



**Committee for the Evaluation of Education and  
Science Education Study Programs**

**Ben-Gurion University**  
**Department of Education and program of Science and Technology Education**  
Evaluation Report

**September 2014**

## Contents

<b>Chapter 1:</b> Background.....	3
<b>Chapter 2:</b> Committee Procedures.....	5
<b>Chapter 3:</b> Evaluation of Education Study Program and Science and Technology Education Study Program at Ben-Gurion University .....	6
<b>Chapter 4:</b> General Recommendations and Timetable.....	20

### **Appendices:**

Appendix 1 – Letter of Appointment

Appendix 2 - Schedule of the visit

## **Chapter 1: Background**

The Council for Higher Education (CHE) decided to evaluate study programs in the field of Education and Science Education during the academic year of 2013-2014.

Following the decision of the CHE, the Minister of Education, who serves ex officio as Chairperson of the CHE, appointed a Committee consisting of:

- **Prof. Sam Wineburg** - Graduate School of Education, Stanford University - California, USA. Committee Chair.
- **Prof. Patricia Alexander** - College of Education, University of Maryland - Maryland, USA.
- **Prof. Yehudit Judy Dori<sup>1</sup>** - Department of Education in Science and Technology, Technion – Israel Institute of Technology – Israel, and Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology – Massachusetts, USA.
- **Prof. Sharon Feiman-Nemser** - Mandel Center for Studies in Jewish Education, Brandeis University - Massachusetts, USA.
- **Prof. Stephen Jacobson** - Graduate School of Education, University at Buffalo - New York, USA.
- **Prof. R. Malatesha Joshi** - College of Education and Human Development, Texas A & M University - Texas, USA.
- **Prof. Jeremy Kilpatrick** - Mathematics Education Program, University of Georgia - Georgia, USA.
- **Prof. Alan Lesgold** - School of Education, University of Pittsburgh – Pennsylvania, USA.
- **Prof. Arie Wilschut** - School of Education, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences – Netherlands.
- **Prof. Anat Zohar<sup>2</sup>** - School of Education, The Hebrew University in Jerusalem – Israel.

Ms. Tal Reichman served as the Coordinator of the Committee on behalf of the CHE.

---

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with the CHE's policy, Prof. Yehudit Judy Dory did not participate in the evaluation of the Education Department at Ben-Gurion University to prevent the appearance of a conflict of interests. Her signature on this report refers only to the evaluation of the Program of Science and technology.

<sup>2</sup> In accordance with the CHE's policy, Prof. Anat Zohar did not participate in the evaluation of the School of Education at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Within the framework of its activity, the Committee was requested to:<sup>3</sup>

1. Examine the self-evaluation reports submitted by the institutions that provide study programs in Education and Science Education, and to conduct on-site visits at those institutions.
2. Submit to the CHE an individual report on each of the evaluated academic units and study programs, including the Committee's findings and recommendations.
3. Submit to the CHE a general report regarding the examined field of study within the Israeli system of higher education including recommendations for standards in the evaluated field of study.

The entire process was conducted in accordance with the CHE's Guidelines for Self-Evaluation (of July 2012).

---

<sup>3</sup> The Committee's letter of appointment is attached as **Appendix 1**.

## **Chapter 2: Committee Procedures**

The Committee held its first meeting on March 18, 2014, during which it discussed fundamental issues concerning higher education in Israel, the quality assessment activity, as well as Education and Science Education Study programs in Israel.

In March 2014, the Committee held its first round of visits of evaluation, and visited Bar-Ilan University, the Open University and Tel-Aviv University. In June 2014, the committee held its second round of visits of evaluation, and visited Ben-Gurion University and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. During the visits, the Committee met with various stakeholders at the institutions, including management, faculty, staff, and students.

This report deals with the School of Education at Ben-Gurion University. The Committee's visit to the university took place on June 15-16, 2014.

The schedule of the visit is attached as **Appendix 2**.

