

Urban Education PhD Proposal

Presented to IUPUI GAC 2-23-2010

Response to Comments and Concerns

March 16, 2010

Changes made in the Proposal:

The following changes have been made in the proposal itself:

- Page 8 – The plan for the financial support of students was revised to place the responsibility for funding graduate assistantships squarely on the School of Education. This was done to demonstrate our understanding that we should not be dependent on the IUPUI campus funds for this program. It is up to the School of Education to find funding for the students.
- Pages 14-15 – A qualifying examination was added.
- Pages 19-24 – We reworked the list of *School of Education Faculty* associated with the program. We eliminated lists of faculty from other campuses, departments, and the School of Education who participated in earlier discussions of the proposal, but really play no defined role in the current proposal. We noted that two tenure-track and one clinical professor(s) have moved from the rank of *assistant* to *associate* this spring. And we added the names of additional and new faculty members who will be active in the program. This should provide more accurate detail about faculty involved with the program.
- Pages 26-27 -- The section about the *Need for Additional Learning Resources* was rewritten to emphasize the importance of working with the library, creating a work center for doctoral students, and continually tracking technological advancements.

Addressing Comments and Concerns in the following areas:

1. Are the goals clear and achievable?

It was noted in multiple reviews that we need to hire a senior scholar and a coordinator for the program. Toward that end, we have appointed Dr. Robert Helfenbein, Associate Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, to serve as the Coordinator of Program. He will

get two course releases in 2010-2011 for this work, but he will begin work immediately, giving him the rest of the spring semester and summer to develop needed resources and implement plans.

We are planning to do a search for a senior scholar in 2010-2011. In the meantime, we are planning to work with Dr. Gerardo Lopez from the Bloomington campus to supplement the urban education expertise needed to develop the program. Dr. Lopez teaches many of his courses in Indianapolis already and has been an ally in the development of our program proposal. He has agreed to work with the special task force to further develop the infrastructure for recruiting and advising as well as the curriculum. We have relied on his knowledge of urban education and doctoral curriculum in the past and consider him to be a cornerstone to our development process.

In addition to these leadership roles, a special task force of four faculty and one support staff person has been created to help with the logistics of going from proposal to program. This implementation committee includes: Dr. Beth Berghoff, Chair of Graduate Programs and Associate Professor in Literacy, Culture, and Language Education; Dr. Jose Rosario, Professor of Curriculum and Instruction; Dr. Samantha Paredes Scribner, Assistant Professor Educational Leadership, Dr. Thu Suong Nguyen, Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy, and Sarah Brandenburg, Graduate Student Services Support. Dr. Pat Rogan, Executive Associate Dean, joins the committee as needed to provide guidance and help with critical decisions.

Dr. Helfenbein will begin working immediately with Dr. Berghoff, Chair of Graduate Programs, and Sarah Brandenburg, Graduate Student Services Support, to develop the student recruitment plan and advising materials. In addition, a graduate student with an assistantship in CUME is being assigned to help with the development of student and faculty resources and recruiting materials. See the attached *Admissions Timeline* for more details about the development deadlines.

The PhD Task Force will meet every other week from now until June and again next fall to contribute to this development and oversee the process. This group will also revisit the program evaluation plan and make sure the infrastructure for collecting data and reviewing the program are in place.

2. Is the program academically sound?

In discussions following the Graduate Affairs Committee meeting, the Task Force agreed with the reviewer who suggested the program should include a qualifying examination. We revisited the Graduate Bulletin and borrowed language and guidelines to create a new section in the proposal describing the qualifying exam for this PhD program. See pages 14-15 in the proposal. We still think the dossier that we originally included in the plan is an appropriate assessment point as well, so students will do the dossier as a step toward showing they are engaged and developing as scholars and researchers in the field and are ready to take their qualifying exams. The qualifying examinations will assess their mastery of the theoretical and methodological constructs of the field of urban education. We thank the reviewer for catching this gap in the proposal.

This proposal has a long history and represents a learning process. Seven years ago, when the School of Education started the discussion of an Urban Education PhD program, we did not really have the faculty and infrastructure to manage the program on our own. Consequently, the initial conversations with different schools and departments on campus focused on the creation of a truly multidisciplinary program. We started with a vision of a program that would be delivered by different departments. As the early critiques of the proposal came back to us, we began to understand that we would not be able to mentor doctoral students and introduce them to the kind of community-based, collaborative teaching and research necessary for a scholar of urban education unless we created a program with specific goals and focused experiential elements. In the meantime, the School of Education has grown more sophisticated in exponential ways. This is the result of developments like: the CUME and UCASE centers with a focus on translational research; our new urban education masters program; educational reform grants that link us with many different stakeholder groups in the community like ESL

teachers and community centers; new avenues of faculty scholarship; and new faculty hires. The School of Education has developed the capacity to offer a coherent urban education doctoral program.

The proposal is an interesting audit trail of our continuous journey toward this readiness for a PhD program in urban education. The proposal still has some of the language of the interdisciplinary vision, but not the actual structure that initially guided those discussions. We know there are excellent courses and opportunities available on this campus in other departments. We know there are faculty members in other departments who are interested in working with us and the urban education PhD students. We plan to continue to explore these opportunities as we further develop viable minors for our students. We readily admit that we have more work to do in the development of minors, but in part, we need to start recruiting students before we can really know what their needs are going to be. We have done initial explorations and established relationships that will put us in position to plan with other departments as we move forward.

