



The University of Georgia

University Council
Athens, Georgia 30602

April 11, 2012

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE – 2011-2012

Mr. David E. Shipley, Chair
Agricultural and Environmental Sciences - Dr. T. Dean Pringle
Arts and Sciences - Dr. Roxanne Eberle (Arts)
Dr. Rodney Mauricio (Sciences)
Business - Dr. William D. Lastrapes
Ecology - Dr. James W. Porter
Education - Dr. William G. Wraga
Environment and Design - Mr. David Spooner
Family and Consumer Sciences - Dr. Leslie Gordon Simons
Forestry and Natural Resources - Dr. Sarah F. Covert
Journalism and Mass Communication - Dr. Alison F. Alexander
Law – No representative
Pharmacy - Dr. Keith N. Herist
Public and International Affairs - Dr. Robert Grafstein
Public Health – Dr. Marsha C. Black
Social Work - Dr. Stacey R. Kolomer
Veterinary Medicine - Dr. K. Paige Carmichael
Graduate School - Dr. Tracie E. Costantino
Undergraduate Student Representative – Mr. Marshall Mosher
Graduate Student Representative – Mr. Zachary Watne

Dear Colleagues:

The attached proposal to deactivate the major in Social Foundations in Education (Ph.D.) will be an agenda item for the April 18, 2012, Full University Curriculum Committee meeting.

Sincerely,

David E. Shipley, Chair
University Curriculum Committee

cc: Provost Jere W. Morehead
Dr. Laura D. Jolly




**OUTLINE FOR DEACTIVATION OR TERMINATION
OF A GRADUATE OR UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM**

1. Institution University of Georgia Date January 25th, 2012
2. School/College College of Education
3. Department/Division Workforce Education, Leadership and Social Foundations
4. Program: Social Foundations of Education
Degree Ph.D.
Major Social Foundations of Education
5. Deactivation or Termination
6. Last date students will be admitted to this program Spring 2012
7. Last date students will graduate from this program Spring 2016
8. Abstract of the deactivated or terminated program
Provide a brief summary of the deactivated or terminated program that includes an overview and highlights of the response to the criteria in Section II.

The department offers a Ph.D. program in educational foundations and policy studies with emphases in either sociocultural studies of education or the history of U.S. education. The social foundations of education and policy studies draw on the research traditions and skills of anthropology, history, political science, sociology, philosophy, and related disciplines to deepen scholarly and public understanding of teaching, learning, schooling, and other forms of education. Examining ethics and values is integral to the study of the social foundations of education; questions of why and ought are considered along with questions of how and what.

The Ph.D. program is designed for any individual interested in advanced interdisciplinary study of education in its social, economic, cultural, political, ethical, and historical contexts. The program seeks to prepare high level researchers, scholars, teachers, policy analysts, and other educational and political leaders through the critical analysis of schools in society.

9. Signatures

 _____ Department Head	<u>14 Feb 2012</u> _____ Date
 _____ Dean of School/College	<u>2/14/12</u> _____ Date
 _____ Dean of Graduate School	<u>3/21/12</u> _____ Date

II. Conditions for Deactivating or Terminating Programs

The deactivation (temporary suspension) or termination (discontinuation) of programs is expected to address satisfactorily the conditions listed below in order to be approved and implemented within the University of Georgia. Please provide sufficient information to confirm each condition.

1. Provide copies of the studies and decisions that warrant deactivation or termination of the program. See departmental program review (attached).

2. State the reasons for deactivating or terminating the program.

We are proposing the deactivation of the Ph.D program in Social Foundations of Education because the size of the faculty at the end of this academic year will be disproportionally small given the number of doctoral students enrolled. Because of retirements and program transfers, the faculty will be reduced to three members in AY 2012-13. The program needs time to collaborate with faculty members from around the college with an interest in social foundations so that it can develop a broader range of curricular offerings. We begin by quoting from the Academic Program Review of Social Foundations of Education that was conducted in the fall of 2010:

“The Social Foundations program has a doctoral program and has been graduating two students per year for the last three years. It appears to have about 16 students in the program. The program has four tenure track faculty members and one lecturer. Given these enrollment and degrees conferred numbers, it would appear that the program has more faculty members than it needs. In a more academic sense, however, such staffing might be considered skeletal. The field of social foundations of education is comprised of the disciplines of history, sociology, anthropology, economics, philosophy, comparative education, cultural studies, and allied fields. The current faculty represent at best four of those disciplines. It is difficult to imagine how such minimal staffing can hope to achieve the PhD program’s announced mission: “The program seeks to prepare high level researchers, scholars, teachers, policy analysts, and other educational and political leaders through the critical analysis of schools in society.” Graduates from the program will not be competitive simply because they cannot have had exposure to even half of the disciplines that social foundations scholars are traditionally exposed to in their doctoral studies.

