COE Senate Meeting
September 10, 2010
(3237 Benjamin 10:00-12:00)

Chair: David Imig
Chair Elect: Nelly Stromquist
Secretary: Paul B. Gold

MINUTES

Senators in Attendance

- Alberto Cabrera, EDHI
- Christy Tirrell-Corbin, At Large
- Bob Croninger, EDPS
- Paul B. Gold, EDCP
- Gary Gottfredson, EDCP
- David Imig, EDCI
- Brenda Jones Hardin, EDHD
- Elisa Klein, EDHD
- Betty Malen, EDPS
- Bob Mislevy, EDMS
- Sherril Moon, EDSP
- Andre Rupp, EDMS
- Debbie Speece, EDSP
- Jean Snell, EDCI
- Kasra Sotudeh, Graduate Student Representative
- Nelly Stromquist, EDHI
- Marvin Titus, EDHI
- Linda Valli, EDCI

Senators Absent

- None

Invited

- Donna Wiseman, Dean
- Bob Lent, EDCP, SROC Committee, Chair
- Pat Campbell, EDCI, SROC Committee Member
1. DAVID IMIG, CHAIR, CALLED the MEETING to ORDER at 10:00 AM

2. INTRODUCTIONS of 1st-Year & 2nd-Year COE SENATORS

3. ELECTION of COE SENATE SECRETARY

*Linda Valli nominated and moved that Paul Gold to serve as Secretary of the Senate for the 2010-2011 Academic Year*

Motion

Motion to accept nomination: Yes: 17; No: 0; Abstain: 0
Motion Passes

4. ADOPTION of the 05/06/2010 SENATE MEETING MINUTES

Paul Gold informed the COE Senate that minutes had been approved by electronic vote and were posted on the COE Senate Website on 05/27/2010. Thus, no vote on the minutes was required.

5. FILLING COE SENATE VACANT SEATS

David Imig informed the COE Senate today that he and Dean’s Office and the Chairs have been working on recruiting COE faculty, staff, and students to fill vacant COE Senate seats.

6. REPORT on the STATE of the COLLEGE

*Donna Wiseman, Dean*

- **Budget: 2010-2011 Academic year**
  - No budget cut—first year in the past four years in which there was no budget cuts at the beginning of the year
  - However, faculty/staff furloughs will continue for the 2010-2011 Academic year

- **Provost Reallocation**
  - We will need to plan for the 3rd year of a 2% reallocation of state funds as part of the provost’s strategic plan reallocations.
  - College of Behavioral & Social Sciences (BSOS) received additional resources as a result of the provosts strategic reallocation, giving them necessary funds permitting it to hire 22 new faculty
  - COE: nine searches plan for this academic year: resources for one search are provided by provost’s reallocation, the rest of the positions are replacements for faculty members who have retired or left the college.
• **COE Senate & Dean’s Office Collaboration**
  o Dean Wiseman shared her appreciation to the COE Senate for its assistance with decision-making across many reorganization activities over the past two years
  o She intends to continue to rely on the COE Senate for guidance going forward

• **SROC Report:** Dean Wiseman stated that she was very impressed with the Report’s:
  o Thoughtfulness & comprehensiveness, which will provide a solid base from which to proceed with COE Reorganization’s next steps
  o Refining COE Reorganizational Plan Criteria
  o Examples for COE Vision Statements

• Dean Wiseman acknowledged that SROC Recommendation #2 for locating OLPS within the COE is a very tough issue to resolve

### 7. SUMMER REORGANIZATIONAL OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (SROC) REPORT

**Bob Lent, Chair, SROC**

Bob Lent reminded the Senators of SROC’s charge as defined during the final COE Senate Meeting of the Academic Year 2009-2010 as follows *(Reproduced verbatim from 05/06/2010 COE Senate Meeting Minutes)*:

---

**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

---

SROC Report Summary

Bob Lent, Chair, SROC

1. **Presenting the SROC Report to the COE Senate**: COE Senate’s 1st Fall 2010 meeting
2. **COE Senate Action on the Report**: decisions about whether to:
   a. To accept the report, and
   b. To forward it to Dean Wiseman, who would consider it as advisory to her decision-making process
3. **Evaluating the Current COE’s Reorganization Plan’s 3-Department Structure**
4. **Criterion Dimensions for assessing viability of the COE’s Plan**: developed in consultation with Dean Wiseman:
   a. Political acceptability
   b. Financial feasibility and efficiency
   c. Intellectual coherence
   d. Creation of interdisciplinary and collaborative opportunities
   e. Connection to College and University strategic plans

5. **Senators’ questions**: about the Report’s methods, findings, and recommendations addressed by Bob Lent

---

Disposition of the SROC Committee

**Motion**

*The COE Senate accepts the SROC Report, officially disbands the SROC, and heartily thanks the SROC for its work*

Motion to Accept: Yes: 17; No: 0; Abstain: 0
Motion Passes

---

EDHI Response to the SROC Report

**Motion**

*EDHI Response to SROC Report be considered by the COE Senate as a Formal Document to be appended to the SROC Report and sent to the Dean*

Motion to Accept: Yes: 17; No: 0; Abstain: 0
Motion Passes
Discussion of SROC Recommendation #2: Placement of OLPS in the COE 3-Department Structure

COE Senators’ concerns about SROC’s Recommendation #2: categorized thematically:

- **Dilemmas of department mergers**: “conceptual coherence” vs. “collective buy-in of faculty”

- **Dilemmas of reorganizing to gain strategic advantage over competitors vs. preserving nationally-recognized small departments**
  - Tough economic times reduces COE’s resources to the extent that small-scale programs will put the COE at a strategic disadvantage among universities across the nation
  - All COE programs as articulated in the current COE Reorganization Plan must be scrutinized in several ways:
    - To what extent does any new COE configuration use its resources efficiently and strategically?
    - What are consequences to the entire COE if resources are spread too thinly across departments, programs, and specialty tracks?

- **Operational Issues about OLPS placement**:
  - Adequacy of faculty advisors for OLPS doctoral students
  - EDPS and OLPS jointly offer courses in policy studies

- **Current COE Department responses about OLPS placement**
  - EDCP, in an internal meeting, voiced support for OLPS joining the merged EDCP-EDHI department as approved in the Spring 2010 version of the COE Plan of Organization
  - Neither EDPS nor EDCI had an opportunity to discuss OLPS coming into that new department; the Dean planned to have a meeting with the EDPS faculty to discuss the matter

- **Implications for OLPS Final Placement**:
  - OLPS ultimate placement in the reorganized COE may differentially impact its capacity to capture external resources (e.g., outreach programs, federal grants)
  - Suggestion for moving some OLPS faculty go to EDCP/EDHI--other faculty to EDCI/EDPS
  - Regardless of where OLPS is placed in the reorganized COE, internal resource issues need to be addressed
  - Because the State of Maryland highly values the OLPS program, under-resourcing it might send a counter-productive message to the state government that the COE’s commitment to leadership training
David Imig reminded Senators that this first COE Senate meeting required a focus on broader set of issues regarding the COE Plan of Organization, including the SROC Report’s Recommendation #2 about placement of OLPS in a to-be-determined final 3-Department Model.

*Defer further discussion about SROC Report’s Recommendation #2 to another time &place Motion*

**Motion to Terminate:** Yes: 16; No: 0; Abstain: 1  
Motion Passes

---

**Discussion of Alternatives for Acting on the SROC Report**

**Linda Valli suggestions:**
- **Option #1:** COE Senate transmits both the SROC report & EDHI’s responses to the report to the Dean
- **Option #2:** COE Senate votes in support of SROC Recommendation’s #1, 3, & 4
- **Friendly Amendment** (Nelly Stromquist)—Senate takes no position on Recommendation #2
- **Discussion:**
  - Andre Rupp: stakeholder position statements on Recommendation #2 be sent forward with SROC Report & EDHI response
  - Bob Croninger
    - COE Senate has already held two open forums, all COE stakeholders have been adequate time to voice concerns
    - Given tight timelines/deadlines SROC Report, its Recommendations, & Responses to the Report need to be voted upon and placed in the formal record

**Bob Lent suggestions:**
- Given the charge of the SROC committee, and COE Senate’s Constitution & Bylaws, any COE faculty member can submit responses directly to the Dean
- The COE Senate does not need to debate and/or endorse the Report’s findings and recommendations; COE Senate is free to transmit all responses to the COE Dean

**Bob Croninger suggestions:**
1. Vote on Recommendation #2  
2. Decouple vote on the three other SROC Recommendations  
3. Send report with EDHI response to Dean with a statement that we debated concerns raised about Recommendation #2
Motions on SROC’s 4 Recommendations

(1) Recommendation #1: We recommend that EDSP be shifted from EDCI/EDPS to EDCP/EDHI in the 3-department model.

