

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
November 29, 2007
Johnson Hall Conference Room

Present:

Andrew Bonamici, Gavin Bruce, Herb Chereck, Hilary Gerdes, Dave Hubin, Dean Livelybrooks, Alexandra Marcus, Lyllye Parker, Steven Pologe, Karen McLaughlin, Ron Severson, Karen Sprague, Alan Kimball, Elizabeth Reis, and Jim Imamura

Absent:

Elizabeth Jarvis, Anne Laskaya, Andrew Leavitt, Arkady Vaintrob, Kate Wagle, Malcolm Wilson, Bill Rossi, and Paul Engelking

Guests:

Mike Bullis, Dean, College of Education
Jerry Rosiek, Dept Head of Teacher Education
Joanna Goode, Assistant Professor, Teacher Education
Jill Baxter, Associate Professor, Educational Studies

Minutes:

A vote on the November 15, 2007 minutes was postponed since they were not ready for Council's review. The Chair reminded members to submit their available times for meeting so the Winter term meeting schedule could be set. Cathy Kraus will notify the Council of the schedule.

Introductions:

The Chair introduced the guests from the College of Education who would present a proposal for a new Undergraduate Degree in Educational Studies in the College of Education.

College of Education Proposal for a New Unified Undergraduate Degree in Educational Studies

(See: [Updated Proposal for Unified Undergraduate Degree in Educational Studies, Education Program Requirements Comparison](#))

Mike Bullis presented a brief history of the development of the Teacher Education program at UO. Three-four years ago, significant criticism had been leveled at the program for inconsistency, content weakness, and lack of responsiveness to cultural diversity. Two years ago, an extensive review and revision of the Teacher Education program after an internal audit confirmed that the Teacher Education program had grown inconsistently over the years. As a result, there had been some consideration of cutting the undergraduate program in Teacher Education, but Lorraine Davis, Provost at the time, and John Mosely, Sr. Vice President of UO, had adamantly discouraged this. The current

undergraduate program is a feeder program into the Masters of Education program. Dean Bullis emphasized the importance of educating teachers effectively, especially in science and math, as a state and national priority. He also noted that since 47% of Oregon teachers are expected to retire within the next five years, there is great need for new teachers..

Jerry Rosiek explained that the proposal being presented to the Council is an effort to consolidate the two tracks of the current undergraduate program (Educational Studies and Integrated Teaching) into one degree program with the elimination of redundancies. The proposed undergraduate degree program in Educational Studies leads to a pre-professional degree; it does not provide a licensure to teach. The new proposed program also responds to calls for greater cultural competency, cultural context, and more science and math for prospective teachers. Jill Baxter noted that the new degree program builds on the Education Pathway Program that was designed to provide hands-on science training for Elementary Education students. There are 2 tracks in the new program: one for students intending to teach at the elementary level; another for students intending to teach math and/or science at the middle/secondary level.

- **Discussion**

Council members addressed a variety of questions and concerns to the College of Education representatives:

- Why does Teacher Education at the elementary level require only 100-level courses in science? These are non-science liberal arts courses.

Jerry Rosiek responded the Elementary Education teachers are expected to be literacy teachers; with math and science, the need is to be broad rather than deep. Jill Baxter added that it would be unrealistic to have Elementary Education teacher candidates go deeply into every area they taught; however, the goal is to create the “disposition to learn” in teacher candidates. Karen Sprague explained that the Biology courses in the Education Pathway were at the 200-level, but those courses proved too challenging for Teacher Ed Students; 100-level courses can serve as an introduction to some scientific concepts and they can help students overcome their fear of science. They don’t provide solid grounding in the principles of science, however.

- How is the College of Education going to develop the transition from current programs to the new program? What will be the enrollment impact? What will be faculty impact?

Current students will be shepherded on a case-by-case basis during program transition. There will be no enrollment impact. The same number of students as are admitted into the current 2-track program will be admitted into the proposed new degree program; the type of student applying to the new program might change. The new courses offered through the program will be rotated; most faculty for these courses are already available on campus. These classes will be limited in enrollment. Upper-level classes in specific areas [of

math or science] might be able to substitute for some courses in the degree program.

- Is a major in the subject required for the middle/secondary track of the proposed major?

Currently, a subject area major is required for students intending to teach at the middle/secondary level. In contrast, the new degree program requires only a minor and ~8 additional credits in the subject area. The secondary track of the proposal is a compromise to address the issue of “add-on” certification endorsement for science & math through praxis testing (as opposed to subject specialization/major).

- Student feedback suggests that quality is compromised in the online versions of some of the courses that count toward this degree. The Council argued against using such on-line courses in the degree program.

The College of Education representatives acknowledged that there are many different perceptions of their proposed new degree program, but they hoped for the Council’s speedy recommendation as they hoped to inaugurate the new degree in Fall 2008.

After the guests departed, the Chair asked the Council: What is the Council’s recommendation? Does it vote in favor of the Elementary Track? What about the Secondary Track?

- If the Council moves the proposal forward, should it move forward as a whole? The Council noted that this is the first time that the academic merits of this proposal have been considered outside the COE;
- What is the rationale for NOT requiring a major in a relevant subject area for high school [secondary] teachers? Would it help to specify that the proposed secondary track is limited to middle school? Does a “Highly Qualified” teaching endorsement require a major in the subject?

The Chair called for a motion from the floor (or electronically, via e-mail after members considered the matter further); no motion was made and the Council did not want an electronic motion.

Council members proposed that it would be necessary to talk further with the College of Education about the proposal as presented. There was general approval of the Elementary Education track, but there were major concerns about the Secondary Track. The Chair and member Karen McLaughlin agreed to discuss the Council’s stance and concerns with Jerry Rosiek. They will also clarify the timeline the College of Education is following for review of the proposal.

The meeting was adjourned.

The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Monday, January 14, 2008, 12:00pm at Rowe Conference Room, Knight Library.