Given that the field of social foundations of education is highly interdisciplinary, serves all educational professions preparation programs, and has the potential to raise important questions that transcend departmental boundaries, and given that a number of faculty in the college have social foundations backgrounds or the disciplinary training to contribute to the college’s social foundations program at all degree levels, we recommend that the college investigate alternative models of programmatic organization that would better serve the college and university than the current arrangement. Further, given the size of the Social Foundations faculty, its enrollments, and its asymmetrical make-up relative to the expected disciplines that traditionally comprise the social foundations of education as a field, we recommend that the doctoral degree program be discontinued unless the program can be reconfigured in ways that will resolve this issue.”

We are asking that this program be deactivated, that the students currently enrolled be allowed to continue toward graduation with the three faculty members in the program, and that the College work

with interested faculty members across departments to re-imagine and re-configure a graduate-level program in Social Foundations of Education that is viable and attractive to highly talented students.

3. State the plans for allowing those students already in a program to complete degree requirements.

The three faculty members that will remain in the program will continue to teach and advise enrolled students until they complete their program. The faculty member who is retiring will work as a retire-rehire so that she can continue working with her doctoral students.

4. What will be done to minimize the impact of deactivation or termination of the program upon the personal and professional lives of the faculty involved?

The remaining faculty members will continue to teach their courses and advise their students during the period of deactivation.

5. What will be done to insure that deactivation or termination of the program does not weaken other programs (graduate, undergraduate, or professional) for which the department may be responsible?

As the program review makes clear, the Social Foundations of Education Program had no substantive relationship to other programs housed in the department. Students in some degree programs take the undergraduate Social Foundations of Education courses, but those will continue to be offered for both students in WELSF as well the rest of the COE.

6. What plans, if any, is there for subsequent reactivation or reinstatement, respectively, of the deactivated or terminated program?

As soon as the program is officially deactivated, college leadership will begin working with social foundations of education and other interested faculty around the college to design and build a newly conceptualized program that would work from different assumptions and an enlarged academic perspective.

Review of the Department of Workforce Education, Leadership, and Social Foundations

Overview

The Department of Workforce Education, Leadership, and Social Foundations is comprised of three programs: Workforce Education, Educational Leadership, and Social Foundations of Education. It is housed mostly in the Rivers Crossing facility, with one degree program at Gwinnett. In FY 2010, the department had nineteen full-time, tenure-track faculty members (one of whom was untenured), one lecturer and one academic professional, for a total of twenty-one faculty members. In the three years reviewed, its faculty has increased by one, but at the end of FY2010 four tenured faculty members retired. The department offers seven academic degrees, including six offered by the Workforce Education program (from BSED to PhD) and one in the Social Foundations of Education program (PhD only). Educational Leadership no longer offers degree programs. The department is a creature of reorganization; the three programs that comprise the department bear virtually no logical relationship to one another.

The Workforce Education program has previously had degree programs at Gwinnett but no longer does. The MEd in HROD was moved to LEAP at the time of reorganization and the IPTT program was discontinued. The unit offers an online MEd to meet needs of not only students at Gwinnett but across the state.

Key Metrics

Enrollment

Enrollment in the department's one undergraduate program, the BSED in Career and Technical Education, has trended lower over the last three years, losing about 40% of enrollment over that period (52, 41, 31). Graduate program enrollments have also trended lower, though the decline has not been nearly as marked, a less than ten percent decline (204, 194, 186). Only the two PhD programs have experienced increased enrollments over the last three years, each increasing by one to two students in that period; both average 15 to 17 enrollees annually. Although enrollment has declined across the other degree programs in Workforce Education, all continue to have significant numbers of students except for the program's EdS with only seven to eight students per year. Overall, the department has the lowest enrollment in the college with 217 students; for the last three years, it had the lowest enrollment by enrollees per instructional EFT, though the FY2010 retirements may change that metric substantially.

However, since the reported enrollment data only count enrollment of program majors, the data do not provide a full picture of enrollment in the department's courses. Both Workforce Education and Social Foundations provide service courses to the college and the university, particularly required undergraduate and graduate courses. As a result of those courses, the average undergraduate class size in those two programs is relatively large. Average undergraduate courses in 2009 were 28 and 34 for WE and SF,

respectively. Average class size for graduate courses was close to the average in other departments: 16 and 17 for masters and specialist degree programs; and for doctoral courses, 7 and 9, respectively. Despite the fact that the department is a major provider of service courses, however, the enrollment trends and below average credit-hour production indicate that the department has problems with attracting students that need to be addressed.

