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Preface

When the College of Education was established at UNC Charlotte in 1970-1971, the University enrolled 4,676 students. Now over 25,000 students are pursuing higher education on this campus, with over 3100 preparing for careers in education. The story of our College is a story of rapid growth: growth in the scope and size of our mission and growth in our impact on the field of education and on the communities we serve.

I am grateful to two long-time colleagues, Professor Jeff Passe and Associate Dean Barbara Edwards, for collecting, organizing, and sharing the stories that give such a meaningful glimpse into the 40 years of our growth and of our history as the College of Education (College of Human Development and Learning...College of Education and Allied Professions...) at UNC Charlotte.

Jeff and Barbara have lived a lot of the history of our community. Barbara joined the faculty in 1976 and served in diverse roles, including faculty member in reading education, Chair of the Department of Reading and Elementary Education, and as Associate Dean of the College until her retirement in 2009. Jeff Passe moved from UNC Charlotte to Towson University in Maryland in 2009; he joined the UNC Charlotte faculty in 1986 and served as Professor of Elementary Education. Recounting Jeff and Barbara’s long terms of service at UNC Charlotte reminds me that this has been one of our greatest strengths: faculty have joined this community and stayed to contribute to our growing and changing mission in very meaningful ways.

As you read this manuscript, you will discover other strengths as well: a passion for good teaching and learning, a deep understanding of why this work is important, a willingness to reflect on practice and learn from experience, the courage to innovate, and a valuing of collaboration and relationships. You will also encounter disagreement, irritation, and conflict, related, I think, to the passion and to the desire to create an amazing college.

The voices in this manuscript are largely those of faculty and administrators who have built this community and participated personally and deeply in some or all of our forty years. While a few student profiles and student voices are included, there’s a place for a Volume II that captures the student experience. I hope those of you who have been students in this college will share your stories during this time of celebration of the college’s 40 years.

I have been part of this college for twenty-eight of its forty years, having joined the faculty as Assistant Professor of Special Education in 1982. I’m honored to be part of this story and am grateful to my colleagues and students who have shared and are sharing this amazing journey. I can’t wait to discover what will happen next!

Mary Lynne Calhoun
Dean, College of Education
October 15, 2010
Introduction One

This is an oral history. After interviewing over thirty faculty, students, and administrators, I organized their quotes to tell the story of UNC Charlotte’s College of Education. There are four sections, corresponding to each of our four permanent deans.

This project was born when long-time faculty member Sister Mary Thomas Burke died in 2002 after more than 30 years of service to the College of Education. It occurred to me that a great repository of our College’s history was buried with her. I was inspired to record the recollections of my past and present colleagues before it was too late. As you’ll see, it’s a remarkable story, capturing not just the history of a college, but of a series of historical eras.

I am grateful for the availability, candor, and support from each of the subjects who were interviewed. I regret that I was unable (due to considerations of time and expense) to talk with even more of the many educators who were part of the story. Being new to oral history (I had taught how to do it, but never actually tried it. Make your own judgment about that!), I was overwhelmed by the amount of time the project required. I had to stop somewhere.

Each interview was conducted one-to-one, transcribed, and then reviewed by the interviewee. We think we have it right, but memory and bias are bound to affect the reliability to some degree. The sources are noted throughout by position, rather than name, because I wanted the story to be about the College, not the individuals. I have used superscript notation to relate each quotation to the interviewee’s position; these positions are listed at the end of this document. Sometimes, a quote was changed from first- to third-person because the personal reference made the source too obvious. Other than that, the quotes are as I recorded them in my written notes.

You will find that this is a celebratory account, by design. There were some harsh statements that were set aside for a more definitive historical study, though there are no plans, as of yet, for such a document. Yet, there are some critical comments that were kept in because they added insight or counter-weight to the described events. The editorial decisions were mine.

I am hopeful that this work will be continued for years to come. By studying, and continuing to study the UNC Charlotte College of Education, we can better understand who we are, celebrate what we have become, and prepare for the future.

Whoever wishes to foresee the future must consult the past; for human events ever resemble those of preceding times. This arises from the fact that they are produced by men who ever have been, and ever shall be, animated by the same passions, and thus they necessarily have the same results. - Machiavelli

“History is interim reports issued periodically.” -Anonymous

Jeff Passe
Professor
Introduction Two

My participation in this endeavor has had three distinct stages. The first was awareness and approval. Having worked with all four deans and scores of faculty over the years, I was immediately delighted to learn that Jeff Passe was undertaking an oral history project about our College of Education. I knew it was an amazing story to be told, and I believed that Jeff’s diligence in developing that story would reveal its richness.

The second stage was my own interview as a long-standing member of the faculty (1976-2009), which I thoroughly enjoyed. Rarely had anyone shown such intense, respectful, and non-judgmental interest about my experiences in this vastly changed college over the years. Given the unhurried amount of time that Jeff spent asking me questions, and the insightfulness of those questions, I couldn’t imagine how he’d ever create a coherent story. But he did just that!

Finally, the third stage began a number of months after my retirement when Dean Calhoun asked me to edit and expand upon Jeff’s excellent draft since he had left UNC Charlotte for a leadership position in another university. I read his draft and resonated with nearly every quotation he had included. I didn’t say I agreed with every statement, now; I said resonated. I reflected on the many changes that have come amidst celebration, turmoil, optimism, suspicion, relief, disappointment, and once, actual fanfare by a trumpeter. No organization as complex as a growing university would ever have consensus among its active participants at any given time, let alone in retrospect, so I was more than satisfied that Jeff had captured the diversity of voices and perspectives. (The university enrolled about 7,000 students when I arrived in 1976 and had grown to nearly 25,000 students when I retired in 2009.) Cautious about approaching another person’s work to make changes, I soon realized I could enrich the wonderful oral history he had created simply by adding contextual overviews to each section, making some minor changes of sub-section organization, and adding in a bit more interview data from exemplar graduates.

In editing, providing contextual overviews, and adding spotlights on three graduates, I have attempted to maintain a non-biased, simply descriptive stance. As I’ve said, I lived through all the turbulence and successes of these changes throughout the years, so I certainly have biases attached to my experiences. Hopefully, these biases did not influence my choices of what to describe in the overviews. If my due diligence with dusty catalogs provided interesting facts relative to the many, many programmatic changes, then consider them as background for reading the oral history that emerged from the interviews; if not, ignore the overviews and dive into the richness of the quotations. Without any caveats, I am confident that the spotlights on just a few of the outstanding graduates have given readers another window with which to consider the enormous change in the College of Education over the past four decades.

It is the very nature of life to strive to continue in being. Since this continuance can be secured only by constant renewals, life is a self-renewing process. What nutrition and reproduction are to physiological life, education is to social life. - John Dewey

Barbara Edwards
Associate Dean Emeritus
Part I: The College of Human Development and Learning (HDL) (1970 to 1979)

Overview

The earliest version of the College of Education was the College of Human Development and Learning (typically called HDL). It was formed in the early 1970’s from the tiny Department of Education that preceded it, but without the intention of a singular focus on education. The College of Human Development and Learning was so named in order to communicate that a broad array of helping professions included but was not limited to teaching, and that preparation of individuals for the various helping professions should embrace many common principles and priorities related to liberal education, human relationships, self-knowledge, and personal development. Early faculty came from a variety of the helping professions, including K-12 classrooms, educational administration, special education, pediatrics, psychiatry, counseling, child development, theology, sociology and psychology.

In the early 1970’s, HDL provided a Master of Education program that allowed teachers to seek masters-level certification as classroom teachers or to branch out into counseling, administration, or supervision. The Master of Arts in Education (M.A.Ed.) for the fields of English and history was offered through the College of Humanities; the M.A.Ed. for mathematics was offered through the College of Science and Mathematics. All M.Ed. and M.A.Ed. students took coursework in theories of human development and learning and in curriculum theory, with those 6 hours being the only HDL requirements for the M.A.Ed. students.

There was no undergraduate degree offered through HDL until 1976. Prior to that time, undergraduates who wanted to become early childhood or intermediate grade teachers majored in an academic discipline just as those students who wanted to teach high school subjects. All undergraduates who were seeking teacher certification in these aforementioned fields met degree requirements within their academic disciplines and completed a series of 5 to 7 HDL courses plus student teaching. Students who wished to become art or music teachers majored in individualized programs offered through the Creative Arts Department, took HDL courses according to identified needs and interests, and earned the Bachelor of Creative Arts (BCA). BCA majors seeking certification were permitted to spread the 150 clock hours of student teaching across multiple semesters, according to individualized plans. Students already holding a bachelor’s degree and seeking teacher certification were required to take two additional courses in their major field, one course in human development and learning, and student teaching.

In the mid to late 1970’s, many changes occurred within HDL. The B.A. in Human Development and Learning was approved and first offered in 1976. This program was the route to teacher certification in Early Childhood Education (K-3), while students planning to teach in the intermediate grades (gr. 4-9) could choose to major in either HDL or an academic discipline. Students aspiring to become secondary teachers (gr. 7-12) continued to major in their academic disciplines. Students not wishing to become teachers could major in HDL to become “infant and child development specialists, program directors, infant and day care coordinators, human service specialists, and other personnel for related helping professions” (1978-79 Undergraduate Catalog, p. 167). The Master of Education became the Master of Human Development and Learning and retained much of its curricular design from earlier years while adding routes to
certification in the additional fields of learning disabilities, reading education, and gifted and talented education.