Motion
Motion to Accept Recommendation #1: Yes: 15; No: 0; Abstain: 2
Motion Passes

(2) Recommendation #2: We recommend that the Organizational Leadership and Policy Studies (OLPS) Program be shifted from EDHI/EDCP to EDCI/EDPS.

Motion
Motion to Accept Recommendation #2: Yes: 0; No: 6; Abstain: 11
Motion Rejected

(3) Recommendation #3: We recommend that the Early Childhood Education (ECE) Program remain in the reorganized EDHD/EDMS department.

Motion
Motion to Accept Recommendation #3: Yes: 15; No: 0; Abstain: 2
Motion Passes

(4) Recommendation #4: We recommend that a high priority be placed on efforts to promote collaboration, both across and within the new departments.

Motion
Motion to Accept Recommendation #4: Yes: 17; No: 0; Abstain: 0
Motion Passes

Articulating the new COE Vision Statement

See SROC Report “Addendum” (pp. 1-5) for examples of vision statements

Discussion on developing the COE Vision Statement

• APAC Expectations Vision Statement in COE Plan of Organization
• A clear vision statement ought to be finalized, and integrated into the Plan of Organization before submitting the COE Plan of Organization APAC
• **Vision Statement: concept shaping & operationalization:**
  o What should the COE Senate recommend to the Dean?
  o Should a formal process for shaping a vision statement be undertaken before operationalizing the vision statement at a later time?

• **Responsibility for drafting a final Vision Statement:**
  o Dean alone
  o Dean & the COE Senate
  o COE Senate only
  o COE Senate-sponsored process to ensure that faculty responses are integrated (integration of faculty reactions)

In light of observations made in the SROC report, the COE Senate recommends the COE Dean give priority toward production of vision statement in next three weeks

**Motion**

**Friendly Amendment**

The COE Dean should consult with the COE Steering Committee, for the purpose of inviting faculty input across the entire college

**Motion that Dean takes Lead on Vision Statement:** Yes: 17; No: 0; Abstain: 0

Motion Passes

### 8. PREVIOUS BUSINESS

Departmental Faculty-Staff Representation

*Table Senate Representation until a Revised COE Plan of Organization is drafted containing SROC and/or other proposals for modification*

**Motion**

**Motion to Table COE Senate Representation Model:** Yes: 17; No: 0; Abstain: 0

Motion Passes

### 9. NEW BUSINESS

A. **Appointment of Senate Committees:**

1. **Budget Oversight Committee**
   a. Marvin Titus
   b. Nelly Stromquist

2. **Faculty Development Committee**
   a. Andre Rupp
   b. Betty Malen
3. **Initial Teacher Education Committee**
   a. Christy Tirrell-Corbin
   b. Sherril Moon
   c. Jean Snell
   d. Kasra Sotudeh
   e. Linda Valli

4. **Graduate Education Committee**
   a. Bob Croninger
   b. Gary Gottfredson
   c. Debbie Speece
   d. Elisa Klein

5. **Community Building Committee**
   a. Paul B. Gold
   b. Judith Torney-Purta

6. **Awards and Recognitions Committee**
7. To be chaired by Nelly Stromquist, the committee will comprise all 1st year members of the COE Senate.

B. **Consideration of University Awards for Student Scholarships**
   
   • Is the College Getting Its Fair Share?
   • University awards student scholarships-invite someone from central administration in COE
   • Differentially fewer scholarships?? (speak to Maggie for advice)

---

**Meeting Adjourned:** 11:00 pm  
**Minutes Submitted:** Paul B. Gold, Secretary  
**Minutes Approved by COE Senate:** 10/01/2010