The Committee thanks the senior management of Ben-Gurion University and the Department of Education and the Program of Science and Technology Education for their self-evaluation report, and for the hospitality extended to the committee during its visit at the institution.

## **Chapter 3: Evaluation of the Department of Education & the Program of Science and Technology Education Study Programs at Ben-Gurion University**

*This Report relates to the situation current at the time of the visit to the institution, and does not take account of any subsequent changes. The Report records the conclusions reached by the Evaluation Committee based on the documentation provided by the institution, information gained through interviews, discussion and observation as well as other information available to the Committee.*

### **1. Executive Summary**

The education faculty at Ben-Gurion University is split into two units, the Department of Education and the Program of Science and Technology Education. Together these units share a mission to serve the south of Israel and the particular populations living there. During our meetings, we heard students, faculty, and administrators articulate this mission and express their commitment to it.

Currently, the two separate education units have little to do with one another. While this configuration allows for programmatic autonomy, it contributes to a lack of a unified purpose and creates numerous inefficiencies.

The separation of the two units impedes the ability of Ben-Gurion University to fulfill its mission, particularly with respect to the preparation of high school teachers. The Department of Education states that it is “the sole academic institution that provides training in the south of high school teachers and school principals.” However, teacher certification is isolated and disconnected from both education units. Both units treat teacher certification as a separate program staffed almost entirely by adjunct faculty.

Merging the Department of Education and the Program of Science and Technology Education in a newly organized School of Education would create a centralized and efficient structure, and would better enable a common mission to be realized. In

such a merger, the Program of Science and Technology Education should be allowed to maintain its distinct identity and continue to emphasize the centrality of subject matter knowledge and content specific pedagogy in its programs.

We further recommend that the University undertake a search for someone with the necessary leadership skills to lead a new School of Education. This scholar should have no prior academic appointment in either of the two preexisting units. Furthermore, as an expression of the University's commitment to the preparation of new high school teachers, we recommend that *at least three* academic-track positions be added to the Education faculty. These positions should target scholars with expertise in the teaching and learning of specific school subjects, and/or in teacher education with an emphasis on learning to teach specific school subjects.

## 2. **Mission**

### Observations and Findings

The School of Education at Ben-Gurion University has a clear mission to serve the south of Israel and the particular populations living there. During our meetings, we heard students, faculty, and administrators articulate this mission and express their commitment to it.

Currently, two separate units are responsible for education at BGU: the Department of Education and the Program of Science and Technology Education. While this configuration allows for programmatic autonomy, it contributes to a lack of unified purpose and creates various inefficiencies.

We believe that the separation of these units impedes BGU from fulfilling its mission to prepare Israel's high school teachers. The Department of Education states that it is "the sole academic institution that provides training in the south of high school teachers and school principals." However, teacher certification is isolated and disconnected from both education units. It suffers from low academic status and

lacks strong faculty leadership. Neither the Department of Education nor the Program of Science and Technology Education takes full responsibility for the preparation of new teachers. Both units treat teacher preparation as a separate program served almost entirely by adjunct faculty.

Bringing together the Department of Education and the Program of Science and Technology Education in a newly organized School of Education would create a centralized and efficient structure, and would better allow for the articulation of a common mission. Teacher preparation would be at the core of this new organizational structure.

#### Recommendation

##### **Essential change:**

Universities have the sole responsibility for preparing Israel's high school teachers. The University as a whole must make teacher preparation a priority by providing sufficient financial, organizational, and intellectual support to this enterprise. (See specific recommendations on reorganization in the next section, "Organizational Structure").

### **3. Organizational Structure**

#### Observations and Findings

At present, the two units of education at BGU lack an organizational structure that allows them to set priorities, measure progress, and take advantage of natural opportunities for collaboration and synergy.

Throughout our meetings, we struggled to determine the reasons underlying the separation of the Department of Education from the Program of Science and Technology Education. We came to the conclusion that the separation was a decision made at a particular moment in history and that the conditions justifying it are no longer valid. As we listened to the pros and cons of a merger, we perceived that the

units hold assumptions about one another based more on past impressions than on what is happening today.