**The Context of the University**

*Chancellor Colvard developed areas, rather than disciplines.*

*Colvard was a visionary, but a cautious visionary.*

*Colvard identified himself as a non-traditionalist.*

*The administrative support was there. In other words, Chase wasn’t speaking to an enemy. In fact, Chase never spoke of administrative obstacles or resistance.*

*Hugh McEnery (Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs) was very supportive.*

*McEnery and Chase were tight.*

*McEnery encouraged thinking outside the box.*

*Faculty didn’t want UNCC to have a teacher’s college branch of the university. It would weaken other programs. Other colleges tried to tamp down HDL growth.*

*The founders of Arts and Sciences (i.e., Sherman Burson and Schley Lyons) were very academic.*

*Tradition is very hard to upset, even among intellectuals.*

*It was an unstructured arrangement when I came here – departments were not well-formed. (Founder Bonnie Cone was a high school teacher.)*

**The First Education Program and the First Dean, John Chase**

*In the early days of UNC Charlotte, teacher education was handled by just two professors – Ben Hackney taught the elementary education courses, and Philip Vairo taught the secondary courses.*

*My early recollections are that, in the 1970s, there was a move to disband colleges of education due to there being no body of knowledge. It could be taught in existing departments.*

*The Dean decision (for the new Education College) was Ben Hackney vs. John Chase.*

*Ben Hackney was a traditionalist. He rolled with a lot of punches. He was a Deweyan progressive, a fair-minded man.*
John Chase’s mother was in the State House – Nancy Chase. That gave John Chase prominence.  

Who was Dean John Chase as an intellectual?

“Chase was a science education professor. He became a leader in the field during the humanistic science education phase (experiential, hands-on.) He was cited as one of ASCD’s ‘curriculum 100, based on his co-authorship (with J. Minor Gwynn) of a landmark curriculum text, (Curriculum Principles and Social Trends (New York, Macmillan,1969))

Chase was a science education professor. He became a leader in the field during the humanistic science education phase (experiential, hands-on.) He was cited as one of ASCD’s ‘curriculum 100, based on his co-authorship (with J. Minor Gwynn) of a landmark curriculum text, (Curriculum Principles and Social Trends (New York, Macmillan,1969))

Chase was an anomaly (as a dean) at that time because he was well grounded in curriculum theory. He reconstructed thinking about curriculum in the US in his book. He called his theory non-traditional existentialism – I/Thou.

Chase was a humanist. His emphasis was on HUMAN Development and Learning. He focused on human potentiality (which was a popular movement at the time.)

Chase read Buber, other books on human potential (Maslow, Combs, Rogers) He aligned with those behind group dynamics, sensitivity training. We were all hippies.

Chase got a private foundation grant with schools. He had good relationship with public schools.

Who was John Chase as a leader?

Brilliant, a risk taker, loyal. Detractors viewed him as power-hungry, playing favorites.

An idea man (encouraged others to carry out policy.)

Chase had his hand in everything. His vision created the Bachelor’s program.

Chase couldn’t be fought – he had money and a strong, loyal staff, and his mother was in the legislature.

There was a feeling of commitment to Chase among the faculty.

Chase, again and again, saw a potential in somebody.

Chase was very charming and outgoing. He was professionally ambitious, aspired to greatness.

He was charismatic.

Chase was amazing at recruiting faculty. There were lots of black and female faculty. Faculty included a nun, a monk, and a practicing psychologist.
Bobbie Rowland came as Kindergarten person, Jonnie McLeod as a pediatrician, and Sister Mary Thomas came after Sacred Heart folded.  

His style was pragmatist/scientific thinker.  

John Chase had strong opinions and idiosyncrasies.  

He was an enigma in some ways – a poor administrator, but a great public speaker. He could get them fired up!” He was a master salesman – he believed in what he was selling.  

He was an uncommon person. He didn’t do things halfway. He was creative, a thinker, a planner, a doer, and a programmer.  

John Chase had his own definite opinions and a different approach.  

While many administrators at the time were more democratic, Chase was more administrative, top-down.  

Chase was very bright, fascinating to watch, but he had personal issues; he was powerful and manipulative.  

Chase gave a loose rein to people he trusted, maybe too much.  

**Creating the College of Human Development and Learning (HDL)**  

There were 8 UNCC colleges, all autonomous. The autonomy was Vice Chancellor McEnery’s influence.  

The name was due to Jonnie McLeod’s Human Services program. It communicated the value of contributing to community. It built a base for social work or education or Masters level work. We could have added Criminal Justice, Allied Health, and Public Administration.  

We had a self-study. Faculty like to be involved almost beyond the capability of being involved.  

The HDL proposal was an easy move. Any objections were handled by writing rationales.  

It was pretty turf-conscious, with so little turf ourselves.  

**The HDL Philosophy**  

Human Development was the centerpiece around which everything else was structured. It was non-traditional, in that it didn’t reflect disciplinary specialties.  

We had to use the term “helping professional,” not “teacher.”
HDL was a “free form” model.  

Chase’s vision: write rationale for College, generalists, K-12, faculty responsible for students for 4 years.  

Piaget, Maslow, Kohlberg, and Erikson were stressed.  

They (HDL) wanted to be a different kind of place (though there were similar programs at the University of Florida, Virginia, and the University of Massachusetts.)  

The major thing that Chase did was create a spiral curriculum combining Curriculum Principles and Social Trends.  

There was a notion that teacher education ought to be a seamless, integrated enterprise - a la whole child.  

The commitment was to knowing oneself well enough to be of service to other human beings. Students either hated it or were thrilled by it.  

It was the 70’s – an outgrowth of the 60s. We had to DO things.  

It was a human development orientation -- multi-dynamic problems require multiple angles (early childhood, administration, counseling, etc.) and person-orientation with rigor in thinking.  

**Curriculum, Advising, Teaching and Learning in HDL**  

We had an unusual advising process. We met once a week with advisees to set goals for the clinical -What do you want to learn? In our advising meetings, 25 to 30 students sat on the floor of open-space offices.  

HDL was more humanistic. Classrooms were very student-centered. There were lots of group projects. The emphasis we were taught was “hands-on,” and the faculty taught that way.  

The emphasis was on personal and professional growth.  

Each course was supposed to help students examine issues from a “Systems Analysis” approach- In other words, there is no real bag of tricks. Each of us could use different things differently. As a class approached an educational issue, students were presented with: the following format: Situation: Problems-Promises: What did you do about it? What were the results? Why did it work or not work?  

The program was built around discussions, with the teacher as facilitator.  

There were lots of open discussions in every class.
Every single class had a clinical component. 

There were lots of field experiences. 

The first semester internship was in a non-school setting (e.g., agencies, rec centers.) Students had a lot of choices. 

Question: When will they learn to teach an English novel? Answer: When they’re ready. 

Human Services did clinicals in elementary or middle and vice-versa, and paired graduate students with undergrads on class projects. 

You better not be caught sitting in rows rather than circles. 

Faculty modeled caring and meeting student needs. They knew us. 

There was lots of Pass/Fail (but they began to give grades later on.) We didn’t want student preoccupation with grades. 

We didn’t get grades –just high pass/low pass. It was left to interpretation on the transcript. 

There were no grades in the graduate program. 

We (faculty) had wonderful philosophical arguments about grading. 

Professors were “passing out A’s,” reflecting faculty skepticism about grading systems. They would say, “Who am I to judge?” 

Expectations for Faculty: Generalists Abound 

The vast majority of faculty members, regardless of expertise, were expected to teach Human Development for undergraduates. 

Chase’s theory was: Get generalists, then develop teams to link various issues (psychology, development, middle school, elementary, counseling, philosophers.) 

Chase hired good people, regardless of the program needs. 

Everybody was “a renaissance man.” Each course was a course in the person, not the content. 

Course content was personalized (Faculty Member 101, then themselves 101, 102, 103.) 

It didn’t necessarily allow for a common perspective (which may have been what Chase was trying to do.) 

It was a great training ground for a gadfly.
I taught stuff I didn’t know as well as I should have. My Social Studies methods course became an epistemology course. (It had to be adjusted because some students were not going to be teachers.)

My first course was Strategies and Design in HDL Teaching. It was K-12, believe it or not. I was told by two sources that it could be anything I wanted it to be.

I (a professional counselor) taught an undergrad course in curriculum. I was unqualified. I ended up teaching Marriage and Family Counseling in that curriculum course.

When I was interviewed, I said there was nothing in HDL I was interested in. But Ben Hackney said that one day we’d have a program (around my interests).

I had to teach courses in adolescent psychology and educational psychology, but it had been a while since my active involvement in that content.

The idea was that novices could teach experts. Knowledge was not limited to formal experience.

**Organization of HDL (apart from Health and Physical Education)**

The Chapel Hill higher education model was deliberately jettisoned. We had a Steering Committee instead. Chase consulted with the first rung – de facto senior staff. That group grew.

There were no departments other than Health and Phys Ed. We were interdepartmental instead – HPE, then the rest.

Faculty member Frank Parker introduced the idea of interdisciplinary teams. There were 3-year reconstitutions, though some faster, then every year.

Task Forces were created.

The task force organizational system had structure but was so dynamic.

Each task force worked for a team goal, such as providing a program for a masters degree. One team, for instance, offered a Masters program at one of the schools. Then teachers did content on campus in the summer. There were also task forces for open school and for middle school.

Faculty were assigned to task forces based on interests, though each had a Health and PE person. Task forces included student representatives.

