COE Senate Meeting
March 04, 2011
(3237 Benjamin 9:00-11:15)

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

MINUTES

Senators in Attendance
1. Alberto Cabrera, EDHI
2. Paul B. Gold, EDCP
3. Gary Gottfredson, EDCP
4. Latisha Hall, Administration Representative
5. Jeff Harring, EDMS
6. David Imig, At Large
7. Elisa Klein, EDHD
8. Joan Lieber for Debbie Speece, EDSP
9. Betty Malen, EDPS
10. Sherril Moon, EDSP
11. Connie North, At Large
12. Andre Rupp, EDMS
13. Jean Snell, EDCI
14. Kasra Sotudeh, Graduate Student Representative
15. Nelly Stromquist, EDHI
16. Christy Tirrell-Corbin, At Large
17. Marvin Titus, EDHI
18. Linda Valli, EDCI
19. Mike Wisniewski, Undergraduate representative
20. Frances Woods-Suku, Staff, COE Dean’s Office

Senators Absent
1. Bob Croninger, EDPS

Invited
1. Donna Wiseman, Dean

COE Faculty Attending
1. Philip Burke, EDSP
2. Greg Hancock, EDMS
1. REVIEW and APPROVE SENATE MEETING AGENDA

Motion to Approve Agenda
Motion: Yes: 19; No: 0; Abstain: 0

2. APPROVAL OF SENATE MEETING MINUTES

Motion to Approve 02/04/2011 COE Senate Meeting Minutes
Motion: Yes: 19; No: 0; Abstain: 0

3. STATE of the COLLEGE of EDUCATION

Donna Wiseman, Dean, College of Education

1. University of Maryland Senate Action on COE Reorganization Proposal (03/01/2011)

Greg Hancock’s presentation to the University Senate, setting out concerns about the COE Reorganization Proposal, were distributed to all COE Senators prior to today’s COE Senate meeting. The COE Senate afforded Dr. Hancock the opportunity to elaborate upon his concerns

A. Synopsis of Greg Hancock’s Comments about COE Reorganization Proposal

1. **Goals and Objectives**: unclear and lacking evidence that they will be met
2. **COE’s current strengths and weaknesses remain unknown**: no external team has been invited to comprehensively evaluate the COE’s vision, mission, and operations to generate an evidence base upon which to formulate a strategic and substantive reorganization plan
3. **CEA Voting Process on Models Only Superficially Open**: the CEA was constrained to vote on a limited number of competing reorganization structures
4. **COE Dean’s early proposal of a 3-department model rejected** by a majority of COE departments
5. **Dr. Hancock urged that further modification of the Reorganization Proposal requires that**: COE Dean should convene a blue ribbon panel of representatives from leading Colleges and Schools of Education around the country to:
   A. Conduct a thorough external evaluation
   B. Set concrete goals and objectives that our community can accept
   C. Determine the methods best suited to meet those goals and objectives, and
   D. Establish the criteria that most directly indicate whether those have been met

B. COE Senate Discussion of Dr. Hancock’s Comments

1. **University Senate Requests for COE Responses to Dr. Hancock**: one Senator requested Dean Wiseman to respond to each of Greg Hancock’s points or concerns
2. **University Senate Primary Concerns about COE Governance Process**: Nelly Stromquist, Chair-Elect and a member of the University Senate, noted that the University Senate focused
most on whether appropriate procedures for developing and voting on the COE
Reorganization were followed

2. University Senate’s Request for Dean Wiseman’s Responses to Dr. Hancock’s Concerns

The University Senate postponed action on the proposal for one (1) month to obtain additional
feedback from the COE; Dean Wiseman supported this decision to delay. COE Senators and
Dean Wiseman discussed the following issues and decided upon the following responses to the
University Senate concerns:

1. **Dean Wiseman should prepare a point-by-point response to Dr. Hancock’s concerns**: the
response will be submitted to the University Senate by 03/31/2011, and shared with the COE
Senate
2. **Both Dr. Hancock’s concerns & Dean Wiseman’s responses should be shared in open
forums**: in the next 2 weeks (although the points have been debated for 2 years)
3. **Dean Wiseman will appear before the University Senate on 04/07/2011 to rebut Dr.
Hancock’s concerns**
4. Some COE Senators speculated that the University Senate might have otherwise voted to
disapprove the COE Reorganization Proposal, because most university senators were not
well-acquainted with the Proposal’s contents, they therefore might have been inclined to
accept an assertion that it lacked sufficient “evidence” to support moving the proposal
forward. A member of the University Senate proposed that a vote on the COE
Reorganization Proposal be “postponed” **NOT** “tabled” pending receipt of more
information from Dean Wiseman
5. Many questions raised by members of the University Senate are already explicitly addressed
in the COE Reorganization Proposal
6. Some COE Senators interpreted the University Senate decision as a concern about the
robustness of COE’s “faculty governance”
7. Members of the University Senate shared Dr. Hancock’s concern about whether the **College
of Education Assembly (faculty, staff, and students)** and/or the **college faculty** had ever held an
Up-or-Down Vote to reorganize the COE
8. Dr. Harring noted that the University Senate had referred the matter back to the College for
consideration, and for a possible vote on reorganization.

