COE Senate Meeting
May 06, 2010
(1106 Tawes 8:30-11:00)
Chair: Bob Lent

MINUTES

Senators in Attendance

• Paula Beckman, EDSP
• Christy Tirrell-Corbin, At Large
• Pat Campbell, EDCI
• Steve Selden (for Bob Croninger), EDPS
• Paul Gold, EDCP, Secretary
• Lattisha Hall, Admin. Professional Representative (Exempt) Arrived 9:30
• Dennis Herschbach (for Betty Malen), EDPS
• David, Imig, At Large
• Hong Jiao, EDMS
• Andrea Jones, Undergraduate Student Representative
• Bob Lent, EDCP, Chair
• Hanne Mawhinney, EDHI
• Bob Mislevy, EDMS
• Sherril Moon, EDSP
• Carl Morrow, EDHI, Graduate Student Representative
• Connie North, EDCI
• Andre Rupp, EDMS
• Kasra Sotudeh, Graduate Student Representative
• Hedy Teglasi, EDCP
• Judith Torney-Purta, EDHD

Senators Absent

• Bob Croninger, EDPS
• Brenda Jones Harden, EDHD (substituting for Geetha Ramani)
• Betty Malen, EDPS
• Marvin Titus, EDHI

Invited

• Linda Valli
I. Mission Statement and Plan of Organization for Department of Pedagogy, Policy and Special Education (8:30 – 9:00 am) – Linda Valli – Preliminary review by COE Senate

- DPPSE document is still unofficial; requires modification and faculty vote
- Rules re which faculty can vote have not yet been finalized

General comments/concerns from senators
- Definition of the electorate (e.g., tenure-line faculty vs. all faculty) may result in differential voting influence of faculty both within and across new departments
- Concern expressed about the need to protect highly-ranked programs within the reorganization process
- We need to clarify with the Dean the time-frame for official votes on COE plan of organization, and department plans of organization

II. Open Forum with COE Dean’s Office – APAC Recommendations for Revising COE Plan of Organization (9:00 – 10:00 am) (Donna Wiseman, Kathy Angeletti, Steve Koziol, Maggie McLaughlin)

- COE Plan of Organization: before COE Senate will vote, the COE Plan will be revised, taking into consideration concerns and suggestions raised by the (a) APAC report, (b) a Senate-sponsored committee to be established to work on plan this summer (see below), and (c) other stakeholders (?)
  - COE Plan of Organization should be completed and approved by January 2011
  - Department Plans of Organization should be completed and voted upon by January 2011

- Why Reorganize the COE? Defining the COE vision for reorganization with aid of:
  - Documents containing past recommendations for updating college and departments’ activities generated by
    - External reviews of department activities conducted over the past decade;
    - Notes of internal COE meetings
    - Data collected regarding COE operations over time
  - Donna will take lead in increasing clarity of vision and purpose of reorganization

- Some Implications of Reorganizing in Context of Shrinking Budget
  - Loss of 8 faculty lines in past ** years; State of Maryland will not allocate funds to replace these lines
  - Currently proposed 3-Department structure will require scaling up and increasing cross-disciplinary activities
  - Programmatic plans with departments will be deferred until larger COE structure in place
  - Year of transition for staff deployments/assignments; all 7 current departments have lost staff and no state funds will become available to recover these lines
Advising for Teacher Education/Preparation: each department currently has its own advising model. No discussion has yet been held on modifying advising policies to date, however, the first discussion on advising will take place with undergraduate students this afternoon. Graduate advising models unlikely to require any change.

Faculty retirements and departures over the near future: deans and Provost will have to consider following options in allocating funds covering these faculty: (a) continue to fund these faculty lines, (b) increase faculty salaries, (c) replace staff.

Possible threats to National Rankings of Current COE Programs if any of these programs are modified, dismantled, or otherwise affected by departmental reorganization.

• Dean Wiseman’s priorities and perspectives:
  o Workforce effectiveness and morale top priority
  o Grateful for time invested by faculty on reorganization process
  o Less worried about program rankings because reorganization should not adversely affect their operations and excellence
  o Strategizing forward with the 3-department model selected by the COE Senate; conceded that the model contains both strengths & weaknesses

Resume Regularly-Scheduled COE Senate Business
(10:00 – 11:00 am)

III. Approval of minutes: Mar. 5th, Mar. 26th, and April 9th Senate meetings (minutes distributed previously)
  • Motion to approve 03/05/2010 Minutes: Yes: 18; No: 0; Abstain: 0
  • Motion to approve 03/05/2010 Minutes: Yes: 18; No: 0; Abstain: 0
  • Motion to approve 03/05/2010 Minutes: Yes: 18; No: 0; Abstain: 0

IV. David Imig agreed to run for Chair, COE Senate, 2010-2011 Academic Year; still need to identify a chair-elect

V. Proposal to create a Senate-sponsored committee to respond to the concerns identified in the APAC feedback re the College’s reorganization plan

Motion: Pat Campbell + friendly amendments

• Role of Senate-Sponsored Committee – advisory with recommendations to Dean
• Schedule & funding: Meet through summer, members to be funded from dean’s office, report to Senate/Dean in Fall (ideally by November)
• Membership: 7 tenured (or tenure-line), one selected by, and from, each of the 7 existing COE departments, to be appointed no later than this May
Charge of the Senate-Sponsored Committee

• **Start with COE 3-department model approved by COE Assembly in 09/2009**
• **Evaluate this model in light of**
  
  o *APAC comments* on COE plan
  o *Consistency with University of Maryland Strategic Plan and Existing COE plan*
  o Incorporate relevant concerns and recommendations from *findings from external reviews conducted for each department over past decade*
  o *Goals/Outcomes desired as a result of the reorganization effort.* Does the COE Three Department Model ensure that goals and outcomes are met? Do the structures (Departments) and Procedures (e.g. to enable increased interdisciplinary input into programs and other desired outcomes of the reorganization) link to desired outcomes?
  o *Recommendations for incorporating changes* into the current COE 3-Department Model (identifying advantages, remedying disadvantages with justification consistent with the COE vision/mission and desired outcomes of the reorganization)

• If the current COE 3-Department Model is found to be insufficient in promoting strategic plans and program excellence, then the Committee will consider different arrangements of programs for a Revised 3-Department Model, and evaluate with same method as Current 3-Department Model
• Should all alternative 3-Department Model configurations be considered insufficient, then the Committee will consider new configurations
• **Vote: Yes: 11; No: 3; Abstain: 4**

Meeting Adjourned 11:00 pm  
Submitted by Paul B. Gold, Secretary  
Approved by COE Senate via email vote 05/25/2010