

School of Education Spring Faculty Meeting

April 16, 2010

IUB-School of Education Auditorium

IUPUI/IUPUC via Videoconference

10:00 am – 12:00 pm

What follows is a summary of speaker contributions. Full presentations by each contributor to this meeting can be found on the School of Education website or by following this link: [full presentations](#).

I. Dean's Report: Dean Gonzalez

Despite all the challenges this semester and the academic year as a whole have brought, the morale of the faculty and the quantity and quality of work produced by the faculty are as high as ever. The U.S. World News and Report rankings came out this week, and we have remained among the top twenty schools of education in the nation (ranked number nineteen). In addition, five of our specialty programs were ranked in the top ten: Higher Education Administration, Counseling, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and Curriculum and Instruction.

We had a visit from NCATE. This is our national accreditation; it takes place every seven years. The process was, in part, a chance for us to reflect on what we do well and what areas we can improve on. The team, headed by Dr. Nicholas Michelli, was exceptionally strong this year. Everyone participated in the review in one way or another, and special thanks should be extended to faculty and program chairs who spent countless hours of work organizing the necessary information. The people at ETS—Larry Riss and Jon Lawrence and others—put all the information on the web; Jill Shedd at Bloomington and Linda Houser at IUPUI, Deb Whitaker at Columbus, Mary McMullen for the advanced programs, Larry Riss for technology, and many others did a wonderful job. Without exception, we met all the standards. Only one area was identified for improvement: the need to do a better job following graduates of advanced programs and getting input from their employers and others about their performances. We already knew this was an area of improvement for us. In addition, two areas were identified as having reached “target” levels, meaning that we have reached an ideal level that other institutions should be striving to achieve: 1) quality of the faculty and 2) governance. Overall, it was a productive and helpful visit.

REPA presented (and continues to present) us with challenges. Since the rules were approved, there has been some miscommunication, particularly related to the secondary education major. The Governor's Office and the Superintendent's Office have made statements indicating that students seeking a secondary education degree must now major in their discipline. This was part of the original proposal at one time. However, the rules as they were approved clearly state that secondary education can continue to be a major as long as the content area requirements are identical to those of a content-area major. For example, secondary education students who choose math as their discipline must complete coursework that is (at least) identical to the coursework for a math major in the mathematics department. By and large, we have always been dedicated to strong content background; only minor adjustments may be necessary. At the elementary level, we will be required to develop certain minors. Faculty are already engaged in discussion and making progress toward this requirement. Even though we need to make only minor changes in light of REPA, it is important that we continue to take these changes seriously

and to do the things we need to do to adhere to the rules. The effective changes that were made to the original document were the result of the educational community coming together in unison; members of the faculty, our students, colleagues in schools, alumni, school boards, superintendants, principals, and so on spoke out about the value of an education degree and the quality of what we do. But, we must remember that there is still work to be done and there are still forces that would like to see a return to the changes proposed in the original document.

On the budget: even though we are better off financially than many institutions, we still felt the impact of the economy's condition across the state and the nation. The dean's office has been in conversations with the Faculty Affairs Committee to institute a program whereby we can recognize and reward faculty who have achieved high levels of performance. In the proposal, we have allocated \$200,000 from our cash reserves so that every faculty member who submitted an annual faculty report for the last two years and who received an exemplary or outstanding ranking in either year will receive a deposit to her or his research account to be used at the discretion of the faculty member. The exact amount is still being determined by the FAC, but we hope it will be substantial. Decisions have not been made about salaries for next year, but it is possible that raises will not happen.

Finally, I am honored to announce the new Armstrong and Jacobs Chairs: Pete Kloosterman is the new Armstrong Chair and Tom Brush is the new Jacobs Chair. I would also like to recognize the work of the current Chairs: Diana Lambin as the Armstrong Chair and Sasha Barab as the Jacobs Chair.

B. Bull thanked Dean Gonzalez for his leadership on REPA

II. Matching the Campaign Promise: Sarah Baumgart

S. Baumgart gave an overview of the Capital Campaign.

III. NCATE Feedback: Jill Shedd and Linda Houser

L. Houser gave an update on NCATE feedback. All standards were met both at the initial and advanced levels, with one area for improvement that was cited for standard 1 at the advanced level: We have not gathered significant data from employers to indicate how students who have graduated from our Masters programs are performing. It was also recommended that standard 5 (Faculty) and standard 6 (Governance) be "target" areas, meaning that we have reached a level that other institutions should be striving to achieve. L. Houser also gave an overview of how the process moves forward from here.

Some questions and discussion ensued, particularly related to the recommended area for improvement.

P. Rogan and Dean Gonzalez thanked both Jill Shedd and Linda Houser for all their work.

IV. Undergraduate Enrollments: Don Hossler

D. Hossler gave an overview of the undergraduate enrollment information at Bloomington.

V. Graduate Enrollments: Mary McMullen

M. McMullen gave an overview of the graduate enrollment information at Bloomington.

Pat Rogan discussed the graduate enrollment trends at Indianapolis. She also reiterated the growth of both distance education and professional development programs at Indianapolis. P. Rogan also discussed undergraduate enrollment trends at Indianapolis and indicated that undergraduate credit hours for spring 2010 are up 12%.

Dean Gonzalez pointed out a turnaround in undergraduate credit hour enrollment on the Bloomington campus, crediting Katie Paulin for her work in recruitment.

Some discussion ensued, particularly related to assistantships and fellowships for graduate students.

J. Plucker pointed out how impressive the undergraduate enrollment numbers are, especially given the improvements in student SAT scores and other indicators of student quality.

VI. R&D Trends: Bob Sherwood

B. Sherwood gave an overview of the research and development trends.

Pat Rogan discussed growth in grant productivity at Indianapolis. Currently, six applications for 19 proposals for about \$2 million have been funded. Of those, 14 were funded at \$1.7 million and of those 11 have indirect at about \$123,000. These numbers are up from last year and demonstrate steady growth.

VII. Budget Forecast: Pat Rogan and Jack Cummings

P. Rogan gave an overview of the budget forecast for Indianapolis.

J. Cummings did the same for Bloomington, ending with a look at in- and out-of-state tuition costs for undergraduate and graduate students.

Some questions and discussion ensued.

VIII. General Discussion: All

The floor was opened for general discussion items. None were raised.

****Dean Gonzalez adjourned the meeting at 12:00pm.****