Students did not get assigned to task forces, just some representatives.

Task Force meetings had systems analysis too.

There was team teaching among task force members.
Four task forces (named #1, #2, etc.) were supposed to meet once a week. Some took task forces more seriously, and became small departments. Chase gave them autonomy. He let them do their own thing.  

Every Tuesday, we met as a group (HDL Day), then broke into task forces. It was cutting edge, non-traditional.

The autonomous teams worked best off-campus. We had no notion that the environment mattered. It was parallel play, not interdisciplinary.

One premise was that students and teachers could learn if they’re not there in person (foresight of today’s distance education).

One Department in HDL: Health and Physical Education

In 1965, HPE was “affiliated” with the Education “area.” In 1966, a consultant made recommendations to put HPE in Social and Behavioral Sciences to influence health behavior.

We stayed there until John Chase created HDL. Chase wanted Psychology, which didn’t want any part of HDL. So Vice-Chancellor McEnery and Chase did some horse-trading, Chase got HPE. (HPE Chair Harvey Murphy was not asked for his own position on the matter.)

I was astounded that PE and Health seemed to be respected (despite HDL’s reputation.)

Vice-Chancellor McEnery wanted a PE major to attract athletes. Chase wouldn’t allow it to go forward. (The State Board of Governors wouldn’t have let it go through anyhow, due to an oversupply of PE grads) Intramurals was the biggest program – more than HPE and Athletics put together.

Harvey Murphy didn’t want an undergraduate major. There were too many strings attached, and limited flexibility.

Murphy never wanted a PE major. He wanted health promotion. He wanted to focus on the entire population’s health habits. We became a model for other schools, the YMCA, and Recreation Departments.

UNCC’s early basketball success (making it to the 1977 Final Four) didn’t affect things much. We still had inadequate Belk gym facilities, with no place to expand.

Dynamics within HDL

The Chase era was “Camelot” – a maturing of the vision.
It was a closely knit group of people. There was a ritual of going from desk to desk each morning, greeting one another.  

Such exciting people! It was heady - so much energy, ideas.

There were lots of social gatherings among task force members. (There were lots of extroverts.)

Professors had charisma.

Faculty hung out together, like grad school continued.

For the first couple of years, faculty ate lunch together.

Because it was mostly graduate school, we only taught at night. It created a problem of getting the right people in the right meeting.

After class, we all went to Gus’s where we discussed vision and possibilities. We talked about what we can do to improve schools and agencies.

It was common to take students to one’s home for a party.

There were lots of non-traditional students.

HDL attracted wonderful people. There was a “natural selection” process. The program attracted people who loved children and who had passion.

There was a lot of entourage around Chase.

Chase would say, “There is an inside clique, but it’s not impenetrable.”

Integrating new people was a challenge. There was no mentoring, “You came and played.” People with fairly stable egos did fine.

There was group-think till the mid-70s, but overall energy and optimism (reflection of the times.)

There was a high level of excitement among faculty.

We started in Denny.

We had one telephone in the middle of our space.

At first, there were no cubicles. We didn’t know how good we had it - big open space, lots of space, with dividers. The open space was in keeping with the task force idea of one big family.
We moved to Atkins, and shared space with Architecture. There were cubicles with bookcases like spokes against radial walls.  

**Critiques of HDL**

HDL approached problems in a different way, particularly from other colleges (The question of whether its ideas would work, combined with turf wars, led to trouble.)

People designed the program as they went along.  

It was a constant effort to connect what we most value to how we operated.  

The human development orientation worked against rigor among students. It was not an either-or situation, but a matter of balance between HDL and a teacher education orientation.  

Human Services grads were the only ones who got jobs (e.g., drug prevention, sex abuse.)  

When I came, I was excited about the philosophy; the goals were admirable. But I had pedagogical reservations – it didn’t go far enough. It should have complemented liberal arts. It was a well-articulated philosophy. We walked the talk. It was well thought out, but a little bit idealistic. The written plan was not carried out; people did their own thing.  

In my interview, I said, “You don’t have any damn program, you have a cafeteria.”

**The Reputation of HDL**

We were different from Arts and Sciences – their full professors were well-respected. COED’s reputation was harmed when our full professors (who didn’t do research) represented the college across campus.  

Education and Arts and Science needed each other. It was not good to drive them apart.  

Many people concluded that the substance wasn’t there, besides “thinking outside the box.”  

There were general criticisms against open education.  

Art Combs (famous humanist) was Chase’s hero, but humanism was more popular in education than the rest of the university.  

Innovations were frequently attacked inside and outside the university (amidst national attacks on the humanistic movement). We were called “the college of touchy-feely.”

HDL was considered unstructured, with too much left to chance.
Every Masters degree was in HDL – some superintendents didn’t understand that.  

There was truth to the notion that we weren’t very rigorous in preparing teachers.  

Detractors said there was no regard for methodology. Students were sent out unprepared. There were no tools to fall back on.  

The early years were better for faculty than for students.  

I’m not sure a lot of people would have come here under the early model. There were lots of things in the catalog even I couldn’t understand.  

The criticism from the rest of university was an impression of no quality, no standards.  

Students were ill-prepared to teach. They first learned lesson/unit planning in the 3 weeks before student teaching.  

Even Chase’s biggest supporters saw flaws. The program needed structure and rules.  

HDL was not seen as involved with teacher education. It was not accredited.  

I originally dreaded going to Curriculum Committees with a proposal. It was a nerve-wracking, insulting experience  

It rubbed me the wrong way that HDL was regarded as touchy-feely.  

We were called “Honeydip lunatics.”  

HDL was flexible in dealing with special cases.  

HDL had good reputation for outreach/distance education.  

We had lots of off-campus cohorts (SPEC-Southern Piedmont Education Consortium.)  

We delivered an entire masters program off-campus.  

HDL had an undeserved bad reputation, but when you think of some of the characters, maybe it was deserved.  

The Evolution of HDL  

It became very hard to hang onto Chase’s vision as new folks arrived. Many said that they didn’t necessarily buy into the organizational structure and principles or philosophical perspective.  

Two cultures developed – first phase/original group, plus new folks who were more structured and resistant to the prevailing vision.
The inner circle had “seen the vision” – others had seen parts of it but didn’t embrace it yet.\textsuperscript{15}

They put the needs of program first.\textsuperscript{10}

Chase’s people were worker bees.\textsuperscript{7}

There were two sets of faculty – Education and non-Education (human services). You couldn’t tell much difference between College and department meetings. There was a potpourri of various philosophies, perspectives, and student bodies taking responsibility.\textsuperscript{21}

People across campus gradually began to see a different breed of folks in HDL.\textsuperscript{20}

I was naively attracted to HDL philosophy, but was quickly disillusioned. It had wonderful course titles - but students were doing the same things over and over.\textsuperscript{17}

Each person had his or her own view of what we were about – not necessarily the same. Everyone had a grandiose vision for College and UNCC, and we were unrealistic about speed of reaching goals.\textsuperscript{15}

One senior faculty member privately said he didn’t know what was going on.\textsuperscript{15}

The era had ended, but some people hadn’t realized it.\textsuperscript{15}

It was not an environment that encouraged research. Senior faculty (on the review committees) hadn’t done it themselves.\textsuperscript{16}

The primary belief (of administration) was that we needed a teaching institution, not another research institution.\textsuperscript{8}

No one ever mentioned research in my interview. It was about community outreach and teaching.\textsuperscript{20}

\textbf{The Death of John Chase (1978)}

There was a 6 month period of heart attacks.\textsuperscript{10}

Chase had his third heart attack in 1978.\textsuperscript{9}

When Chase died, Harvey Murphy, Ben Hackney and John Pleasants served as a steering committee.\textsuperscript{9}

Lots of tension had developed in the College over personnel issues.\textsuperscript{6}

Political differences came to the forefront.\textsuperscript{9}
Spotlight on a graduate: Malinda Mast Rathbone (1979, 1982)

Degrees and licensure
- Bachelor of Arts in Human Development and Learning – 1979 (Licensure in K-4)
- Master of Human Development and Learning – 1982 (Licensure in K-4)
- B-K licensure completed elsewhere

Current employment
- Education consultant for the NC Office of Early Learning (formerly the Office of School Readiness), housed within the NC Department of Public Instruction. We have recently expanded our focus from Pre-K to Pre-K through 3rd grade. I’m also working with teacher licensure and using the PreK-K Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument (TPAI) as an evaluator.

Relationship of employment to educational background from the College of Education
- I’ve traveled a long road. My HDL background was the solid foundation the whole way. It was a birth-to-death program model when I was there, using the spiral curriculum model of exploration…involvement…commitment …universality. When I moved from teaching young children to working with adolescents and families, it was incredibly helpful to have had the birth-to-death focus rather than just focusing on young children. In the late 1980’s, I came back into working with younger population when I was asked to bring developmentally appropriate practice to the Wright School in Durham (a school for emotionally disturbed/BED 6-12 year olds). I spent 3 years doing that work, and think I made a difference. Had I not had a holistic focus, I’d never been able to do that.

Of particular importance while a student …
- The more holistic model. After my junior year in high school, I went to ASU for a year, then entered HDL in 77. I had done an ERIC search in my junior year, trying to find a program that matched my philosophical orientation as a constructivist – I found three: University of Hawaii, University of Vermont, and HDL at UNCC. I chose the in-state tuition school! I valued the birth-to-death focus, being involved every semester while you were there with clinicals, practica, etc. really important - rather than waiting until student teaching and discovering you hate teaching. In Task Force One, the element of designing your own course of study was extremely important. I valued the hands-on and experiential learning. I spent almost a year in Europe and got course credit for all that! Being able to experience British Primary Schools was hugely positive and impactful.