The separation of the two units contributes to the isolation of BGU's teacher education program. While many of the students in the Program of Science and Technology Education are teachers and plan to return to the classroom, the unit does not prepare new teachers. And, while three professors from the Department of Education each teach one course apiece in the teacher certification program, this arrangement does not go far enough in meeting the goals of faculty participation and program integration specified by the Ariav Report. Furthermore, there is a mismatch between funds generated by tuition (and allocated by the CHE's planning and budget committee) and funds available to the teacher certification unit. This mismatch further contributes to the isolation of the teacher certification program from BGU's core programs in Education.

### Recommendations

#### **Essential changes:**

- 1) With the full support of University leadership, the Department of Education and the Program of Science and Technology Education must be reorganized into a new School of Education. This merger should allow the Program of Science and Technology Education to maintain its distinct identity and continue emphasizing the centrality of subject matter knowledge and content specific pedagogy in its programs.
- 2) The University must undertake a search for a head with the requisite leadership skills to lead the new school. This new head should be someone with no prior academic appointment in either of the two preexisting units.
- 3) The two units within the new School of Education must take joint responsibility for teacher certification.
- 4) As an expression of the University's commitment to teacher certification, the University must create *at least three* academic track positions for faculty with

expertise in the teaching and learning of a specific school subject and/or in teacher education with an emphasis on a specific school subject.

#### 4. **Study Programs**

##### Observations and Findings

##### **B.A. & M.A. programs**

The Department of Education's B.A. program is organized around three "foundational" disciplines: psychology, sociology and philosophy. Exposure to these disciplines is intended to give students a broad introduction to the study of education. We learned that students do not always see the connections among the three disciplines and how this disciplinary combination addresses real educational problems that students encounter in the field. Furthermore, we learned of a significant overlap between the courses offered in the psychology department and those in the psychology track of the Department of Education. Eliminating this overlap would free up needed resources. During our visit, we also learned of plans by the Department of Education to offer a new program in special education.

We learned that efforts to raise admission standards and to close the "Windows to the Academy" program have hurt the very populations the University is dedicated to serving. Although there is now a university-wide program for special populations, we heard that for students in Education, this program it is not as effective as the earlier "Windows to the Academy" initiative.

The committee was impressed with the clarity of purpose in the Program of Science and Technology Education. Its study options emphasize both content knowledge and content specific pedagogy, an emphasis that reflects best practice in schools of education worldwide. We commend the Program Head and the faculty on this approach. Graduates of the program have assumed important leadership roles in municipalities and in the Ministry of Education. Students who want to gain new mathematical, scientific, and engineering knowledge for teaching are attracted to the

Program of Science and Technology Education and typically choose it over the Department of Education.

The committee learned that M.A. students in the Program of Science and Technology Education receive fewer credits for work on their thesis than in comparable M.A. programs elsewhere. Because students earn fewer credits, they must take additional coursework to complete their degrees, which often results in increased time to complete the degree.

We also learned that the literature review requirement in the Program of Science and Technology Education creates difficulties for many of the program's M.A. students. The committee questions the value of this assignment as a stand-alone exercise.

#### Recommendations

##### **Essential changes:**

- 1) The two education units must not open any new programs until the integration of the Department of Education and the Program of Science and Technology Education has been achieved.
- 2) With support from University administration, the Department of Education and the Program of Science and Technology Education must create and restore programs to recruit, retain, and support special populations.

##### **Advisable changes:**

- 1) As the units carry out a reorganization, faculty should undertake a review of curricula at leading schools of education. They will find, for example, that the "three foundational disciplines" approach has largely been abandoned at top schools of education.
- 2) At the B.A. level, the Department of Education should make a course in learning and instruction mandatory for all students.
- 3) M.A. students, both in the thesis and non-thesis tracks, should be encouraged to research problems of practice in their own classrooms. In the Program of Science

and Technology Education, such action-research projects could serve as an alternative to the current literature review.

