Educational Policies and Planning Committee

February 13, 2002,
(Continuation of meeting on February 8, 2002)

Members present: George Bailey, David Lawrence, Jim Smith, Michael Brown, Rita Reaves, Amy Carr-Richardson, Karen Elberson, D. W. C. Dennard, Gerhard Kalmus, Bob Morrison, and Paul Tschetter.

The committee discussed issues raised by the document from the Department of History, on the proposed move of the program in social studies education to the School of Education.

The department raised the following objections:
1. "Their primary concern was the damage to the quality of the program that such a move would entail." The committee judged that damage to the program was not substantiated in the document.

2. "The national trend in teacher preparation has been for some time to provide instruction based in the student’s discipline—the course of action recommended by both the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) and the National History Standards." This is relevant, but the committee needs a copy the NCSS recommendations and the National History Standards from the Dept. of History.

3. "A thorough grounding in the subject matter is especially important for North Carolina secondary school educators who must pass two demanding Praxis exams based upon the knowledge of history for licensure." The committee needs substantiation for this. Do the students currently do well on the Praxis?

4. "The Dean of Education could offer no guarantees concerning curriculum changes and personnel decisions." This is not irrelevant, but cannot be checked, since such problems lie in the future.

5. "Because of the critical importance of subject matter courses, a member of the History Dept. is best suited to advise students about course selection." It is not practical to try to verify this statement.

6. "The directors of social studies education have been fully integrated into the History Dept., as evidenced by their having been afforded ex officio membership on the unit’s Curriculum and Undergraduate Committees." Since they are apparently voting members, this is relevant.

7. "These history educators have cultivated close relationships with the public schools of eastern North Carolina, and all history faculty have contributed to the forging of such links." Probably relevant, but do we know if the close relationship will get worse or improve as a result of the faculty move? Is there evidence of how many schools are involved? How many history faculty are involved? Why would the content faculty cease to be involved if the move was made? The proposers of the move should be asked how the relationship with the public schools would improve after the move.

8. "Faculty preparing secondary school history teachers should be located near the History Lab, a facility carefully designed for teacher preparation." The statement may be relevant, but there are questions: What will happen to these facilities if the move is made? What does this lab consist of? We should ask both the History Dept. and the Deans about this.

9. "The loss of roughly half of the unit’s undergraduate majors (along with the M. A. Ed program) would surely result in a concomitant reduction in F. T. E.s. With fewer faculty, the History Dept. would be unable to offer the full panoply of courses necessary for the kind of instruction students need to pass the Praxis Exams." Relevant, but we need to know how many undergraduates they would lose. How many courses could they not offer? Why?
10. “The deans’ proposal involves the relocation of three highly successful teacher education programs.” Nobody has alleged that these are bad programs, so we accept this. Allegation in the deans’ proposal is that they will be improved by the move; that is what we need evidence of.

11. The issue of Foreign Languages, Psychology, and Theater and Dance education faculty not moving to the School of Education is not relevant to the quality of the programs that are proposed to be moved, so this point is not relevant.

12. “ECU has achieved distinction statewide for its teacher training efforts in large measure because of the efficacy of the current structure.” This is a relevant point. If the current system is excellent, there might be less quality if the programs are moved. We would need evidence of this.

The committee then discussed the Mathematics Dept. document that presents arguments in opposition to the move. Within the Executive Summary, there are 17 bulleted points, which the committee evaluated as follows:

1. Relevant point.
2. The point is relevant, and the committee has been provided supporting data
3. Relevant point.
4. Relevant point.
5. Relevant point.
6. Relevant if true.
7. Not relevant.
8. Relevant
9. Relevant, but similar to point 4.
10. Relevant.
11. Relevant
12. Relevant.
13. Relevant.
15. Relevant if other programs have not flourished. Is there evidence?
16. Relevant.
17. Relevant.

David Lawrence, Secretary