What I’d change …
- Going back 31 years to that first year of teaching … I went from an environment where we all pretty much believed the same thing to a work environment in the rural NC mountains where I was a “freak.” Gov. Hunt was initiating the first testing program – it was incredibly challenging for me to work in that environment – so maybe more emphasis on developing skill for articulating to audiences (principals, parents …) why developmental practices are appropriate and critical. Graduates should be ready to explain practices to people with different belief structures. The level of disparity was
huge between the environment I’d just come from and a place where teachers told me to discipline students by drawing a circle on the blackboard and putting their noses on it. But I went blowing in with centers…. It was incredibly difficult. I didn’t give up my beliefs, but when schools of education don’t prepare teachers today for the reality of the public school environment, they do give up.

- Another comment – back then, there was no teacher support program – no evaluation system, no mentoring, no professional growth model – I’ve wondered if teacher education programs could have more of built-in support structure. The sense of isolation when I got into that rural classroom was profound. Teachers I work with now also talk of isolation and wanting support. So, new teachers need skills of either developing support structures or fostering support-structure building.
Part II  The College of Education and Allied Professions (1979 – 1992)

Overview

After the death of Dean Chase in 1978 and the service of Dr. Clarence (Butch) Smith as Interim Dean in 1978-79, the College of Human Development and Learning hired Dr. Bill Heller as its second Dean. During this period, the College experienced many changes in organization, personnel, programs, design and purpose as it evolved into the College of Education and Allied Professions.

In the fall of 1979, the College moved to the new Colvard Building, occupying most of the second floor of Colvard South in offices built as cubicles. Organizationally, the College moved from one department and three interdisciplinary task forces to various departmental structures and added a unit to focus on supervision of student teaching. As money became available over the years, the cubicles were gradually converted to conventional offices, and the faculty grew larger, spreading into other areas of Colvard South and occupying a portion of the fifth floor of Colvard North as well. By the end of this period, the various departments and the Office of Field Experiences had more clearly defined spaces for faculty and staff than in the previous open-space quarters in Atkins or in the original arrangement of cubicles in Colvard South.

Conceptually and programmatically, the College moved away from the blended liberal arts and helping professions orientation and toward a model that increased the distinctions among the purposes and designs of the various programs offered by the College of Education and Allied Professions. Undergraduate teacher education programs became more focused on the various age and certification ranges from kindergarten through 12th grade, with specific majors offered in early childhood education, intermediate education, middle grades education, and special education. Courses for arts and science majors intending to become high school teachers started to become separated from courses for elementary and middle grades majors. Some coursework and content of the original HDL undergraduate degree was maintained or modified for a non-teaching major in Human Services.

Graduate programs also reflected greater distinctions among certification areas, with new majors emerging in middle grades education, reading education, teaching English as a second language, and health education. Graduate level counselor education programs identified differences between preparation of school counselors and community/agency counselors. Sixth year programs, called Certificate of Advanced Study, became available in counselor education, elementary education, administration, supervision, secondary education, and special education. There were two interinstitutional programs: (1) the M.A. in Adult Education, with the degree awarded by Appalachian State University, and (2) the Ed.D. in Educational Administration, with the degree conferred by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
Hiring Bill Heller as Dean

Bill Heller was the first dean hired by Chancellor E.K. Fretwell. Fretwell wanted to bring in individuals with great credibility and impeccable credentials (i.e., research, publications.)

Everyone in HDL had an opportunity to sound off on the dean selection. Harvey Murphy was nominated, but said, “I wasn’t qualified in the first place; in the second, I might get it.”

Heller’s experience as administrator was in an Alabama hospital. In the interview, he told how many people he had fired. He said, “Just remember my name is HELL-er.”

Bill had a good heart. He loves people, loves children.

He was personable.

Bill was interested in who I was.

His heart was in the right place.

He could see opportunities where others couldn’t.

Heller’s strength was “we can do.”

Bill Heller’s Goals

1) NCATE certification. It gives national recognition and says to the world that we have reached the same level as other institutions. This would not have been achieved as HDL. (It was lots of work; everybody had to agree to it. It was a conscious decision. Everybody bought into it.)

2) Grants – We had to write them to get them. We weren’t writing them.

3) Move toward doctoral program. We needed to help provide leadership. Research and grant development would lead to doctoral status

4) Service to community and school systems, perhaps through continuing education. Get faculty out into the community. Don’t make people drive in.

Colvard Building

The year Bill Heller arrived, the college moved to the new Colvard Building, which was designed for HDL.

Space was cut in half (during the planning) because it was easier to shorten the building than to rearrange the utility lines.

Cubicles replaced offices. They were economical as well as philosophically open.

I put up a piece of plywood to make a roof over the cubicle.

The new building was “Boxed stalls for horses.”

It was a lousy design. It was built to facilitate the HDL orientation.
There was a task force in each corner with a private conference room.\textsuperscript{7}

**Transitions in Philosophy and Expectations**

*Heller brought a more traditional teacher education approach.*\textsuperscript{15}

*He tried to create a “real” program.*\textsuperscript{19}

*It was an opportunity to change direction of the College.*\textsuperscript{4}

*There was initial resistance to Heller, but not a groundswell.*\textsuperscript{17}

*There was resistance from individuals who had committed themselves to the HDL concept.*\textsuperscript{30}

*There was a split between pro and anti-Chase factions.*\textsuperscript{9}

*Heller tried a clean break with the past. He did not try to nurture old-timers.*\textsuperscript{10}

*Ben Hackney was a staunch supporter of moving toward the education model – hiring specialists.*

*Heller was a technical manager coming out of a health tradition. New people were no longer connected to the original dream, so they worked for change.*

*I was excited about Heller’s Washington experience. Previously, research was treated as a hobby. Only Bryan Robinson was doing research. Meanwhile Vice-Chancellor Werntz was making things tighter (regarding scholarship.)*\textsuperscript{17}

*People were scared of the research emphasis.*\textsuperscript{21}

**Reorganization from HDL to the College of Education and Allied Professions**

*Heller brought in his own people.*\textsuperscript{9}

*In one of first acts, he appointed area heads (Mary Thomas Burke-graduate, Gail Huffman – teacher education.) Sooner or later, someone was going to have to do it.*\textsuperscript{15}

*Some faculty refused to stay with EAP. They lacked the qualifications. The message got out that we were in a revision process after some tenure decisions.*\textsuperscript{30}

*His hiring and firing became a moral issue for many.*\textsuperscript{20}

*We had to redo everything because it was less than rigorous.*\textsuperscript{27}

*The center of gravity was shifting. Heller went about doing what he knew best.*\textsuperscript{15}

*They were exciting years, going in the right direction.*\textsuperscript{16}

*The College of Education had good people but still had a way to go. They needed to gradually add programs that made sense.*\textsuperscript{8}

*The HDL name didn’t communicate the type of preparation that was taking place. (Secondary didn’t have that problem. Their degrees said history, etc.)*
HDL did not give as much identity as a College of Education. It didn’t really communicate what we were doing. It had an ambiguous reputation (e.g., teaching courses without degrees in the area, faculty without terminal degrees.)

Nobody knew what HDL meant.

Organizing departments was bold and dangerous.

Department structures were probably a good thing. It came out of a 2-day meeting

Departments worked out in a collegial way.

The culture of collaboration became a culture of specialization. In retrospect, it was an okay change.

People are more productive when they are talking to those in a related area.

Vice Chancellor Werntz was supportive. At first, he wanted Teacher Education to be controlled by the university at-large. He proposed putting us under the Teacher Education Council, which would have been a governance nightmare. The proposal was voted down by the College faculty, with support from other colleges. (If it had passed, we would not have gotten accredited.)

The new departments were 1) Administration and Supervision, 2) Curriculum and Instruction, 3) Human Services, and 4) Health and Physical Education.

Sister Mary Thomas Burke, Chair of Human Services

She had a memorable smile. She was the epitome of dancing Irish eyes. She exuded warmth. A marvelous academic and first class scholar. She set the right tone.

Sister’s philosophy: Rules are made to be broken.

Sister was a protector. She’ll stand up for you.

When I interviewed for a faculty position, the administrator said: “Mary Thomas told me that you’re the one, so I don’t have any questions.”

She was so busy with so many things.

In 1972, I came to UNCC to talk to this nun I’d heard so much about. I told her what I wanted to do (as a student.) Sister said no, there were too many courses in the program that I didn’t need. She said “Let’s start over.” I signed up for the required course, but did independent study unrelated to the course content.

I went over to UNCC to talk with the dean of the graduate school. After that interview I came away discouraged. His message was that I ”couldn’t get there from here,” or at least it would be a hassle. As I walked away I decided to stop by to see Sister Mary Thomas. (I had come to know her through our contact at Covenant Presbyterian Church). I told her what the dean had said, and she had a very different message. She suggested that I might take this course, that course, another independent study - in other words, it was POSSIBLE. She painted a picture of what I could do rather than emphasizing obstacles. So, I enrolled, felt comfortable that I belonged, and graduated with a master’s degree in counseling in 1975.
I thanked the Mother Superior for lending Sister to us. (Her time and caring could have been done for the church.)