**Wallace Loh & Ann Wylie: Positions on COE Reorganization Proposal**

- Dean Wiseman noted that the President and the Provost had indicated their support for COE
Reorganization Proposal, but were not fully acquainted will the Proposal’s elements

---

2. Actions of University APAC and PCC Committees

- Dean Wiseman noted that both of these bodies unanimously supported the COE
Reorganization Proposal prior to its placement on the University Senate agenda
3. Budget Reversions and Reallocations

- **President Loh** at this time has:
  - Asked colleges to set aside only 1% in state resources, in anticipation of a rescission request
  - Indicated that the central administration will be absorbing 3% in cuts

- **Dean Wiseman** indicated that if the rescission is >1%, then the COE will:
  - Could have held back on filling faculty lines—5 of 10 lines filled; 2-3 under negotiation
  - If 10 of 10 lines are filled, then the COE may face a shortfall if the state enacts deeper budget cuts

- Former Provost Nariman Farvardin’s 2% strategic plan reallocation is back on the table for debate by the Council of Deans with many deans reporting insufficient funds available to meet a give back request

- The Council of Deans will address the reallocation policy at their next meeting (04/07/2011)

- There is consideration of finding ways to encourage more faculty to retire

---

4. COE Name Change Update

- **COE Senate-Sponsored 12/17/2010 Forum on Renaming the COE**: iSchool Dean was persuasive in her presentation that the College needed more than reorganization to promote a change in the name of the College

- Based on the experiences of the iSchool, Dean Wiseman suggested that the new three COE Departments need more time to articulate their names first. Based on agreed-upon Department names, the COE can then better articulate a name best reflecting the departments’ perspective on their own missions.

- Dean Wiseman has put this matter on hold

---

OLD BUSINESS

I. Committee Nominations

A. Awards Committee

- **Committee Membership**: per COE Plan of Organization, all senators serving in their first year of their two-year terms are automatically assigned to the Awards Committee

- **Committee Chair**: members must choose a chair

- **Committee Charge**: select faculty for teaching awards

- **New Chair**: Andre Rupp
B. Nominating Committee

- **Committee Membership**: Alberto Cabrera, Mike Wisniewski, Jean Snell volunteered to serve
- **Committee Charge**: (a) assemble slate of candidates for the COE Senate, drawn from each department; (b) reexamine student representation on the Senate, (c) receive nominations for students and at-large; and (d) follow the procedures for electing staff
- **Difficulties with recruiting students to serve on Committee**: lack of formal mechanism to solicit their interest

II. Responding to the University Senate Postponement

David Imig, COE Senate Chair

The Chair opened the meeting by (a) inviting Senators and Visitors to comment on the University Senate action on the COE Reorganization Proposal, and (b) highlighting several key concerns raised by Greg Hancock as a productive way to frame the discussion regarding the action taken by the University Senate. He made clear that he would not adjourn the meeting until a resolution had been formulated and adopted by the Senate, which, ideally, would focus on whether or not to proceed with the current COE Reorganization Proposal. He then distributed a proposal to guide discussion, and a draft resolution for consideration by the COE Senate.

Rationale for Moving Forward with current COE Reorganization Proposal (Memo) versus Rationale for Undertaking COE Reorganization Process from Square One

“Who” Authorizes a Vote to Restructure?:

1. Faculty do not have the authority to approve/disapprove the COE Reorganization Proposal; ultimately the Provost and President will approve/disapprove
2. To date, the COE has taken multiple advisory votes on multiple COE Reorganization Proposals

III. DISCUSSION AMONG SENATORS AND VISITORS

Presented as a Series of Themes

A. Potential Consequences of Not Reorganizing (p. 6)
B. Rationale for Reorganization Proposal (Strong/Weak?) (pp. 6-7)
C. Steps Taken in Preparing COE Reorganization Proposal/Shared Governance (pp. 7-8)
D. External Review Necessary for Guiding Reorganization Decisions? (p. 8-9)
E. Authorizing Votes on COE Reorganization: CEA vs. COE Senate? (p. 9)
F. Delaying Reorganization: Adverse Impact COE Credibility at UMCP? (pp. 9-10)
G. Delaying Reorganization: Adverse Impact on Assistant Professors? (p. 10)
H. Student Input into COE Reorganization Decision-Making (p. 10)

