

**IU School of Education  
Teacher Education Council  
November 28, 2001**

**Present:** Ellen Brantlinger, Keith Chapin, Ginette Delandshere, Sarah Franklin, Thomas Gregory, Matt Hoagland, Susan Klein, Peter Kloosterman, Diana Lambdin, Timothy Niggle, Jill Shedd;  
Minutes taken by: Amy Kemp

**Handouts:** Agenda (11/28/01); Minutes of 11/07/01 meeting; Memorandum requesting change of timing for CoT special education students; Excerpt from proposed SOE constitution concerning TEC; Memorandum concerning Inter-Campus Transfers; Requirements of the Combined Praxis and TIP programs; Excerpt from the 11/20/97 minutes concerning TEC approval process for new programs and courses; TEC guidance sheet providing questions to be asked when considering new programs written 2/13/92 and readopted 11/20/97; TEC guidance sheet providing a list of materials to include in the final report; TEC guidance sheet showing approval process for new courses and programs; the Six Principles

**I. Approval of Minutes**

**A. Minutes of the 11/07/01 meeting were unanimously approved.**

**II. CoT Special Education Students' Admission to K370 and K343 (see handouts section)**

- A. Pete Kloosterman opened the issue by asking whether the TEC should be involved in making policies concerning admission requirements and stated that at present K370 and K343 are only open to students who are admitted to teacher education.
- B. Diana Lambdin stated that admission requirement questions have been under the purview of TEC for some time.
- C. Susan Klein referencing her memorandum (see handouts section) and requested that students who had been accepted to CoT Special Education should be able to register for K370 and K343 before they have finished the admission requirements for teacher education.
- D. Tom Gregory stated that an email conversation had been conducted (prior to the 11/28 meeting) concerning TEC's responsibility and duties for dealing with admission requirements; that in his 3 years with the TEC it had never dealt with entry requirements; and that programs should be free to establish entrance requirements which exceed the minimum requirements set by teacher education.
- E. Tim Niggle stated that the TEC had dealt with issues of entry requirements.
- F. There was a discussion concerning which courses are designated as professional education courses.
- G. There was a discussion of professional education status being used to keep seats open for students in a specific cohort or program.
- H. Pete Kloosterman suggested that there were two separate issues being raised: Does TEC make policy on these issues? And should CoT Special Education students be able to register for K370 and K343 before admission to teacher education.
- I. Tim Niggle mentioned that students from all of the other programs must meet the admission to teacher education requirements, and questioned whether an exception in timing should be given here.

- J. Jill Shedd mentioned that it would make classes more difficult for instructors to teach if they did not know what courses their students had already taken.
- K. Ellen Brantlinger stated that it is difficult for her to teach K370 for both elementary and secondary students, especially if the makeup of the class changes frequently and the sections are large.
- L. Susan Klein, responding to these concerns, stated that the makeup of K370 was problematic and that the current status is simply an interim solution until CoT Special Education enrollments increase.
- M. A discussion ensued concerning the unique circumstances of CoT students and the desire not to put them behind in their course sequence while waiting for approval to enter teacher education.
- N. Tim Niggle and Jill Shedd pointed out that most students follow the sequence and that policy should not be made for a few students.
- O. Pete Kloosterman suggested that CoT Special Education may be a unique case since there are fewer students and there is such a need for them in the teaching force.
- P. Tom Gregory suggested again that this was not under the purview of TEC and motioned to table the discussion. There was not enough support for the motion to table and thus discussion continued.
- Q. A discussion began with reference to the procedural sheets (see handouts section) which showed that TEC in the past asked questions concerning admission requirements.
- R. Keith Chapin stated that his department in the past had made many exceptions for students to take classes before they were admitted to the program and that this became a big problem when students who had completed most of their coursework were not able to meet the admission requirements.
- S. A motion was made and passed that students admitted to the CoT Special Education program should be allowed to enroll in K370 and K343 before formal admittance to Teacher Education and that this decision should be passed onto Policy Council.**
- T. It was also reiterated that questions of admission requirements are under the purview of the TEC.**

### III. Merger of the Praxis and TIP Programs

- A. Based on information given by Pete Kloosterman in the previous TEC meeting (see handouts section), a motion was made and passed that the merger of Praxis and TIP should be approved.**
- B. Tim Niggle provided a revised program planning sheet for the new TIP (see handouts section). It was agreed that the sheet would not be made public until the program merger had gone through the policy council remonstrance period.

### IV. Constitutional Relationship of the TEC to Policy Council

- A. A discussion began after the TIP/Praxis decision concerning what information and decisions from the TEC meant to Policy Council.
- B. Ellen Brantlinger pointed out that decisions of the TEC should be for remonstrance of the Policy Council only and this was not stated in the draft constitution (see handouts section).
- C. A discussion followed about the difference between a policy and/or procure decision and what information should be passed onto Policy Council.
- D. Ellen Brantlinger pointed out that the purpose of TEC, as a standing committee of the Policy Council, is to discuss issues in depth so that they do not have to be completely re-discussed in Policy Council.

- E. Ginette Delandshere stated that she would oppose a proposal that Policy Council should not re-deal with issues the TEC discussed, rather that issues that were problematic should be re-discussed in Policy Council.
- F. Ellen Brantlinger stated that Policy Council's agenda committee should make decisions on what Policy Council sees whether policy/administrative issues or quick approval/further discussion.
- G. It was decided that revisions would be made to the proposed constitution to reflect the relationship of TEC to Policy Council and the purview of the TEC, especially on UAS and accreditation issues. Pete Kloosterman agreed to draft revisions and then email them to TEC members for feedback.