits. E. Boling indicated that the rationale for the change was to make the elective selection more flexible and align better with students' professional goals, because the previous MSED program had a fairly constrained requirement for electives. The faculty members examined what the clusters of courses may look like based on students' professional goals. The revised MSED still retains the goal that after students finish a core, they can be competent, entry-level employees.

The committee members asked several questions regarding the proposal. A. McCormick inquired if the tracks would be noted on the students' transcripts. T. Brush indicated that the IST specializations would not be noted on the students' transcripts. However, students will include the specialty areas in their CVs. Next, L. McCarty inquired if students have chosen to pursue a Master's in Adult Education over IST now that the Adult Education program has been developed. T. Brush stated that he did not think people are pursuing the Master's in Adult Education over IST. He added that the IST numbers have been pretty steady. However, the numbers for Adult Education have gone down since the transition and perhaps with marketing they will go up again.

- *Ben Edmonds moved to approve the revised IST MSED, as presented.*
- *Luise McCarty seconded the motion.*
- *All in favor.*

B. Masters of Science in Education in Technology for Learning

B. Berghoff presented this item. The Masters of Science in Education was initially developed as a track in the elementary and secondary education programs. However, B. Berghoff received a suggestion that the tracks needed to be resubmitted as a proposal for a new program. IUPUI started offering this program as an online program, but it has never been completely approved.

After B. Berghoff's introduction, the committee members asked questions and offered suggestions. S. Sloffer provided several minor editorial changes. Beginning at the bottom of page 2, S. Sloffer noted that the title said "Technology and Learning" instead of "Technology for Learning." The whole title should read as "Master's of Science in Education in Technology for Learning. Next, on page 6 where the distance education fee is discussed, B. Berghoff could add the word "currently" to the beginning of the sentence, as the fee may change. Under the "collaboration" section, one of the sentences should read as "...the program does not include the focus on urban school settings." Next, on page 13, under accreditation in section F, one of the sentences should be changed to, "...all degrees and licensure programs offered by the School of Education." On page 14, S. Sloffer pointed out that the chart needed to be changed to reflect the number of students enrolled as part time and full time.

K. Barton mentioned another area that needed a minor change. On page 13, under #6, the sentence should read as "6 semesters." K. Barton also inquired whether the programs from other universities are direct competitors. B. Berghoff said that some of the programs listed in the table are direct competitors. They are also online.

Before the committee meeting ended, E. Boling provided a recommendation. For the new course names on page 27, E. Boling recommended that B. Berghoff contact faculty members at other campuses to ask if they are okay with the title change. She can inform them that she is proposing to make the name changes and check if they are opposed to the name changes. If faculty members prefer that the course names stay the same, B. Berghoff can submit the courses as new course requests. The name changes are currently in the Carmin system.

- *Robin Hughes moved to approve the Masters of Science in Education in Technology for Learning, with the following changes: change title throughout document to "Masters of Science in Education in Technology for Learning"; on page 6, add the word "currently" to the beginning of the distance education fee sentence; add the word "not" to the sentence "...the program does include the focus on urban school settings under the "collaboration" section; on page 13 under accreditation, change sentence to reflect "all degrees and licensure programs offered by the School of Education"; on page 14, change the chart to reflect the number of full time and part time students; on page 13 under #6, make semester plural, and B. Berghoff will check with faculty on other campuses about changing the names of the courses they teach.*
- *Thu Suong Thi Nguyen seconded the motion.*
- *All in favor.*

C. Urban Education Advocacy Certificate

Samantha Paredes-Scribner presented this proposal. This is a 15- hour certificate online program that draws from existing courses, with a focus on urban education and educational leadership programs. S. Paredes-Scribner and her colleagues conducted focus group interviewing last summer after an increase of students who are interested in advocacy in community organizations, charter schools, and traditional public schools, but aren't necessarily interested in licensure. These students may be teacher leaders or community leaders. This focus group drove the logic behind the curriculum. They also wanted to vet this certificate with the Educational Leadership Program. This drove the logic behind the curriculum.