- 4) In the Program of Science and Technology Education, additional credits should be assigned to the thesis to align it with programs at other Israeli universities.

#### **Desirable changes:**

- 1) The Department of Education should work to eliminate overlap with courses in the psychology department.
- 2) To the extent that the Department of Education maintains the “three foundational discipline” model, faculty should formulate a set of common educational questions that enable students to see the connections among disciplines and how they relate to concrete educational problems.

#### **Ph.D. program**

Many of the doctoral students we met had published in refereed journals with their advisors. Although students receive personal and intellectual support from their advisors, they receive limited financial support to complete their degrees. As a result, many students have to work full-time during their studies.

The committee learned that the University does not provide courses or other means of support for academic writing or presenting at professional conferences. For Ph.D. students who hope to attain academic positions, writing their thesis in Hebrew may put them at a disadvantage.

#### **Recommendations**

##### **Advisable changes:**

- 1) The new School of Education should create opportunities for Ph.D. students to gain the skills necessary to become members of the international research community. Some examples include a proseminar in which students present and receive feedback on work in progress, and a mini-conference in which students present their research findings in English.

- 2) Ph.D. students who seek academic positions should be encouraged to write their theses in English and be provided with the necessary support for doing so.
- 3) The University should provide additional scholarships and funding for Ph.D. students.

### **Teacher Certification**

The teacher certification program is an academic orphan that is isolated and disconnected from other programs in the two education units. The program suffers from low status and inadequate faculty involvement. We learned that the Department of Education is aware of some of these problems and is eager to remedy them. We also learned that the Department of Education is attempting to concentrate placements of teacher trainees in a small number of cooperating schools, a development we commend.

The Program of Science and Technology Education has an approach to teacher development that emphasizes subject matter knowledge and content specific pedagogy. This is a powerful combination that reflects best practice in teacher preparation. However, the Program of Science and Technology Education works only with experienced teachers and does not prepare new ones. This is unfortunate because their approach could serve as a model for preparing teachers in other subjects in the high school curriculum (e.g., language, history, Bible, civics, and geography). We believe that the integration of the two education units would pave the way for a model of teacher preparation that puts subject matter knowledge and content specific pedagogy at the center.

### Recommendations

#### **Essential changes:**

- 1) Teacher preparation must be brought under the auspices of the new School of Education and put at the center of its mission.

- 2) The new School of Education must hire a faculty member to lead in the redesign of the teacher certification unit. This person should have expertise and a research program in teaching and learning in high schools.
- 3) In the new School of Education, the Program of Science and Technology Education must assume the responsibility for preparing new teachers in science, mathematics, and technology education.

**Advisable changes:**

- 1) In the new School of Education, faculty should be added whose specialties are in the teaching and learning of the humanities and social sciences (e.g., literature, Bible, languages, history, civics, and geography) to parallel the content-specific orientation of the Program of Science and Technology Education.
- 2) The new School of Education should create incentives (such as providing course releases) for tenure-line faculty to lead in the redesign of the program.
- 3) The new School of Education should explore the potential for combining the teaching certificate with the B.A. and M.A. degrees, a trend adopted by other universities.
- 4) The University should provide sufficient resources to increase the number of mentors [מנחים מורים] in the practicum of the teacher certification program.
- 5) The new School of Education should continue to target the development of strong clinical sites for teaching practice.

## 5. **Students**

### Observations and Findings

Many students choose BGU over alternatives because of its strong social mission. Students value the opportunity to work with the communities of Beer-Sheva and the Negev while pursuing their degrees. From what we could tell, both education units provide positive learning environments. The committee was impressed by the warm atmosphere and accessibility of the teaching and administrative staff.

The committee learned that at the B.A. level, many courses enroll over a hundred students. Classrooms often lack the technological facilities that enable active learning. We also learned that at the Ph.D. level, students are not provided with opportunities to teach and to develop expertise in instruction at the university level. Furthermore, as a result of the two separate units, Ph.D. students have few formal opportunities to exchange ideas with students from the other unit, even when such exchanges would be beneficial to both parties.

