

**IU School of Education**  
**Teacher Education Council**  
March, 25 2002

- Present:** Members: Ellen Brantlinger, Keith Chapin, Ginette Delandshere, Paulette Dilworth, Sarah Franklin, Thomas Gregory, Matt Hoagland, Peter Kloosterman, Diana Lambdin, Joan Pong Linton, Lissa May, Timothy Niggle, Jill Shedd  
Visitors: Cathy Brown and Fritz Lieber  
Minutes taken by: Amy Kemp
- Handouts:** Agenda (3/25/02); Minutes of the 2/27/02 meeting; New Course Requests for: P313, P312, K422, K441, K448, K452 and K426; Memorandum from Cary Buzzelli concerning Course Change Request for E451; Packet for the English Education Program (as part of the new secondary program), IPSB Standards, Course descriptions, Syllabi for F401/M412/L512 and L516/M452/M403 and degree requirements; Proposal for New Secondary Education Program containing: Memorandum from Dean Lambdin discussing the Secondary Program, Background and Overview of the Program, IPSB Middle School/Jr High Settings, IPSB for Adolescence and Young Adults, and Assessment of Preservice teachers' accomplishments in Secondary Teacher Education; Operational Changes for New Bulletin; and Draft of Procedures for Course/Program Creation or Change for TEC
- I. **Approval of Minutes**
    - A. **Minutes of the 2/27/02 meeting were approved.**
  - II. **Discussion of Additional TEC Meeting**
    - A. After discussion 4/8/02 was put forth as a tentative meeting date.
  - III. **Approval of New Special Education Courses**
    - A. Five New Course Requests forms were presented to TEC after remonstrance (see handouts section).
    - B. Discussion followed as to who was present to explain the requests, whether the courses were part of the distance education program and if they were currently being taught.
    - C. The requests were tabled until questions such as: "What program are these courses supporting?" and "Will 400 level courses count towards a master's degree?" are answered and a cover sheet is supplied.
  - IV. **Approval of Changes to Early Childhood Education Program**
    - A. Diana Lambdin explained that the Early Childhood Program needs to make changes to their block-course structure. She suggested that the matter be tabled until more information is available.
  - V. **Procedure for course/program creation or change**
    - A. A draft of a policy for course/program change was presented by Pete Kloosterman. He stated that he had worked with Frank Lester (chair of the Graduate Program Committee) to make sure that graduate and undergraduate procedures were the same and

explained the steps, including courses being remonstrated before coming to TEC. He also noted that if there is no response concerning remonstrance from other campuses, after 30 days the change would be considered approved and all of these steps will be cataloged in the “paper trail” section (page four) of the form.

- B. Diana Lambdin asked who was to send program/course change requests out to other campuses and keep records.
- C. After discussion it was decided that the Chair of the appropriate Department or the Unit Head should manage this process and send and receive forms.
- D. Diana asked who is responsible at IUB for looking at forms from other campuses.
- E. Discussion followed on the role of the TEC, Education Council and Jan Kaho. It was decided that the Department Chair of the concerned Department should receive the forms.
- F. Discussion followed about current practice and a means of simplifying the process while still notifying all concerned parties. Changes were made to clarify who the forms would be submitted to and by, what the purpose of remonstrance is and that the campus level party on the top of page two is the Chancellor’s office.
- G. **The policy for Course/Program Change was passed with amendments with one abstention.**

#### VI. Secondary Education Program

- A. Cathy Brown began the discussion by summarizing the changes that had occurred since the previous meeting (see color handout) including the additional requirement of M300 and the recommendation that it be taken at the same time as P313.
- B. She asked that at this TEC meeting that only the “common” program (that in bold lettering) be considered.
- C. Diana Lambdin suggested that the proposed program be seen as five programs with a common core and that the TEC should consider that core at this meeting.
- D. Tom Gregory stated that the inclusion of two methods courses would have ramifications for other programs.
- E. Discussion followed concerning the ramifications of new courses, linked courses and changed course numbers on access for other programs. It was decided that more discussion with other programs and careful thought is necessary before changes are made, but many courses are continued from the existing structure to the new program.
- F. Pete Kloosterman read a letter detailing the concerns of David Flinders including: that no one program can meet all needs; that programs such as CoT and Transition to Teach should be considered in the planning as they have concerns as to how methods course are scheduled and linked to field experience; and

that graduate courses may be hurt with the additional requirements for the undergraduate degree.

- G. It was noted by Cathy Brown and Pete Kloosterman that courses can be listed both as graduate and undergraduate credits and that flexibility will be allowed for graduate students.
- H. Tom Gregory asked the extent to which faculty would “move” with a cohort as that is a good way to screen the quality of future teachers.
- I. Cathy Brown stated that extent of "faculty movement" varied with the content area.
- J. Ellen Brantlinger asked for the rationale behind the addition of a new educational psychology course.
- K. Diana Lambdin stated that two educational psychology courses were needed to meet state requirements for student development.
- L. Ellen Brantlinger stated that middle school students are often ignored in secondary education programs and that she would like to see the syllabi of the educational psychology courses.
- M. Matt Hoagland stated that student teachers might be overwhelmed by the push to produce interdisciplinary work at the beginning of their career and that teachers are often judged on their content knowledge.
- N. Sarah Franklin stated that it is helpful to start interdisciplinary thinking early.
- O. A vote was suggested and Ellen Brantlinger stated that syllabi were necessary before a decision was made.
- P. Jill Shedd asked what is required as a benchmark prior to admission to the Teacher Education Program and student teaching. She also asked for clarification of the extent and management of field experience. She stated that field experience coordinators should provide information about the readiness of students to student teach.
- Q. Lissa May asked who will take the responsibility to collect the information and how many students would that information be collected on.
- R. Because time for the TEC meeting had run out, Pete Kloosterman suggested that the discussion continue at the next meeting after these questions (syllabi, field experience, content courses and benchmarks for student teaching) are addressed.
- S. The meeting was adjourned with the expectation that final consideration of the secondary program would take place at the next meeting.