**The Department of Curriculum and Instruction (C & I)**

The new Curriculum and Instruction Department included elementary, secondary, and special education.

Huge C&I? Logically so.

The department was huge – so many people, different needs, different personalities - but we found people who wanted to do stuff.

C&I was not a functional department. It worked reasonably well as programs, but was very much out of balance. Department Chair Gail Huffman claimed to have 5 times as much work as any other chair.

C&I had lots of conflict.

One program (SPED) was in the early stages of building, while the other (El Ed) had too many students. There were differences in advising loads. The solution was to have SPED professors advise elementary majors.

There was a cultural shift with grants and what they meant. The departments were on different paths.

There were issues over control of the money (department chair vs. dean.) It became very uncomfortable.

**The Department of Teaching Specialties**

The College created a new department – Teaching Specialties. It included special education, reading, adult education, and TESOL (Teaching English as a Second Language).

The rationale was that all of its programs were graduate level. (There was no SPED undergraduate program till 1986.)

The Reading faculty was nervous about joining Teaching Specialties because they weren’t grant writers.

The new department was not an issue for us in SPED. We were already doing our own thing, and we never lost the ability to work autonomously. We were less involved in politics.

It was a healthy move to deconstruct. C&I was too big and too broad. Smaller programs were being lost (everything that wasn’t elementary, middle, or secondary.)

Reading and Special Ed did tremendous work together.
Air Force and Army ROTC Departments

During a period of anti-military attitudes, Chancellor Woodward moved ROTC to EAP. 4

ROTC was a marriage of convenience. It needed a home. 8

As an old Army guy, Heller had an affinity for ROTC. 3

We couldn’t put the unit where it would not be treated with a reasonable amount of respect and tolerance. It was not the time to put it in Arts and Sciences. ROTC was essential to the fabric of this country. Also, there is a leavening that takes place when officers come off civilian campuses. 4

Those (ROTC) students came from all over the campus. They were high quality students who would serve as ambassadors for EAP. 30

ROTC made sense when FTEs were needed. 21

There were some FTEs but that was not a major factor. 30

The Office of Field Experiences

Delores Wolfe was the Director of Field Experiences. She had developed a great handbook, orientation, and a set of objectives. She was still building relationships with public schools when she left for another position in Virginia. 11

When I arrived, the student-teaching program was well-organized and coherent. 23

Heller invited Melba Spooner to be Interim Director of FE. (She had done some supervising.) Protocols weren’t established, Melba got systems in place. 11

We had very high expectations for student teachers – extensive lesson planning; 15 weeks of student teaching (DPI required only 8-10 weeks); extensive self-evaluation and /reflection. 23

The office of Field Experiences received grants in 1987 for Project Supervisor and Project REACH. REACH was coordinated by Alice Harrison. It focused on developing summer student teacher opportunities, mostly for SPED. 11

REACH was geared toward candidates who had prior experiences with children, such as teacher assistants and older non-traditional undergrads and post-bac students. It was a fore-runner of fast-track in terms of a program tailored to post-bacs with prior experiences. 23

Project Supervisor was for distance supervision. We served as mentors. (Sue Rebich is an alumna.) 11
A New Program with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (CMS)

Bill’s outreach was good.\textsuperscript{32}

Chapel Hill Professor Phil Schlectly convinced CMS to tie its career development package to a degree program. UNCC taught the courses, which led to a joint program with Chapel Hill.\textsuperscript{22}

Schlectly was invited to Charlotte by Deanne Crowell, a CMS administrator. His plan allowed UNCC “infiltration” into the CMS system with placements and in-service. It allowed us to get our foot in the door.\textsuperscript{30}

It was a good idea, needed at the time, but there was bad execution. It could have been stronger and more productive.\textsuperscript{8}

There was no screening, no admission, but the students were a good group of folks.\textsuperscript{14}

New Expectations for Faculty: The Support of Bob Algozzine

In one of Dean Heller’s most important decisions, he hired Bob Algozzine, one of the nation’s foremost special education scholars.\textsuperscript{22}

Algozzine brought recognition and credibility. He started to expand research possibilities.\textsuperscript{27}

Algozzine understood what his role could become. He helped SPED, young faculty, and the institution as a research place.\textsuperscript{13}

Algozzine was a major addition. He helped others write and publish. He wanted to help everyone, not just SPED.\textsuperscript{30}

Bill Heller’s Management

Bill Heller was a good scholar, attracted good people. If you get nothing else as dean, at least get good people. He had the right standards, motivation, and represented the COED well.\textsuperscript{4}

There were regular chair meetings with the deans-more efficient and effective than before. Until then, if I wanted to know something, I would go to Ben Hackney.\textsuperscript{9}

Heller was nice guy but intolerant for the slow pace of bureaucracy. He sometimes acted before all approvals were in place.\textsuperscript{15}

Bill had an affinity for students. Sometimes he would say yes when the answer should have been no, or I don’t know yet. He saw himself as advocate for students. He was unapologetic about that.\textsuperscript{15}

The Departure of Bill Heller

After 13 years as dean, Bill Heller accepted an administrative position at the University of South Florida.
It was an exciting opportunity. Bill’s departure was a natural thing, the right timing. His good work was recognized by USF. The College of Education was not into fund-raising at the time. Heller said that the hardest thing was leaving the faculty – its climate of collegiality.

**Bill Heller’s Legacy**

He laid the foundation for the COED of today. It turns out that Heller and Chase would have agreed on some things. HDL had a good reputation for outreach/distance education before Heller came. He organized it for Continuing Education, paid to the EAP, which included credit for Masters Degrees. Heller transformed HDL into a College of Education -the most significant event in our history. Heller was great at grants. He knew people from US Dept of Education - maybe some of it trickled down to other programs. He was very successful very quickly with grants. He promoted grantsmanship and brought in a wealth of money.

**Bob Mundt- Interim Dean (1992-93)**

Bob Mundt, a veteran political science professor, was appointed Interim Dean after Bill Heller left for USF. He served for one year while a search was conducted.

I wondered why the choice went outside EAP. Bob Mundt got a good outsider look at what was going on. Bob became an advocate. He had an even-handed reputation. He worked for UNCC’s greater good. He was a peace-maker for units in trouble. That year was good for EAP to get on an even keel. He gave us a little breathing room. He was a good caretaker. He positioned us better for the next chapter. Mundt brought academic regularity and predictability. He was ethical and fair. Bob was a very good listener. He was perceptive and astute. He consulted because he knew he was not a teacher educator. He sought advice and took it. He was very good internally, and with people, skills that were needed at that moment. Mundt eliminated suspicions and distrust. He was a good transition to Jack Nagle. Everyone trusted him. He stabilized, soothed, and healed wounds.

Overview

In the six-year tenure of our third dean, Dr. John (Jack) Nagle, many changes occurred in the organization of the College and in the programs offered. The Department of Health Promotion and Kinesiology (previously HPE) was moved to the College of Nursing and Health Professions, and the masters degree in health education was phased out. The ROTC departments were moved out of the College and into a university-level organization of special programs. The previous departmental structure of the College of Education and Allied Professions was reconfigured into four departments housing related programs, and the College grew into additional space, taking up the entire second floor of Colvard South and the entire fifth floor of Colvard North. Sixth year programs (Certificate of Advanced Study) were phased out due to emphasis on increased rigor in master’s programs and the university’s desire to create doctoral programs.

The Department of Counseling, Special Education, and Child Development (CSPC) phased out the undergraduate degree in Human Services as the job market diminished for those graduates; the Bachelor of Social Work newly available on campus was a preferred route to employment. The department created a new undergraduate major in “Child and Family Development” (CHFD), as well as a new masters degree in “Child and Family Studies.” Undergraduate CHFD majors who met the rigorous standards for admission to teacher education programs could seek Birth–Kindergarten teacher certification. (Certification terminology was changed to “licensure” by the NC Department of Public Instruction.) However, many CHFD majors did not choose the licensure track and focused on preparing to work in hospitals, child care centers, and social service agencies. The department also provided a program leading to the Graduate Certificate in “Supported Employment and Transition,” a non-licensure program for guiding adults with disabilities into the workforce.

The Department of Educational Administration, Research, and Technology (EART) successfully moved away from the inter-institutional Ed.D. program in Educational Administration and developed their own doctoral program in this area. The Ed.D. program was aligned with licensure for school system superintendents. This department also developed a new masters program in “Instructional Systems Technology” that could lead to a masters license for experienced teachers, but also prepared students for non K-12 educational settings in community colleges, business, and industry.

The Department of Middle, Secondary, and K-12 Education (MDSK) became the focal unit to coordinate teacher education programs with departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, so that undergraduates could receive knowledgeable College of Education advising if they were seeking licensure in any of the secondary school areas of English, math, history/social studies, biology, chemistry, earth sciences, or physics and in the K-12 arts areas of art, dance, music, and theatre education. This department developed a masters degree in secondary education for science and social studies teachers and co-developed with the English Department an interdisciplinary M.A. in English Education.

The Department of Reading and Elementary Education (REEL) provided focused oversight for the rapidly growing population of elementary education majors when elementary schools
reduced class sizes and began to need more teachers. This department provided statewide leadership when the Department of Public Instruction and the legislature required revisions of all master of education programs so that graduates would qualify for a 10% pay raise.

