

**IU School of Education
Teacher Education Council
November 7, 2001**

- Present:** Christine Bennett, Ellen Brantlinger, Keith Chapin, Ginette Delandshere, Sarah Franklin, Thomas Gregory, Peter Kloosterman, Diana Lambdin, Lissa May, Timothy Niggle, Jill Shedd, Carmen Simich-Dudgeon;
Minutes taken by: Amy Kemp
- Handouts:** Agenda (11/07/01); Minutes of 10/23/01 meeting; Course Change Request L442; Finalized Bilingual and Bicultural Education Endorsement; New Course Request L491; Memorandum concerning Merger of Praxis and TIP; General Program Admission Requirements; Management of Unit Assessment System

I. Approval of Minutes

A. **Minutes of the 10/23/01 meeting were unanimously approved.**

II. Bilingual Endorsement Program

A. Carmen Simich-Dudgeon presented the Course Change Request form for L442, a finalized Bilingual and Cultural Education endorsement program and a New Course Request for L491 as requested in the 10/23/01 meeting (see handouts section).

1. Carmen quickly explained the changes that had been approved in principle at the 10/23/01 meeting.
2. **A motion was made and unanimously passed to approve the title and description change, program changes and new course request.**

III. Changes in the Praxis and TIP Programs

A. Pete Kloosterman explained the Memorandum concerning Merger of Praxis and TIP (see handouts section).

1. Pete explained the history of why the two programs were separate, how they are different and the adverse consequences of maintaining two programs instead of combining them. He suggested that the two programs could be combined for the coming Fall.
2. Lissa May voiced a concern and a discussion followed concerning the possibility of different music requirements for the two programs. (This was checked later in the meeting and it was determined that both programs now have the same music requirements.)
3. Tom Gregory suggested that combining the programs will eliminate choice for students; that 4 years of reform were ending with much the same programs as existed pre-reform; and that programs at the IUB SOE were not reflecting the integration and interdisciplinary of public schools. *tracks*
4. Christine Bennett suggested that DDSJ could be brought back for an alternative, but as Praxis and TIP are currently configured they are so similar as not to offer alternatives.
5. Tim Niggle explained how students "use" the two programs. He stated that students made their decisions based not on the philosophies of the two programs but rather on the bases of scheduling and foreign study.
6. Ginette Delandshere stated that in the public schools as in the SOE, standards mandate content by discipline rather than in an interdisciplinary manner.
7. Pete Kloosterman suggested that interdisciplinary courses are created by people having time to discuss their courses rather than the nature of

the program. He stated that the combination of Praxis and TIP could free faculty from some of the administrative concerns and facilitate cooperation.

8. **A motion was made and passed with 11 ayes and 1 abstention that the integration of the TIP and Praxis programs is approved in principle.**

IV. Information on Program Admission Prerequisites

- A. Jill Shedd explained that the General Program Admission Requirements (see handouts section) was a response to a request made by the TEC at an earlier meeting.
- B. A discussion ensued concerning admission prerequisites and courses that are required by programs after admission. It was decided that gatekeeper courses were at issue, but if a course that is a prerequisite for admission can fill a requirement in another program then there is still transferability between programs.
- C. Ellen Brantlinger began a discussion about the proportion of COAS courses to education courses in teacher education programs, and the extent to which that proportion has remained stable in recent years.

V. Information on IUPUI Policy Concerning Age of Acceptable Credits

- A. Amy Kemp read an email message from Linda Houser concerning the IUPUI policy. At IUPUI, professional education courses must be completed within 10 years before graduation.
- B. Tim Niggle described the situation which brought this issue to the fore – a student enrolling at IUB to get around the IUPUI requirement – and that the Associate Dean was the person who made these decisions in the absence of a standing policy.
- C. Jill Shedd suggested that we draft a policy concerning acceptance of credits.
- D. Ellen Brantlinger stated that no policy is a policy, in effect stating that all credits should be accepted.
- E. Tom Gregory suggested that as programs become more performance based, acceptance of credits could be based on successful performance of the skills.
- F. Tim Niggle offered to draft a suggested policy for further discussion, and suggested that this issue will interact with Unit Assessment Systems questions.

VI. Discussion of Procedures for Course and Program Approval by TEC.

- A. There was a short discussion (from the beginning of the session) concerning procedures if a quorum is not present.
- B. The next concern was for voting and presentation procedures. Pete Kloosterman suggested that multiple presentations were helpful, with an initial approval in principle and a second meeting to approve formally.
- C. Discussion followed concerning procedures in the past which allowed for multiple presentations, Tom Gregory offered to find old procedures and questions for presenters. Jill Shedd asked whether those questions asked presenters to address the 6 principles. Tom Gregory stated that they did not.
- D. Diana Lambdin suggested that the TEC could provide presenters with a series of questions that they should be prepared to address.
- E. Discussion followed concerning different procedures for programs, courses, large changes and small changes.
- F. Jill Shedd stated that this should be an important step in the creation of non-patchwork-programs and suggested that presenters provide context for their proposals dealing with the 6 principles and UAS issues.

- G. There was concern that a policy requiring two visits to the TEC for every request would be too burdensome for some small changes or presenters at the last meetings of the year.
- H. Ellen Brantlinger suggested that materials should be provided at the session before a vote was expected. Peter Kloosterman clarified that this would not mean that a vote would always be made at the next meeting. Carmen Simich-Dudgeon restated that guidance is necessary for presenters and Tim Niggle added that this would help the TEC to be consistent.

VII. Discussion of the Role/Function of TEC

- A. Pete Kloosterman stated that the Policy Council is meeting for long-range planning and in those meetings is addressing the “fit” of each committee. He asked whether the TEC should be considered a subcommittee of the Policy Council. Discussion ensued about the Constitution, the unique makeup of the TEC (including those from outside the SOE), the election of members and the charge.
- B. Ellen Brantlinger stated that the TEC had always been a subcommittee of the Policy Council.
- C. Ginette Delandshere mentioned that the Dean would like to revise the Constitution.
- D. Tom Gregory stated that at a previous retreat there was consensus on being a subcommittee of the Policy Council
- E. Jill Shedd stated that the TEC needs a charge and that its charge will include oversight of UAS. She distributed the Management of Unit Assessment System (see handouts section) and reiterated the necessity of further discussion.