### Recommendations

#### **Advisable changes:**

- 1) The two education units should explore interactive pedagogies and technologies in large classes.
- 2) A cross-unit proseminar should be developed for Ph.D. students that allows them to exchange ideas and learn from each other.

## **6. Faculty and Human Resources**

### Observations and Findings

Both units have a committed and productive faculty. Within each of the two units, there are many instances of collaboration. Yet, when we looked across the two units, we got the impression that there were other opportunities for collaborations that were not being realized.

It seemed to us that faculty members are responsive to students' needs, responding quickly to inquiries and making themselves available for individual meetings.

Both units face a number of upcoming retirements. We learned that there are no clear plans for replacing faculty members in key areas of the curriculum and in leadership positions. The Department of Education has made some efforts to promote junior faculty members and to prepare them for leadership. However, at present, there are few individuals capable of exercising the strong leadership the units need.

In both the Department of Education and the Program of Science and Technology Education, there are few faculty members from under-represented populations.

#### Recommendations

##### **Essential change:**

The two units of education must rethink their hiring plans in light of the new organizational structure we recommend.

##### **Advisable changes:**

- 1) The units should take active steps to prepare younger faculty members for leadership positions.
- 2) The units should implement special recruitment and retention efforts aimed at diversifying the faculty with members from under-represented groups.

## 7. **Teaching and learning outcomes**

#### Observations and Findings

In general, the students we met were satisfied with their programs.

Both the Department of Education and the Program of Science and Technology Education have recently raised admission standards. Although this policy may have raised the caliber of students, it has also made it more difficult for BGU to meet the needs of the special populations of the Negev. The recent closure of the “Windows to the Academy” program has further exacerbated the problem.

Adjunct faculty members teach many courses, particularly in the teacher certification program. Many of the adjuncts have academic and real-world experiences that contribute to their effectiveness. However, there is no systematic oversight of the courses taught by adjuncts, who are often left on their own to determine the course content. The result is wide variation in the nature and quality of learning outcomes

and assessments.

In both units, student surveys seemed to be the only means for evaluating teaching. This is problematic given the uneven reliability of course ratings as an indicator of student learning.

### Recommendations

#### **Essential change:**

With support from the University administration, the Department of Education and the Program of Science and Technology Education must create and restore programs to recruit, retain, and support special populations.

#### **Advisable changes:**

- 1) In addition to student course ratings, faculty should explore new means for evaluating teaching. Peer evaluations of teaching, reviews of syllabi, and analyses of student work are all options for creating a culture of continuous improvement around teaching.
- 2) There should be better monitoring of adjuncts. Senior faculty should review adjuncts' course syllabi to ensure the quality and consistency of course content.

## 8. **Research**

### Observations and Findings

The Department of Education and the Program of Science and Technology Education emphasize the importance of research and encourage publication in international journals. Faculty members publish in a wide variety of journals. Many receive internal and external grants and present their findings at respected peer-reviewed conferences. Faculty members from both units have secured large external funding for their research, a particularly impressive feat in an era of diminished funds for research.

Schools of education serve a dual role in the research university: to create new

knowledge but also to enhance the practice of education in schools and other educational venues. It was unclear to us how this second goal was being met. Because faculty research appears largely in English language journals, there are few opportunities for practitioners and the general public to learn about the research conducted by Ben Gurion University faculty. The chief audience for research seems to be other scholars who publish in the same English language journals, rather than Israel's teachers, principals, policy makers, parents and students. Many leading schools of education develop mechanisms such as special publications or websites that distill research findings into a format that influences public discourse about education. We saw no unified efforts to do this in either the Department of Education or in the Program of Science and Technology Education.

#### Recommendation

##### **Advisable change:**

The two educational units should develop mechanisms (e.g., new kinds of publications, websites, email blasts, podcasts) by which parents, practitioners, policymakers, and the general public can learn about and benefit from their research.