Other College-wide changes occurred as the College grew during a time of teacher shortage. The Office of Student Academic Services was created, with Dr. Dawson Hancock serving as the first advisor for all undergraduate students before their admission to a teacher education program. This office also served as the conduit to the NC Department of Public Instruction as program graduates applied for licensure. The demand for services resulted in the addition of an advisor and the revision of the original advisor’s position to that of a director. Additional organizational units were added to the College to help with its expanded mission, including the Office of Educational Outreach, and the Mathematics and Science Education Center. The Teaching Fellows program was created in North Carolina, and a campus-based program was developed with a director and faculty advisors for each class of Teaching Fellows. Technology specialists were added to the staff to help faculty and students develop newly-expected technology skills for instruction and research, to create and supervise technology labs, and to provide expert advice on the rapid acquisition of desktop computers for all faculty and staff.

The College faculty and administrators worked together to identify the relevant mission of the college within the changing context of the university, region, state, and nation and to achieve national accreditation through the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) before it became a statewide requirement. That achievement placed the College among other Colleges of Education in the nation who met rigorous standards for faculty expertise, provision of resources for students and faculty, design and delivery of academic programs, and organization and management of teacher education on a campus.

Expectations for faculty to apply research skills to professional publications and grant proposals increased as the University moved toward achieving elevated status as a doctoral-granting university. As expectations for both faculty and students increased, the faculty required more research skills and original research of its masters students. Faculty and student collaborations became more common, resulting in co-publications and co-presentations at professional conferences.

**The Hiring of Jack Nagle**

*We interviewed 20 candidates.*

*He was an experienced dean, well respected, a good scholar.*

*There were two things we wanted – moving forward and fairness.*

*Jack’s initial impression was that the faculty was eager to move forward, looking for focus and direction, eager to increase rigor in programs, and move up the level of programs. It was an institution on verge of dramatic expansion, with aspirations to become a major player in the state system.*
Jack was surprised to find faculty interested in schools (in comparison to his previous institution.)

It was a period of growth and change, a “fast moving ship.”

Jack started codifying stuff that needed to be done. We now had policies for what used to be “voodoo.”

It was time for a person who would listen. He’d get things in writing. He was appropriately self-reflective regarding change. Jack had a good sense of getting things clear so it can live beyond a human being’s memory.

He was needed at first – a process kind of guy, we needed consistency.

We became more professional than ever.

**Revising the Mission**

Provost Phil Dubois suggested that the college needed a clearer focus.

The provost wanted fewer programs with more quality. Other colleges were encouraged to do the same, focused enough to force choices but broad enough to be inclusive.

Jack also felt that we were spread in purpose, trying to do an awful lot – some tangential to schools (e.g., allied professions: kinesiology, human services, ROTC.)

Nagle was unable to see beyond K-12. We had to fight for the Pre-K.

The college held conversations, with lots of revisions.

He wanted to be collaborative with faculty.

The new focus would be on schools and kids.

He listened, asked stimulating questions to foster intellectual conversation, inductively synthesized a statement, and fed it back. It was an effort to be open, honest, forthright, and as collegial as possible.

The revised mission was needed, given our disparate interests.

The mission and values statement was very helpful.

The mission revision was well-motivated, a fabulous change.

Through the process, the dean got to know faculty.

The organizational mission and vision led to faculty engagement. It was exciting work.
Reorganization

Once the mission statement was established, it was time to move non-school programs, including ROTC. Then you look at what’s left, and try to focus on names.31

The new name was the College of Education, dropping Allied Professions.) Four departments were formed: 1) Reading and Elementary Education, 2) Counseling, Special Education, and Child Development 3) Middle, Secondary, K-12 (MDSK) and 4) Educational Leadership. The Department of Health and Physical Education moved to the College of Nursing, and the Human Services program moved to Social Work.22

The changes were done denotatively (e.g., call research “research”) We tried to focus on program areas (because students and faculty are in program areas, not departments.)31

We tried to make departments reasonably equivalent in size.31

Changes were based on the themes in the campus Academic Plan – Children, Families and Schools.28

Early Childhood never had enough faculty. It was viewed as nice, but not really needed. (B-K licensure changed that.)7

Organizational changes were driven by academic programs. It was necessary in achieving our goals.31

The combination of Educational Administration, Research, and Technology made sense. Others were not entirely logical.31

Through the department reorganization, MDSK became the “department of miscellany.”13

Teaching Specialties became Counseling, Special Education and Child Development.21

It was a very functional name.31

There were new departments, but we were still autonomous despite reconfiguration.3

We had autonomous enclaves within the circus.21

The Departure of Two Programs

The new configuration meant that Human Services, the keystone of the original HDL program, would move to Social Work.22

Doing away with the Human Services program was much more difficult than any other change.4

At the Lake Lure planning retreat, people kept talking about what was a fit. They saw Human Services as no fit, and HPE as a marginal fit.3

32
Moving HPE was part of an entire effort to make sure academic units had a clear sense of purpose. It was not just Nagle who made that happen. It emphasized the COED’s real focus. (We were unsure of the College of Health’s direction at that time.)

**Jack Nagle’s Management**

Dean Nagle and Ron Anderson were the Dean’s office. He traded in other administrator positions so he could hire the technology guys.

Dean Nagle was a hard worker, driven.

Jack made rapid movement on multiple fronts.

Melba Spooner moved from OFE to become Assistant Dean.

He came to Melba because she had a lot of answers. He was impressed by the organization, camaraderie of her OFE office.

Jack and Melba took on more than they should have.

Nagle gave departments significantly more autonomy.

Jack believed that if quality of a college is dependent on programs, the emphasis should be on program support. If quality is dependent on faculty, the support within the dean’s office is less important.

He was dependent on chairs for vision.

Jack was a great mentor.

There was lots of appropriate and helpful mentoring for department chairs.

He loved the structural stuff.

It was an era of white papers.

We met more often than chairs would have liked, but it was important to know what each other was doing.

They were exhaustive even to those in the know. I found them extremely informative, a crash course.

It was amazing how structured his college meetings were. He managed them well.

Faculty meetings became more organized.

Meetings were excruciating.

At the end of his first year, he wept at the College meeting as he recounted how far we had come. I was very moved by his openness and sincerity.
Continuing NCATE Accreditation

The new mission was impetus for delaying the NCATE visitation.\textsuperscript{24}

The first ever consensus in COED was the new Conceptual Framework. We had created something to be proud of for NCATE.\textsuperscript{21}

We used NCATE standards for our Professional Development Schools. We would teach on-site, provide year-long interns, and provide in-service development support - all based on our self-study.\textsuperscript{23}

One strength of Jack’s tenure was outreach to schools, including K-12 people in his Program Review Teams.\textsuperscript{31}

He brought in teams of students, and the community for program review.\textsuperscript{23}

He presented the COED well to external constituents.\textsuperscript{4}

He redid all undergraduate programs, including course outlines. He redid all the Masters programs to meet new advanced licensing regulations.

He reworked the Masters of School Administration.\textsuperscript{11}

Re-thinking Advising and Student Services

He created good student services support, and strong advising. Programs fall apart without it, especially undergraduate.\textsuperscript{31}

He created the Advisement Office.\textsuperscript{11}

Nagle deserves credit for the advising office.\textsuperscript{25}

A new Director of Academic Advising, Dawson Hancock, was hired. He inherited a robust amount of stuff, all the pre-education advising, academic planning sheets (with wholesale revisions), and licensure. The process became organized.\textsuperscript{24}

Dawson brought purpose, direction, discipline and brightness to the advisement office. Advisement had been too general. A single advising unit could be consistent, one size fits all. He took resources and made trade-offs. It turned exclusively into a student service office.\textsuperscript{31}

Jack started USTEP (University-School Teacher Education Partnerships). That laid the groundwork for Professional Development Schools.\textsuperscript{23}
Office of Field Experiences

OFE grew, moved into clinical work, USTEP, and year-long internships (a major accomplishment.) We tried to ratchet up visibility of the office. Staff wanted to do more grad work themselves. (All got PhDs along the way.).

OFE made sure they were affiliated with departments because the supervisors needed program knowledge.

There was a new philosophy of specialization in OFE.

We revised our assessment to incorporate the state’s Teacher Performance Assessment Inventory (TPAI).

Today, the involvement of OFE has grown. We have early field experiences, which are more intensive and extensive; better at providing diverse experiences.

We have graduate internships. The creation of the fast-track/MAT lead to clinicals and student teaching for a program almost as large as the undergraduates.

Clarifying Expectations for Tenure and Promotion

One of Jack’s achievements was strengthening of faculty, with increased attention to scholarship, strong new people, fostering strengths of existing faculty, and a revised Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) document.

The previous RPT was unspecific.

It was a loosey-goosey process, with unclear criteria. Dean Nagle said he saw it in the first set of recommendations he reviewed.

It needed to be nailed down.

The old RPT felt unhealthy, hungry for criteria.

The provost encouraged revising our document.

We needed to find ways to allow faculty to carve out niches (e.g., service), and develop a point of pride.

The big fight on the committee was over whether research had to be first, then the other areas.

I fought like the devil for service and teaching.

The committee created a document in which every high achieving, hard working faculty could see him or herself.