A. Potential Consequences of Not Reorganizing

Nelly Stromquist differentiated two issues as necessary context for clarity in debating reorganizing issues:

- **Procedural issues**: whether we have a choice or not to reorganize
- **Substantive demands**: weighing merits of competing proposals

Nariman Farvardin/Dan Mote Positions on COE Reorganization

- **COE should reorganize**, but neither specified structures and/or processes by which the COE should reorganize
- **Negative consequences for choosing not to reorganize**: Nariman Farvardin warned the CEA (04/09/2010) of potential severe consequences (e.g., COE might be less competitive for funding awards drawn from the 2% Reallocated Fund Pool to support developing new innovative programs in COE)

COE reorganization process driven more by perceived “threats” from central administration, not by substantive needs to reorganize (Nelly Stromquist countered Greg Hancock’s assertion that the COE chose to reorganize in response to external threats versus reorganizing for strategic ends going forward)

COE reorganization might now be justifiably redirected, given that the UMCP Strategic Planning and Reorganization actions began under President Mote and Provost Farvardin, both of whom have departed:

- However, it remains unknown how UMCP’s new President (Loh) and Interim Provost (Wylie) view need for COE Reorganization
- Dean Wiseman reported that, although both supported the current COE Reorganization Proposal, neither may be fully informed about its details

UMCP Strategic Plan favors department structures consisting of scaled-up programs (i.e. personnel, resources) for purposes of increasing university competitiveness with peer institutions: Interim Provost Wylie has expressed concerns that of six (6) UMCP departments are comprised of less than 10 faculty; three (3) of these six (6) are housed in the COE

B. Rationale for Reorganization Proposal (Strong/Weak?)

Greg Hancock Position on COE Reorganization - Key issue is not about whether to reorganize or not, rather attention should be devoted to:
1. Ensuring high quality of evidence & criteria by which to judge how to reorganize
2. Undertaking cost-benefit analyses of reorganization model alternatives
3. Avoid overvaluing observers’ perspectives of COE reorganization process at expense of the substance of the COE reorganization
4. Arranging for a comprehensive evaluation of the COE, given that the COE has not been reviewed in a long time, despite that departments are reviewed every seven (7) years

Greg Hancock also shared that he was personally uncomfortable raising objections to University Senate about COE Reorganization decision-making protocols and votes

Andre Rupp requested that the following be formally included, on record, in the Minutes of the COE Senate 03/04/2011 Meeting:

“The comments that Dr. Greg Hancock made in front of the University of Maryland Senate do not simply reflect his own personal beliefs, but rather, the beliefs of various members including students, staff, and faculty, in the COE. Thus, Dr. Rupp would like to ask all senators to not portray any [COE] Senate actions, including votes, as a response simply to “Dr. Hancock’s comments,” but rather, as a response to the concerns in the COE that were voiced/presented by Dr. Hancock.”

C. Steps Taken in Preparing COE Reorganization Proposal/Shared Governance

• UMCP Central Administration “instigated” the COE reorganization process

• Dean Wiseman repeatedly relied upon COE Senate for guidance

• Principles of shared governance honored by:

  1. Involving as many stakeholders as possible in decision-making
  2. Preserving, to the extent possible, current departments’ structure and personnel; and preserving current programs
  3. Shield and protect exemplary programs in new departmental arrangements that benefit both students and stakeholders

• CEA membership involvement in decision-making: many opportunities provided to shape, compare, and contrast reorganization model options over past two years through:

  1. Multiple votes on multiple proposed 3-, 4-, and 5-department models
  2. Town hall meetings
  3. Focus groups
  4. Website queries
  5. Small group discussions
6. Advisory committees consisting of faculty, staff, and student representation from all seven current departments

- **Dean Wiseman’s Responsiveness to Concerns/Objections to the COE Reorganization Process & Proposed Models**

  1. Decision-making process slowed down to allow additional time for deliberation
  2. “Senate Reorganization Oversight Committee (S-ROC)”: in consultation with Dean Wiseman, the COE Senate, during its final 2010 academic year meeting (05/07/2010), appointed and charged this committee to review the viability of proposed departmental models, according to carefully-defined criterion dimensions as follows:

     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

Policy on Shared Governance in the University System of Maryland explicitly defines these responsibilities