The most important immediate next step in this process has to be the development of the course syllabi and new course requests. Actually, this is already in process. As we have designed the proposal, we have been discussing the sequence of courses and the content of each course. We have asked different faculty members who might potentially be teaching courses in the program to begin pulling together bibliographies of possible readings and essential learning objectives for the courses on the list to be developed. We are planning to have a Friday retreat in April to bring this group of faculty together to work through the curriculum map for the program. Once we have the overall schema of the courses, we will divide up the work on individual course syllabus. We expect to have the new courses in the pipeline for approval when school resumes this coming August. Dr. Berghoff and Dr. Helfenbein will oversee the writing of these syllabi and preparation of the course requests. We will ask Dr. Lopez to serve as the urban education content specialist along with the Task Force and additional faculty members who have expressed an interest in helping with course development.

While there are eight courses on the list of new courses, four are not really content-laden courses, but independent study and experiential courses. These include: T590 Early Inquiry, T650 Internship, T795 Dissertation Proposal Prep, and T799 Doctoral Thesis. Two of the additional courses will be seminar courses developed around current topics relative to the instructor's expertise. These include: T630 Topics Seminar and T750 Doctoral Seminar in Urban Education. The real development work will need to go into the T620 Issues in Urban Education and T700 Research Seminar in Urban Education.

Unfortunately, our course approval process is lengthy, as we must start with the Graduate Studies Committee in Bloomington who will send it to through the remonstrance process of the Policy Council of the School of Education in Bloomington. Then the course requests will come back to IUPUI and go through the Graduate Affair Committee and remonstrance process on this campus as well. But we expect that we will have little objection to the courses since both of these committee have reviewed the Urban Education PhD proposal. Dr. Berghoff, as Chair of Graduate Programs will shepherd the courses through the approvals procedures.

3. Are faculty resources available to offer this program without undercutting other key missions of the unit?

Following the advice of one of the reviewers, we created a grid that matches courses in the program and potential instructors. This *Course List and Associated Faculty* is attached. It is in draft stage, but it should help to allay fears that the program will overtax the School of Education junior faculty. The chart shows the courses to be taught in program and the faculty most likely to develop and teach those classes. We do not expect to use adjuncts to teach this program, but we may use some of our clinical faculty members as well as assistant professors who are well-prepared to teach doctoral students. Dr. Lopez represents the senior scholar in this chart.

We checked with graduate program experts in the School of Education in Bloomington and at IUPUI (Mary McMullen and Nancy Chism) who told us that most tenured SOE faculty who serve doctoral students are active on 7-8 committees and may have 2 or 3

students who defend every year. We calculated the advising load our faculty would incur if 15 faculty members were actively serving as doctoral advisors and we started 10 students a year. It works out that our faculty would have advising loads exactly in that range. We currently have 13 faculty members at the associate level who could take on these advising roles and we have 10 assistant level professors in the pipeline. In other words, we have the capacity we need for the program of study and dissertation committees, and we can protect our non-tenured faculty.

We appreciated the reminder that we will need to work with our library liaison, Rhonda Huisman, to determine the need for and availability of appropriate library and information resources. We will be inviting Rhonda to planning meetings this spring and getting her help with an assessment of current resources and services relative to the urban education doctoral program. With Rhonda's help, we can make strategic plans for building on the strengths of existing resources and building up deficit areas.

4. Is there overlap, either real or potential, with any other unit that could harm the program or be exploited to help the program?

The School of Education has had many discussions with other units about how to avoid overlap. We were encouraged to identify our niche and to create a program that did not duplicate other doctoral programs in the state, especially programs at Indiana University in Bloomington. We have gone to great lengths to make this doctoral program unique to IUPUI.

That said, there are other units at IUPUI that offer outstanding courses about the urban context. We have every intention of doing more work to identify the courses in SPEA, Social Work, Sociology, Political Science, and other departments that can augment what we can offer in the School of Education.

5. Other recommendations, comments/concerns regarding the proposal:

One reviewer noted that the proposal did not provide details about the number of courses to be offered synchronously, asynchronously, or using a hybrid approach. While it is

highly likely that the courses will involve all of these modes of instruction at some points in the program, it is not our intent to create a program that can be taken from a distance. To the contrary, we believe the strength of the program is in the richly-textured context of urban schools, community organizations, and hands-on experiences. We are going to require students to serve their residencies on campus and expect them to get involved in school and community-based research projects.

Another reviewer expressed concern that resources appear to be rather limited and questioned the support available for hiring additional faculty. We are still in the process of finalizing the budget, but the preliminary numbers give us confidence that as the program matures, the income from students will support at least two faculty lines. We were able to bring on a new professor (Thu Suong Nguyen) this spring who is strong in the area of inquiry and policy studies. She is not a teacher educator, so she will be teaching exclusively in the graduate programs. Adding Dr. Nguyen and a senior scholar to our current faculty will enable us to move faculty around and cover all the new classes to be taught. Again, see the *Course List and Associated Faculty Grid*.

Final Note:

We appreciate the insights and expertise of the reviewers and committee members who questioned different facets of the Urban Education PhD Program. The feedback enabled the School of Education to make some important changes to the proposal and our program. We hope that our responses make sense and convince the committee members of our capacity to move from proposal to program. We look forward to implementing an innovative, rigorous, and highly desirable doctoral program that makes a contribution to the reputation of IUPUI.