Next, S. Paredes-Scribner went over the courses. She explained that the fifth course is an elective. Upon completion of the certificate, the certificate courses would satisfy 4, or possibly 5 of the courses that satisfy the Master's of Teachers in Education with a focus on Urban Education, or possibly 2 or 3 courses required for a Master's in Educational Leadership. In other words, this certificate provides possibilities for students to get several courses under their belt and move forward with a degree.

E. Boling asked about the admission requirements because they were not on the proposal. S. Scribner-Paredes said that the requirements would be commensurate with a master's degree. E. Boling recommended that she add that information to the proposal. E. Boling also mentioned that potential applicants might be reluctant to apply with a GRE requirement. However, there would have to be enough information to vet how much students will be successful if the GRE is not required. Furthermore, if this certificate can feed into other programs, it may need to provide rationale about whether good standing could replace the GRE for the Master's in Educational Leadership.

S. Paredes-Scribner inquired about making the certificate into two instructional options. Currently, some of the courses required for the certificate run as hybrids or face-to-face. The certificate can be offered completely online, but the faculty may also have the capacity and courses to run it hybrid, online, or face-to-face. What's the process for getting it offered as an online certificate and as blended certificate? E. Boling said there are two options: declare it to have one mode or have two separate programs. E. Boling continued that if S. Paredes-Scribner expects it to be online, the certificate should be presented as an online certificate. S. Paredes-Scribner asked if once the certificate is approved as an online program, and a student wants to pursue this certificate but ends up taking one of the face-to-face options for the courses, could he or she still get the certificate. E. Boling said yes. L. McCarty asked if they were to market the certificate as blended, would the students have to pay onsite? E. Boling said yes. L. McCarty asked a question about capacity; she wondered if there would be an issue for the face-to-face option if an online option were available. L. McCarty said that was not an issue for A courses because the 500 course is run as an online course and as a hybrid. It will probably shorten enrollment.

K. Barton said that the committee still needs some clarification on this proposal. S. Scribner-Paredes and her colleagues will have to add some more sections, including the

admission requirements, and whether this course is going to be offered online or as a blended certificate. S. Paredes-Scribner would also need some points on clarification before she brings the certificate back to the next meeting.

- *Peg Sutton moved to table this item.*
- *Alex McCormick seconded the motion.*
- *All in favor.*

III. Discussion

A. Minor Qualifying Exam

Gary Crow presented this agenda item. Faculty members in ELPs unanimously recommended that the GSC/RAFA Committee remove the requirement for the qualifying exam requirement for minor. Programs outside the SoE do not require minor area qualifying exam, so this new policy would be consistent with other programs. It would be up to the program if they want to offer a minor qualifying exam requirement. ELPS deliberated on whether it should be up to the discretion of the program director or minor professor on the advisory committee. Other program areas leave it up to the discretion of the programs to decide on the minor qualifying exam requirement.

K. Barton asked how removing the requirement would make the minor more flexible? G. Crow explained that some students would like to have minors in the SoE but they consider the minor qualifying exam as one more milestone to complete. Therefore, they may go outside the SoE to get their minor. G. Carter commented that if the SoE wants to be consistent with minors outside the school who are not requiring minor qualifying requirement, then why extend the choice to make it happen. S. Sloffer responded to his statement by saying that other programs do require a minor qualifying exam, such as in the Kelley School of Business.

E. Boling will clarify the rationale and send out a message to department chairs. She will make a stronger argument as to why it benefits faculty and students. She will ask for input before the April 29th meeting. If this policy passes, there would be no requirement for a minor qualifying exam; therefore, programs would have to put in a new policy if they want a qualifying exam. If programs want to commit to qualifying exams, that information would be added to the bulletin. The Nomination to Candidacy form would not have to be changed.

B. Subcommittee Assignments

1. *Beechler Award.* There were 6 or 7 applicants. The subcommittee could not fund everyone's requirements. Three of them were fully funded. Four of them were funded partially. One was not funded.
2. *Dissertation of the Year Award.* The subcommittee is deliberating on Monday.
3. *Dean's Fellowship.* There were 5 candidates for the Dean's Fellowship. Two of those candidates were not meeting the criteria. The subcommittee recommended that four candidates receive the fellowship. Three of them met the full criteria. Two candidates are in CEP and two are in C&I. The subcommittee was concerned about the department spread. They were also very concerned about the criteria for admissions. They would like to talk about this issue with the greater committee.