## 9. **Infrastructure**

#### Observations and Findings

BGU has restructured in recent years to help faculty secure external funding. The Dean of Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences has an administrator who monitors and assists faculty members in seeking grants. We commend this development.

The Department of Education and the Program of Science and Technology Education are located in the Social Science Building (No. 72). The building is the home of 14 departments and 5 programs related to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. Except for some shortage of space for research activities and the need for more interactive classroom spaces, we noted no major problems with the University's physical infrastructure.

According to self-evaluation report, technology resources in the teacher certification program were antiquated. We learned, however, that efforts are being made to upgrade equipment.

#### Recommendation

##### **Advisable change:**

Students in the teacher certification program should be using cutting-edge information communication technologies (ICTs). The technology used by teacher trainees should be sufficient to support active learning and to prepare future teachers to be leaders in using technology.

## 10. **Self-Evaluation**

The SE evaluation process provided an opportunity for faculty to learn—in some cases for the first time—about each other's programs and to identify potential areas for collaboration. We hope that this kind of learning will pave the way for an integrated structure that brings both education units together. We are convinced that such a structure will strengthen the study of education at Ben-Gurion University.

## **Chapter 4: Summary of Recommendations**

### **Essential Changes:**

1. Universities have the sole responsibility for preparing Israel's high school teachers. The University as a whole must make teacher preparation a priority by providing sufficient financial, organizational, and intellectual support to this enterprise.
2. With the full support of University leadership, the Department of Education and the Program of Science and Technology Education must be reorganized into a new School of Education. This merger should allow the Program of Science and Technology Education to maintain its distinct identity and continue emphasizing the centrality of subject matter knowledge and content specific pedagogy in its programs.
3. The University must undertake a search for a head with the requisite leadership skills to lead the new school. This new head should be someone with no prior academic appointment in either of the two preexisting units.
4. The two units within the new School of Education must take joint responsibility for teacher certification.
5. As an expression of the University's commitment to teacher certification, the University must create *at least three* academic track positions for faculty with expertise in the teaching and learning of a specific school subject and/or in teacher education with an emphasis on a specific school subject.
6. The two education units must not open any new programs until the integration of the Department of Education and the Program of Science and Technology Education has been achieved.
7. With support from University administration, the Department of Education and the Program of Science and Technology Education must create and restore programs to recruit, retain, and support special populations.
8. Teacher preparation must be brought under the auspices of the new School of Education and put at the center of its mission.

9. The new School of Education must hire a faculty member to lead in the redesign of the teacher certification unit. This person should have expertise and a research program in teaching and learning in high schools.
10. In the new School of Education, the Program of Science and Technology Education must assume the responsibility for preparing new teachers in science, mathematics, and technology education.
11. The two units of education must rethink their hiring plans in light of the new organizational structure we recommend.

**Advisable Changes:**

1. As the units carry out a reorganization, faculty should undertake a review of curricula at leading schools of education. They will find, for example, that the “three foundational disciplines” approach has largely been abandoned at top schools of education.
2. At the B.A. level, the Department of Education should make a course in learning and instruction mandatory for all students.
3. M.A. students, both in the thesis and non-thesis tracks, should be encouraged to research problems of practice in their own classrooms. In the Program of Science and Technology Education, such action-research projects could serve as an alternative to the current literature review.
4. In the Program of Science and Technology Education, additional credits should be assigned to the thesis to align it with programs at other Israeli universities.
5. The new School of Education should create opportunities for Ph.D. students to gain the skills necessary to become members of the international research community. Some examples include a proseminar in which students present and receive feedback on work in progress, and a mini-conference in which students present their research findings in English.
6. Ph.D. students who seek academic positions should be encouraged to write their theses in English and be provided with the necessary support for doing so.
7. The University should provide additional scholarships and funding for Ph.D. students.
8. In the new School of Education, faculty should be added whose specialties are in the teaching and learning of the humanities and social sciences (e.g., literature, Bible,

languages, history, civics, and geography) to parallel the content-specific orientation of the Program of Science and Technology Education.