Degrees Conferred

The number of degrees conferred has roughly followed enrollment trends over the last three years. BSEd degrees have declined from 24 to 22 in that period; graduate degrees have declined from 52 to 46. All but two per year of the graduate degrees were earned in Workforce Education. The department ranks among the lowest departments in the college in degrees conferred whether measured on a per-faculty member or per-instructional EFT basis (4.1 graduates per faculty member or 8.9 graduates per instructional EFT). The college averages are 7.2 graduates per faculty, or 16.4 per instructional EFT.

Time to graduation for the Workforce Education master's and specialist programs has averaged about 2 years; time to graduation for doctoral programs has averaged 6 years for Workforce Education and 6.5 years for Social Foundations.

Credit Hour Production

Across the department, credit hour production has declined by five percent over the last three years, from 8733 in 2006 to 8349 in 2009. The decline was entirely at the graduate level, as reflected in graduate enrollment patterns; the undergraduate credit hour production actually increased by ten percent over the same period (3158 to 3342 to 3475).

To provide a full picture of credit hour production of a department, however, the CHP must be understood as a proportion of the department's instructional EFT. The budgeted instructional time of the department's twenty-one faculty members equals 8.9 EFT (two faculty members in Educational Leadership have no budgeted instructional time). On a per unit basis, then, WELSF generated 686.8 credit hours per EFT. That ranks third lowest in the college.

Scholarly Productivity

The WELSF faculty has the lowest rate of productivity in the College of Education with an average of one publication each year per faculty member, or 3.4 publications per research EFT. The average in the college is 2.6 publications per faculty member, or 8.5 publications per research EFT. The department's research productivity, then, based on research EFT, is less than half the college average publication record.

Grants, Contracts, and Foundation Accounts

Four faculty members, all in Workforce Education, account for all grant activity in the last two years. In 2009, the program won grants totaling \$202,071; in 2010, it gained one grant worth \$40,431. The awards were all from local and state agencies. The largest award was for \$160,856. In the last three years, the department lagged behind all other departments in grant-generation.

Placement of Doctoral Students

The department is able to report on the placement of seventeen of its thirty graduates in 2007 through 2009. All but one of the seventeen were graduates of the Workforce Education program. Nine have taken positions in higher education; two of those are in program director positions, one is a dean. The remainder are in a variety of positions in secondary education, private business, or other fields.

Areas for Discussion

WELSF lags behind the college average on most metrics. On some metrics it lags seriously. Further, as noted above, the three programs that constitute the department have virtually nothing academically, philosophically, or intellectually in common. Members of the department reported that relations within the department were cordial and collegial, but the collegiality seems not to be directed toward any identifiable end beyond civility.

These are the areas that appear to need serious discussion:

Departmental coherence

The largest program in the department, Workforce Education, is a teacher preparation program with a strong reputation in the state and a good record of preparing educators; it is the only program in the state that certifies teachers in some areas of vocational and technical education. It also prepares teacher educators through its advanced graduate programs. In the traditional liberal education-technical training dichotomy in teacher education, it falls fairly strongly on the technical training side of the equation, a tendency reinforced by its focus on preparing teachers for vocational, trade, and technical classrooms.

By contrast, Social Foundations' relationship to teacher preparation has historically been at the other end of the spectrum, eschewing the technical end of teacher education and embracing the study of education sociologically, anthropologically, historically, and philosophically. Indeed, one strand of the social foundations discipline has interrogated the legitimacy of vocational education within schools which are historically intended to foster democracy. In short, one of the programs in the department works to prepare teachers with the technical skills to pursue their vocation while the other questions the premises upon which teacher education rests. That tension appears not to have been

addressed in any way, not even as a source of creative tension. There appears to have been no sustained effort to find any common ground for collaboration.

The third program has been essentially discontinued; its one remaining faculty member has been assigned to work with other programs in the university.

Thus, while the department reports collegial relations, it appears not to have found any way of developing a department-wide mission or a coherent vision of collaborative work.

Service courses

Both Social Foundations and Workforce Education offer service courses for the college and the university. For the Social Foundations program, service courses are essentially its meat and potatoes; without them, the program could not continue as a viable entity. With only one degree program, the PhD, nearly all of the program's CHP is gained through supplying required undergraduate courses and graduate courses taken by students outside the department and the program.

