Educational Policies and Planning Committee
Minutes of meeting February 8, 2002

Members present: George Bailey, David Lawrence, Michael Brown, Paul Tschetter, Amy Carr-Richardson, Karen Elberson, Charles Hodson, Jean Rene Pelletier, Gerhard Kalmus, D. W. C. Dennard, Robert Morrison, and Jim Smith

1. Minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2. Consideration of requests for permission to plan a PhD programs in Medical Family Therapy, Technology Management, and Discourse Studies will be taken up on March 1.

3. Discussion of the memorandum from Dr. Robert J. Thompson, the Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs: “Proposals for the Movement of Selected Education Programs” The discussion centered around the following questions:
   a. What material do we have, and how is it organized?
   b. Do we have any questions about the material, before we call in representatives of the various points of view?
   c. Is the material we have relevant to the issues?

The committee then considered the points raised in “Basis for the Proposal” in the memorandum. Each point in the “Basis” was evaluated for relevancy, and the committee considered whether further information was necessary, or other action needed to be taken.

The following numbers are the same as in the memorandum. The letters are added for the committee’s convenience in organizing the points.

1. A. “Locating these programs within the SOE would allow the Dean of Education more direct input into the hiring, review, and assignment of faculty” Statement is relevant. Evaluation would involve looking at programs that have already been moved.

1. B. “Locating these programs within the SOE would allow the Dean of Education more direct input into curriculum development and oversight, and assessment of course and program effectiveness”: Relevant. Again, evaluation of this statement would involve looking at programs that have been so moved in the past.

1. C.1.”Having the Dean of Education exercise line authority over Education faculty in the core areas of Math, English, and Social Studies would more clearly meet the guidelines as put forth by NCATE”. Relevant, but we need a copy of the guidelines from the authors of the Basis. C.2.” While the most recent review team did not directly address this matter during the most recent site visit, it remains an issue for them and will likely arise in the future”: Relevant, but we need the report of the last accreditation review team, or relevant parts.

1. D. “The key point is the need for closer collaboration between the teacher education programs and the School of Education”: Relevant. We would need to find evidence of current collaboration, and collaboration that should be improved. How would this collaboration affect quality?

1. E. “Centralizing teacher education programs would underscore ECU’s commitment to and strong support for the preparation of teachers”: Not relevant.

1. F. “The current decentralization of teacher education programs and faculty implies that ECU does not recognize teacher education programs as worth of recognition”: Not relevant.
1. G. “Now somewhat marginalized within the College of Arts and Sciences, the College’s teacher education faculty, their courses and curricula would enjoy a centrality of mission within the School of Education.” Not relevant.

1. H. Education-related faculty in foreign languages and literature, theater and dance, music, and art are not proposed to be moved, because:
   a. integrated into the fabric of their home units;
   b. aligned with standards in their disciplines;
   c. are working closely with the public schools;
This point is not highly relevant, since it is not a consideration of the quality of the programs suggested for movement.

1. I. “Those education-related faculty in theater and dance, music, and art programs are highly dependent on their particular facilities for instruction and movement would not be feasible.” Possibly true, but not relevant to the programs being considered for the move.

1. J. “Reassigning the College’s teacher education programs and faculty would bring ECU’s organizational chart into close conformity with national models: Not relevant, unless we know what national models, and whether they apply to ECU.

2. A. “Bringing secondary education faculty into the School of Education would allow their work in their respective areas to be evaluated and rewarded in line with that unit’s Faculty Evaluation Rubrics. Credit in the School of Education is granted for work in public schools and for publications in education journals.” Relevant, since this would affect ability to recruit and retain faculty. Does work in public schools and publication in education journals count in the College of Arts and Sciences departments?

2. B. “As changes in mission and emphasis occur in the College of Arts and Sciences, the differences in tenure/promotion requirements are likely to become even sharper.” Not relevant, since we know not the future.

2. C. “They (the faculty proposed to be moved) would also have many and more extended opportunities for collaboration with other professional education faculty”: Relevant, but we should ask the authors of the proposal the following questions: What collaboration? Why would it improve after the move? Would this collaboration affect the quality of the programs?

3. A. “By moving the secondary education faculty into the School of Education, the issue of Arts and Sciences collaboration with the School of Education would become clearer.” Not relevant.

3. B. “The collaboration that NCATE and other bodies are looking for is that which occurs between content experts in a given area and professional educators (education faculty).” Relevant, but is it true that there is inadequate collaboration and communication now, and both would improve after the move?

4. A. “The secondary education faculty involved with English and Social Studies Education would most likely become part of the new Department of Curriculum and Instruction that would facilitate their involvement in the preparation of a Ph. D. in Curriculum and Instruction.” Relevant. Further information needed: Do we have successful Ph. D. programs now, that did not require faculty to move?

4. B. (The same point as 4. A. is made about the Mathematics Education faculty)

5:00 pm, meeting to be continued on February 13, 2002.
David Lawrence, Secretary