9. The new School of Education should create incentives (such as providing course releases) for tenure-line faculty to lead in the redesign of the program.
10. The new School of Education should explore the potential for combining the teaching certificate with the B.A. and M.A. degrees, a trend adopted by other universities.
11. The University should provide sufficient resources to increase the number of mentors [מנחים מורים] in the practicum of the teacher certification program.
12. The new School of Education should continue to target the development of strong clinical sites for teaching practice.
13. The two education units should explore interactive pedagogies and technologies in large classes.
14. A cross-unit proseminar should be developed for Ph.D. students that allows them to exchange ideas and learn from each other.
15. The units should take active steps to prepare younger faculty members for leadership positions.
16. The units should implement special recruitment and retention efforts aimed at diversifying the faculty with members from under-represented groups.
17. In addition to student course ratings, faculty should explore new means for evaluating teaching. Peer evaluations of teaching, reviews of syllabi, and analyses of student work are all options for creating a culture of continuous improvement around teaching.
18. There should be better monitoring of adjuncts. Senior faculty should review adjuncts' course syllabi to ensure the quality and consistency of course content.
19. The two educational units should develop mechanisms (e.g., new kinds of publications, websites, email blasts, podcasts) by which parents, practitioners, policymakers, and the general public can learn about and benefit from their research.
20. Students in the teacher certification program should be using cutting-edge information communication technologies (ICTs). The technology used by teacher trainees should be sufficient to support active learning and to prepare future teachers to be leaders in using technology.

**Desirable Changes:**

1. The Department of Education should work to eliminate overlap with courses in the psychology department.
2. To the extent that the Department of Education maintains the “three foundational discipline” model, faculty should formulate a set of common educational questions that enable students to see the connections among disciplines and how they relate to concrete educational problems.

**Signed by:**



---

Prof. Sam Wineburg  
Committee Chair



---

Prof. Patricia Alexander



---

Prof. Yehudit Judy Dori



---

Prof. Sharon Feiman-Nemser



---

Prof. Stephen Jacobson



---

Prof. R. Malatesha Joshi



---

Prof. Jeremy Kilpatrick



---

Prof. Alan Lesgold



---

Prof. Arie Wilschut



---

Prof. Anat Zohar

## Appendix 1: Letter of Appointment



February 2014

Prof. Sam Wineburg  
Graduate School of Education  
Stanford University  
USA

Dear Professor Wineburg,

The Israeli Council for Higher Education (CHE) strives to ensure the continuing excellence and quality of Israeli higher education through a systematic evaluation process. By engaging upon this mission, the CHE seeks: to enhance and ensure the quality of academic studies, to provide the public with information regarding the quality of study programs in institutions of higher education throughout Israel, and to ensure the continued integration of the Israeli system of higher education in the international academic arena.

As part of this important endeavor we reach out to world renowned academicians to help us meet the challenges that confront the Israeli higher education by accepting our invitation to participate in our international evaluation committees. This process establishes a structure for an ongoing consultative process around the globe on common academic dilemmas and prospects.

I therefore deeply appreciate your willingness to join us in this crucial enterprise.

It is with great pleasure that I hereby appoint you to serve as the chair of the Council for Higher Education's Committee for the Evaluation of the study programs in **Education and Science Education**. In addition to yourself, the composition of the Committee will be as follows: Prof. Patricia Alexander, Prof. Yehudit Judy Dori, Prof. Sharon Feiman-Nemser, Prof. Stephen Jacobson, Prof. R. Malatesha Joshi, Prof. Jeremy Kilpatrick, Prof. Alan Lesgold, Prof. Arie Wilschut and Prof. Anat Zohar.

Ms. Maria Levinson-Or will be the coordinator of the Committee.

Details regarding the operation of the committee and its mandate are provided in the enclosed appendix.