It was almost unanimously approved. And it’s being continuously renewed.
It was exhilarating to do hard, political work.\textsuperscript{18}

It clarified expectations, which is very helpful in the hiring process.\textsuperscript{31}

**Peer Observation**

Butch Smith deserves the credit for moving it along. He built the program based on his work in supervision. He tried to make it collegial, not evaluative.\textsuperscript{31}

We were under the gun as an institution to come up with it, part of post-tenure review. The initial plan was a bit impractical. It built bonds between observer and observee, but it was not very useful in evaluating faculty. It was, however, a noble effort.\textsuperscript{21}

**University Support**

Under Chancellor Jim Woodward, education became part of the university’s central mission.\textsuperscript{22}

At many institutions, there is not enough respect for the College of Education. It didn’t make sense – there was a body of knowledge, with constant additions. It was critical to have an identifiable profession regarding teaching. Education should be #1 in importance – a place to make a bigger impact, and contribute to the betterment of society.\textsuperscript{4}

UNCC had a good COED, but was too distant from the rest of the campus. There were good scholars, who would have been good at anything. The chancellor didn’t need to support good work, but merely see that it’s recognized. He wanted to ensure deserved recognition as central. Education has a ripple effect through society.\textsuperscript{4}

**The Development of the First Doctoral Program**

At first, there was a joint doctoral program with Chapel Hill.\textsuperscript{22}

The Office of the President was influenced by Chapel Hill’s “aura.”\textsuperscript{8}

UNC-Chapel Hill let Charlotte’s faculty teach the courses. That got some of our faculty involved with university leadership.

The College brought in former CMS Superintendent Bob Hanes, who served as a link to the school system. We showed that we had talent and ability

I was not thrilled with the semi-marriage with Chapel Hill, but it was what we needed to do to get the programs approved.\textsuperscript{24}

Jack considered establishment of a Ed.D. in Educational Leadership to be the single biggest achievement of his deanship.\textsuperscript{31}
His vision was that the COED needed a full array of programs, through the PhD. It required a change in mission by the University’s Board of Governors, which happened in 1993.  

A committee looked at PhDs across the state and decided Charlotte needed PhDs. But there was no new money, so it didn’t happen till 1996. (It was changed by a concern that we’d be left at the gate, with a loss of funding.)

In reality, there was widespread recognition that more doctoral work needs to be available.

The original move to doctoral status was a halting effort, very much on the back burner for Educational Administration, rebuffed by General Administration in Chapel Hill.

The obstacle was that we didn’t have the research firepower.

We started over from a push by Woodward and Dubois, with a proverbial “nose under the tent.”

The Ed.D. in Ed Leadership and Ph.D. in Public Policy could put a stake in the ground, could construct an argument for a regional need without going head to head with existing research institutions.

Technology

Technology was originally for secretaries. Faculty bought their own.

Then we got desktops on very desk, driven by Bil Stahl, out of a centralized management position in the Provost’s office.

The university sought to catch up by buying PCs and Mainframe computers.

In 1991, John Gretes and Gene Schaffer applied for an IBM grant. The proposal was typed on an amber monitor. There were 2,000 applications, and they funded 93 including us. We developed classrooms, an open lab, and faculty resources. We went from nothing to “technology to beat the band.”

Nagle was awesome in getting (technology) funding.

The key decision was the hiring of Lonnie and Dane. We gave up an associate dean position to do that.

Nagle recognized the need for technology support at the right time. The physical change of Colvard was important.

We had one of the first wireless hotspots before the library. Nagle supported it.

Dane and Lonnie are incredible. The best thing Nagle ever did.
Dane is one of the “Spanglers,” hired with money from General Administration’s Spangler Initiative to provide College of Education tech support. Lonnie’s position came from the Dean’s office.26

Having Dane, Lonnie, and Ed is the “envy of 95% of colleges and universities.”17

Gretes was assigned as “faculty coordinator” because Jack wanted to make sure the tech guys weren’t doing “crazy stuff.” (Gretes was a great sounding board.)26

The original tasks were to train faculty, run workshops and classes, and give away CDs and software. Few came to the workshops, but administrative staff did. So, we switched to one-on-one instruction, as requested. (Lots of faculty were too busy or unwilling to learn new skills. They didn’t see how it could benefit their jobs.) We have to let people choose where they want to be tech-wise, then we have to show a better way.26

We went from 30—40% Mac to 100% PC. (Macs made sense at the time.) The office was receiving two calls per day from someone who couldn’t open a common file attachment.26

We built the first smart classroom. It was designed from scratch with a VCR (DVD’s hadn’t come about yet.), a document camera, and a PC built into a professional work stations.26

We pulled labs into the lab standard on campus. The COED set the standard. We were cutting edge.2

Jack Nagle’s Strengths and Qualities

He brought direction, order, and purpose - what we needed.15

He raised money including our first named professorship - the Lake and Edward Snyder (held by Diane Browder.) He went to Philip Morris for doctoral fellowships.31

He was an excellent dean for organizing, structures, getting resources.26

He was a very strong advocate regarding resources.28

He provided good support for part-timers

Our college faculty had become prominent leaders – in the Provost office with Faculty Associates, and two faculty presidents.11

Nagle won converts for the quality of the faculty and program.

Under Jack, we became the only show in town.13

He brought us together as a college. We were isolated units until then.23

His openness and ability to see the big picture was healthy.23

Jack always tried to be fair. He consolidated, built bridges. He got faculty back together.
He built us into what we are today.\textsuperscript{11}

I always felt supported by him.\textsuperscript{23}

He brought quality, organization, and a sense of NCATE. Overall, we emerged from under a shadow as a player in the state, even nationally.\textsuperscript{13}

In six years, he helped the college take a step forward, ratcheted up a level or two. He laid foundation for further changes.\textsuperscript{31}

He was sort of a perfectionist.\textsuperscript{3}

**Jack Nagle’s Departure**

In 1999, Dean Nagle was asked by the Provost to return to faculty status.\textsuperscript{31}

Jack became a faculty member for a year, before moving on to a deanship in California.\textsuperscript{22}
Part IV  The Present-Day College of Education (1999 to present)

Overview

The fourth decade of the College was the first time that the Dean was hired from within the faculty. Mary Lynne Calhoun came to UNC Charlotte as a special education assistant professor during Bill Heller’s tenure as Dean. She advanced through the professorial ranks and became a department chair during Jack Nagle’s tenure as Dean. She first chaired the Department of Teaching Specialties and then, after departmental reorganization in 1996, chaired the Department of Counseling, Special Education, and Child Development. Mary Lynne was appointed Interim Dean in 1999 and then was hired as Dean after a national search in 2000.

The years with Mary Lynne Calhoun have been filled with challenges and changes in the university; the state and regional needs for teachers and principals; the national conversation about teacher education; increased expectations for teachers, principals, counselors, and college faculty; requirements for accreditation; the growing number of students and faculty; and unprecedented budget cuts during the recent economic downturn.

In the early 2000’s, faculty and staff met in focus groups to identify common values and design principles for a new College of Education Building. Highest on the list were the desire for natural light along with an entrance that welcomed students and told them they were important. Both these values were realized in the wonderful new building and its light-filled four-story atrium. We moved into the building during exam week in December 2004; then, by the fall of 2010, we had run out of allotted space in the building and began housing folks next door in temporary spaces in the College of Health and Human Services.

Faculty were highly engaged in program development during the past decade, having added Ph.D. programs in Counseling, Special Education, and Curriculum and Instruction with emphases available in Urban Education, Literacy, Mathematics, and Elementary Education. M.Ed. and M.S.A. programs were offered off-campus at a variety of professional development schools throughout the region. In response to the growing teacher shortage at the beginning of the decade, faculty developed and offered new routes to teacher licensure for adults who already held an appropriate bachelor’s degree and met requirements for admission to teacher education and to graduate school. The Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) offered a graduate program route to initial teaching licensure in Phase One and then to the graduate level licensure (with a 10% pay raise) at the completion of the degree. The Graduate Certificate in Teaching program offered a route to the initial teaching license and could be counted toward MAT requirements if program completers applied to the degree program at a later time. Both programs recognized the educational and employment achievements of adults and provided graduate students a faster route to licensure than their previous option of taking an undergraduate teacher education program. The College partnered with Teach For America to offer Graduate Certificate and MAT programs especially tailored to these new young teachers. By 2009, there were as many graduate students seeking initial teaching licensure than undergraduates, and the College’s overall population of accepted undergraduate and graduate students hovered at 3000.
Other changes were made in response to the teacher shortage and the need to recruit more students to teacher education programs. For example, the collection of education courses for future high school teachers was revised and reduced, then elevated into a minor in Secondary Education, making it a more visible, desirable program for arts and science majors. Another program partnered with a school system and a community college to help their county “grow their own.” The undergraduate elementary education program was offered as a 2+2 completion program on site at Stanly Community College; all graduates of the first cohort were hired as teachers in Stanly County or neighboring counties, and a second cohort is underway. The undergraduate major in Child and Family Development was revised to become a licensure program for all students admitted to the major. The year-long revision process was based on faculty analysis of students’ learning outcomes; the needs of schools, daycare centers, agencies, and other child-centered settings; and the demands of a competitive job market. The Office of Student Academic Services was renamed the Office of Teacher Education Advising and Licensure (TEAL) and now houses a director, two staff, four advisors, and a teacher-recruiter.

Dean Calhoun has made a number of organizational changes. She created the position of associate dean to lead efforts with accreditation, assessment, and program development; respond to student problems and special requests; and assist with faculty development. Later in her tenure, she secured a position of assistant dean to manage the increasing complexities of applying for and spending correctly several million dollars of grant funding per year. She also hired an assessment coordinator to help develop and manage the new assessment system and appointed a special assistant to the dean for the 2008-2010 required program revisions. As numbers of faculty and students grew, Dean Calhoun divided the Department of Counseling, Special Education, and Child Development into two departments: the Department of Counseling and the Department of Special Education and Child Development. The Department of Counseling has achieved prestigious national accreditation for its programs through the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP).