There will be a continuing need for social foundations course offerings; teacher education certification agencies expect a portion of teacher candidates' education to include reflection on the social, economic, historical, and philosophical forces that impinge upon formal education. However, it is not clear why the program is or should be associated with any one particular department. Further, there are scholars throughout the college with strong social foundations training who would bring strength and diversity to the program whose expertise is currently not being tapped.

Workforce Education's involvement in service courses is more complicated. For historical reasons, it has been involved for four decades with a program in the School of Family and Consumer Sciences over which it has little or no influence, though it must provide substantial resources. While the program's content is delivered by faculty in FCS, Workforce Education must provide the teacher education courses, arrange student teaching placement, and coordinate field supervision. This is a fine example of cross-college collaboration that should be recognized and celebrated.

Adequacy of staff to degree program in Social Foundations

The Social Foundations program has a doctoral program and has been graduating two students per year for the last three years. It appears to have about 16 students in the program. The program has four tenure track faculty members and one lecturer. Given these enrollment and degrees conferred numbers, it would appear that the program has more faculty members than it needs. In a more academic sense, however, such staffing might be considered skeletal. The field of social foundations of education is comprised of the disciplines of history, sociology, anthropology, economics, philosophy, comparative education, cultural studies, and allied fields. The current faculty represent at best four of those disciplines. It is difficult to imagine how such minimal staffing can hope to achieve

the PhD program's announced mission: "The program seeks to prepare high level researchers, scholars, teachers, policy analysts, and other educational and political leaders through the critical analysis of schools in society." Graduates from the program will not be competitive simply because they cannot have had exposure to even half of the disciplines that social foundations scholars are traditionally exposed to in their doctoral studies.

Given that the field of social foundations of education is highly interdisciplinary, serves all educational professions preparation programs, and has the potential to raise important questions that transcend departmental boundaries, and given that a number of faculty in the college have social foundations backgrounds or the disciplinary training to contribute to the college's social foundations program at all degree levels, we recommend that the college investigate alternative models of programmatic organization that would better serve the college and university than the current arrangement. Further, given the size of the Social Foundations faculty, its enrollments, and its asymmetrical make-up relative to the expected disciplines that traditionally comprise the social foundations of education as a field, we recommend that the doctoral degree program be discontinued unless the program can be reconfigured in ways that will resolve this issue.

Competing programs within the college

Workforce Education and Human Resource Development do much the same sort of work, have similar courses listed in the bulletin, and engage in similar kinds of research. Having two different programs, one called Workforce Education and the other called Human Resource Development, within the college is, as the department head remarked, an "aberration" since in most schools they would be combined. It does not make sense to continue operating two parallel programs within the college. We recommend closer alignment, if not outright merger, of the Workforce Education Program with LEAP's Human Resource and Organizational Development.

Curricular collaboration within and across programs in WELSF and across the college

Within the two programs currently constituting WELSF, there appear to be about 115 courses (excluding the courses in the CFCS program for which Workforce Education has responsibility), mostly at the graduate level. That is nearly as many discrete courses as offered by the largest department in the college, though WELSF has only two-thirds the number of faculty (and with the most recent changes in the Educational Leadership faculty, closer to three-fifths) and many fewer majors.

Fully one-third of those courses (38) are the responsibility of the five faculty members in Social Foundations. Some of the courses have never been offered, others have not been offered for several years. The current faculty does not have the expertise to offer a number of them, though the expertise exists in the college but has not been solicited to collaborate. Meanwhile, courses are offered in other departments that have social foundations roots and duplicate courses offered in Social Foundations

The twelve members of the Workforce Education handle the other 76 courses. Some of the Workforce Education courses are similar to courses offered in the Human Resources program within LEAP. Further, the HR program fits within the mission of Workforce Education. Yet the current divided program disadvantages Workforce Education, in as much as it must staff an undergraduate program while the prestigious graduate program resides in LEAP's HR program.

As noted earlier, given the nature of the two programs within WELSF, there is virtually no overlap and hence very little logical likelihood of meshing courses or creating courses that reach across the department, whereas there are clearly opportunities for the programs to collaborate with faculty in other departments or to merge with programs in other parts of the college.

Departmental productivity

On measures of productivity – credit-hour production, scholarly production, and grant production – WELSF fares poorly. The latter two areas, publications and grants, are well below what must be expected of scholars in a Research 1 institution and what is expected under the college's Strategic Plan. This situation appears to require aggressive reassignment of budgeted time, among other measures.