I wish you much success in your role as the chair of this most important committee.

Sincerely,  
*Hagit Messer Yaron*  
Prof. Hagit Messer-Yaron  
Deputy Chairperson,  
The Council for Higher Education (CHE)

*Enclosures:* Appendix to the Appointment Letter of Evaluation Committees

cc: Ms. Michal Neumann, Deputy Director-General for QA, CHE  
Ms. Maria Levinson-Or, Committee Coordinator

## Appendix 2: Site Visit Schedule

**Sunday, June 15, 2014**

Time	Subject	Participants
09:45-10:15	Opening session with the heads of the institution and the senior staff member appointed to deal with quality assessment	Prof. Zvi Hacoheh – Rector Prof. Steve Rosen – Deputy rector Prof. Hanoch Flum – Chair of Education Dr. Halleli Pinson – Dep. Of Education Prof. Moshe Barak – Chair of Science Teaching
10:15-10:45	Meeting with head of Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences	Prof. Daviv Newman – Dean
10:45-11:15	Closed door meeting of the committee	
11:15-12:00	Meeting with the Head of the Department of Education	Prof. Hanoch Flum – Chair of Education Dr. Halleli Pinson – Dep. Of Education
12:00-13:00	Meeting with senior academic staff (representatives of relevant committees/programs)*	Dr. Halleli Pinson Prof. Ismail Abu-Saad Dr. Idit Katz Dr. Michael Weinstock Dr. Iris Tabak Dr. Guy Roth Dr. Tehila Kogut
13:00-13:45	Lunch (in the same room)	Closed-door meeting of the committee
13:45-14:30	Meeting with Junior academic staff (Non Tenured lectures)	Dr. Yariv Feniger Dr. Idit Shalev Dr. Noga Sverdlik Dr. Assaf Meshulam Dr. Orit Parnafes
14:30-15:15	Tour of facilities: classrooms, library, labs, offices	Prof. Hanoch Flum Dr. Halleli Pinson Dr. Guy Roth Dr. Adam Lefstein  Dr. Yariv Feniger
15:15-16:00	Meeting with Adjunct academic staff (clinical supervisors)*	Dr. Vered Refaelli Dr. Amnon Glasner Dr. Orit Alfi Dr. Arik Segev Dr. Tamar Icekson Ms. Hava Shavit Ms. Maree Wisman
16:00-16:30	Meeting with Teaching Certification Unit	Dr. Guy Roth Dr. Dorit Tubin Ms.Hagit Kupershtein
16:30-17:15	Meeting with BA students	
17:15-18:00	Meeting with MA students	

**Monday, June 16, 2014**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Participants</b>
09:45-10:30	Meeting with PhD students**	
10:30-11:15	Meeting with teaching certificate students**	
11:15-12:00	Meeting with Alumni**	
12:00-12:45	Lunch	closed-door meeting of the committee
12:45-13:30	Meeting with Chair of Science Teaching	Prof. Moshe Barak
13:30-14:15	Meeting with senior academic staff (representatives of relevant committees)*	Prof. Miri Amit Prof. Michael Fried Prof. Haim Eshach Dr. Orit Ben Zvi Assaraf
14:15-14:45	Closed door meeting of the committee	
14:45-15:30	Meeting with MA and PhD students	
15:30-16:15	Meeting with alumni	
16:15-16:30	Closed door meeting of the committee	
16:30-17:15	Closing meeting with the heads of the institution, head of Faculty, and heads of the departments	Prof. Zvi Hacoheh – Rector Prof. Steve Rosen – Deputy rector Prof. Hanoeh Flum – Chair of Education Dr. Halleli Pinson – Dep. Of Education Prof. Moshe Barak – Chair of Science Teaching

\* The heads of the institution and academic unit or their representatives will not attend these meetings.

\*\* The visit will be conducted in English with the exception of students who may speak in Hebrew and anyone else who feels unable to converse in English.

\*\*\*SE has no junior academic staff