A major emphasis throughout all licensure programs became increased accountability for assessing attainment of the expected knowledge, skills, and dispositions of our students, now called candidates, including their ability to positively impact the learning or learning environment of their students in birth through 12th grade education settings. The systematic assessment of candidates, using program-wide or college-wide instruments, has resulted in the improvement of various aspects of preparation programs in teaching, administration, supervision, and counseling.

**Hiring Mary Lynne Calhoun as Dean**

*It was an ideal time to reach into the college and find a dean.*

*I thought she’d never do it because she always wanted everyone to be in agreement as a Chair, but she’s moved right past that as a Dean. She’s not so worried about 100% agreement, but still wants to build a consensus.*
Mary Lynne is a first class scholar and superb teacher who is well-respected by the faculty. She has the right standards in place.

**Transition**

NCATE was her first year!

Mary Lynne didn’t just keep the course. She continued to build and create a new culture.

She unstifled initiative and loosened the reins, but she’s tough when she needs to be.

She is building a wonderful faculty, the next generation.

The PhD in Counseling got included in the 5-year plan on a whim, and it got through. It included multicultural counseling. The Chapel Hill Graduate Council approved it with the requirement that 3 faculty be added.

The PhD in C&I was the hardest to get approved. Its focus on math and literacy was key, (Thanks to input by Graduate Dean Denise Trauth.)

**Associate Dean Barbara Edwards**

Dean Calhoun asked for an Associate Dean.

REEL was very upset when Barbara left as our chair, but we knew she was the perfect choice for Associate Dean.

Barbara is smooth, connected, and savvy.

Call it the Mary Lynne-Barbara Edwards years!

**Moving to the New College of Education Building**

There was some symbolism to having a building named College of Education. It’s really important that words about college and its work be symbolized.

We made our mark with this building. There are eleven smart classrooms in new building, with 8 more we could control. We doubled the teaching and open labs. We knew we’d outgrown Colvard.

It’s the only building of the 16 new ones with a tech budget.
Boy, we’ve come a long way from the cubicle days.22

Dean Calhoun’s Achievements On Campus

A culture developed of reducing barriers to candidates in teacher education. It was reminiscent of the early days.20

The new culture of assessment is a fascinating but hard change. It helped us learn how to do things better. NCATE forced it to happen.20

She staffed the college well.24

The quality of our faculty is amazing.20

She added Ed Conway’s position, using Distance Education funding, to support on-line courses. It was our first foray into two-tiered support.20

Recently OFE gained two faculty positions to support supervision of graduate-level student teaching, plus two Teachers in Residence positions.23

There’s been an amazing expansion of programs - 3 PhDs and an MAT which has become a model.20

Dean Calhoun’s Achievements Off Campus

She made connections with external relations.28

She enhanced relationships with school systems by meeting the superintendents on their own turf.4

She has been responsive to issues, such as the teacher shortage. I like her constant vigilance in dealing with the state.28

She has always wanted UNC Charlotte to be a leader in MAT and M.Ed programs. (Because of her pioneering work) ...other universities in the UNC system didn’t have to work as hard.27

Dean Calhoun’s Achievements, Period

Her achievements are the COED’s image -- communication of who we are and what we do.24

She is accommodating, humane, gracious, and hospitable. She talks like a counselor.17
Mary Lynne has superior people skills. She’s a consensus builder. She’s a marvelous academic leader – able to provide direction and support. She can give guidance to faculty and be heard because of respect. She sees things as opportunities, not problems. Her attitude is that everybody has a need, and we’ll find a way to meet it. Mary Lynne is on top of things. She has an amazing facility for details. Nobody works harder than her. She’s the best dean of education I’ve ever seen. Period.

What Remains From the Old Days?

1. A collaborative spirit (not accidental.) Thirty-plus years of faculty choosing other faculty they could work with. That value carried forward.
2. We still have a development class in every program.
3. There is supportive problem-solving on behalf of students. We still love, know, and support students.

Spotlight on a graduate: Superintendent Ed Davis (2002)

Program
- Ed.D. in Educational Leadership

Current employment
- I’ve been the superintendent of Union County Public Schools since 2005; I was the assistant superintendent from 2000 to 2005. Before that, I was a principal for ten years – six at the high school level and four in an elementary school.

Relationship of employment to educational background from the College of Education
- The program prepared me well to be an education leader. I focus on what leadership means, what leadership means as an educator. Even after nine years as building principal, leadership at the district level is a whole different world!
Of particular importance while a student …

- The cohort model. There was so much power in being in a group where everyone was an educational leader at some level (assistant principals, principals, assistant superintendents) - the camaraderie – the bonds that last forever.
- The quality of the instructors. Jim Lyons, John Gooden, Jane Testerman, Claudia Flowers, Rich Lambert, Allen Queen, Corey Lock – they expected a lot and, at the same time, understood we were all working professionals. They saw the value of working in the field. There was mutual respect and collegiality. Rather than standing over us, they helped shepherd us through the process – they wanted us to be successful. For example, Rich Lambert spent hours helping me with the number-crunching in my dissertation – hours!

What I’d change …

- I worked hard – I have no normal regrets. I might have tried to enjoy the process more instead of worrying about getting done and graduating. I could have learned more about how to thrive, not just survive while in the program.
- Maybe …hold more Saturday classes and don’t have so much of the program during the week … That’s especially tough for high school principals with so many nighttime activities. However, one night a week with two back-to-back classes was more workable than not.

Spotlight on a graduate: Kimberly Simpson (2008)

Program
- Master of Arts in Teaching: Middle Grades English/Language Arts
- Member of the Teach for America (TFA) cohort

Current employment
- Teaching middle grades language arts at Alexander Graham Middle School in Charlotte-Mecklenburg after two years at Ranson Middle School.
- Ranson Middle – 2 years – then transferred to Alexander Graham – wanted more diversity and to start National Boards …
- wanted to be sure I could teach ALL kinds of kids

Relationship of employment to educational background from the College of Education
- My background was in educational policy, I had studied human development and educational policy at Syracuse. Then I took the TFA training that summer after I graduated. I started MAT right away in my first year of teaching because I wanted to hear educational theories, talk with other teachers who were veterans in the field, and gain another perspective. The content of the courses helped me in my classroom … but so did talking with other teachers in CMS and other counties and learning what was working for them. The TFA corps was really small when you narrowed it down to middle grades language arts – I wanted a clearer vision of what I wanted my classroom to be.
Of particular importance while a student …

- They helped me create my vision of what I wanted my classroom to look like -- they didn’t tell me what the vision should be. By the second year of teaching, I had a clearer vision and a clearer educational philosophy. Dr. Leslie Cook had us write “This I believe …for teaching English/Language Arts.” It was really important for me to figure that out. Some beliefs came from my own experience as a student when I was younger … but I had to find my own place within my school, department, and grade level. She was truly a mentor – very open in knowing where I was coming from and pushing me to reach a potential I couldn’t see in myself at the time! I gained good concrete strategies, theories, and activities to use in the classroom … and other avenues for teaching literature. The MAT offered strategies we could actually use in our classrooms. Theories – yes – but real strategies to use! So valuable!!! Sharing with other teachers in courses and then back at school and with TFA friends – great bridge!

- Lan Quach taught a course that helped with final MAT portfolio – such good alignment with National Boards! I finished National Boards successfully the year after graduation! She really helped me become a reflective practitioner. I could really pinpoint who I wanted to be as a teacher!

- While I was in the MAT program, I did something extra. In the summer of 2007, I did the immersion program in Costa Rica with UNC Charlotte …it’s really an undergraduate program, but UNCC let me take it as a graduate student. That experience changed the way I looked at struggling readers! Because as a teacher, it’s hard to understand why kids don’t get it. But I knew no Spanish, and my teacher in Costa Rica was speaking Spanish. If I didn’t understand the first time, she’d repeat it … but I still didn’t get it. That’s like telling students to re-read something - clearly an ineffective technique. It helped me understand their struggle – to be vulnerable, to remember what it’s like to not get something … how depressed you can become. But when you get it, how great you feel! I had never really struggled in academia … if I worked at it, I got it. But in Costa Rica, I struggled every night!! Very humbling. This program had a lot to do with my motivation to come back as a teacher and really make a connection with struggling readers. It changed the way I talked with my students.

What I’d change …

- I think I was the first TFA to complete the whole MAT – it’s difficult to trailblaze through something. I was a first year teacher, tutoring, working two part-time jobs … I wish I would have planned ahead so I would have known what I needed. Original advisor left while I was a student… I wish I would have spent a little more time figuring out what I needed to do in order to graduate the way I wanted to.

- I was offered soooo much at the University – I hate to say anything negative – but everyone can grow …I would have changed the content classes I took – they were good – but didn’t help me as a teacher. I took the undergrad classes needed to fulfill the English/Language Arts background requirement for licensure, but they didn’t really affect my teaching. They might have helped me a bit to analyze literature, but that didn’t affect my teaching. If content courses are to be required, I would make very specific requirements.
• Maybe having us in a book club as students would be a good model for how to do one as teachers. More modeling would have helped … such a key way to let us know how to do things. Instead of explaining how to do a novel study, how about doing one together?
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