- **Faculty Governance**: additional comments from COE Senators/Visitors in attendance
  - General concurrence that University Senate expressed concern that:
    1. Former Provost Farvardin’s “top-down decision-making approach” inappropriately concentrated power in the central administration and diminished autonomy of UMCP colleges & schools
    2. Principles of good faculty governance may have been violated

- **Linda Valli**:
  1. COE faculty generally understood consequences for not restructuring
  2. The COE Reorganization Proposal ultimately aims to:
     a. Preserve, to the extent possible, the seven (7) existing departments as intact entities inside the three (3) new proposed departments
     b. Protect exemplary existing programs in the seven (7) existing departments in the transition to the three (3) new proposed departments, by specifically meeting as many priorities of students and stakeholders as possible
  3. Pursuing both (a) and (b) inevitably and unavoidably results in a “less than ideal” overall college reorganization

---

**D. External Review Necessary for Guiding Reorganization Decisions?**

Departmental External Reviews Completed over the past decade:
- Share common themes
- SROC revisited these reviews and identified similar themes
- External review recommendations support most COE Reorganization Proposal elements
• **Further External Reviews to Inform Reorganization: Necessary or Not?**
  - Historically, the COE Council of Chairs has not favored inviting external review teams to support competing Reorganization proposal(s)
  - Council of Chairs minutes indicate that, although a decision not to invite external reviewers had not been put to a formal vote, there was a clear consensus not to bring external reviewers to the COE

---

**E. Authorizing Votes on COE Reorganization: CEA vs. COE Senate?**

*Does the COE Senate have a Sufficient Mandate for Reorganizing?* (Jean Snell)

• If so, then is a further vote from the faculty required to proceed with the current COE Reorganization Proposal or to begin anew?

The **COE Senate discussed options for responding to the University Senate’s concerns about the authority(ies) of the COE Dean and COE Senate to pursue reorganization.** General agreement among COE Senators was obtained on several matters:

- Between regularly scheduled CEA meetings, the COE Senate is vested with the authority to specify “who” gets to vote/decide on matters within its jurisdiction
- The COE Dean has no mandate; however, there is faculty choice to support the COE Dean/Dean’s Team as representing the best interests of the COE
- The COE Senate can act as a proxy for the CEA to determine whether the CEA has been provided with an appropriate opportunity to vote on reorganizing
- To allay University Senate concerns with COE governance in general, and with enfranchising CEA members appropriately in the reorganization process in particular, the COE Senate should conduct an Up-or-Down Vote on the COE Reorganization Proposal

  1. **“Yes” Vote** = move forward with the current COE Reorganization Proposal developed over the past two years and submitted to the university for approval
  2. **“No” Vote** = abandon proposed reorganization altogether

---

**F. Delaying Reorganization: Adverse Impact COE Credibility at UMCP?**

*Comments made Attendees*

- **Dean Wiseman**: insufficient funds for 7 department chairs
- **Francine Hultgren**: UMCP central administration previously mandated a reorganization of her program 3 years ago
- **Betty Mallen**: although shared governance is ideal, sometimes such values must set aside in favor of “Realpolitik” for several reasons:
  - A new University of Maryland Strategic Plan adopted in 2008 concentrated power in the central administration and diminished autonomy of UMCP colleges & schools
o Any appeal for a prospective COE external review as a precondition for reorganizing the COE is a strategic move to prevent reorganizing the COE
o No COE Reorganization Proposal will ever be fully acceptable by all interested parties
o The COE loses credibility with the UMCP community in general, and the University Senate in particular, as the process of proposing, adopting, and discarding elements of the COE Reorganization Proposal drags on—i.e. “turf battling” and “competency to collaborate and produce a viable product has been called into question”
  o “COE needs to repair damage [to its reputation] going forward.”
  - Kasra Sotudeh: the central administration does hold sway over UMCP Colleges’ policies; strategically, he asked, would it be wise to invite parties from other colleges to provide additional perspectives in order “to pull us out of ditch?”
  - Elisa Klein: historically Reorganization proposals at University of Maryland have not met with resistance from either the University Senate or from the central administration
  - Andre Rupp:
    o Offered for consideration a worst-case scenario in which the COE chooses not to reorganize, but then confronts a perceived “state of fear” of retaliation/intimidation from the UMCP central administration
    o Urged Dean Wiseman to strengthen the argument about the consequences of not reorganizing, and to get “a read” from Provost Wylie on these consequences
  - Betty Mallen: COE faces a dilemma:
    1. Risking intimidation by not reorganizing versus
    2. Making a rational calculation—reorganizing despite the non-optimal UMCP Strategic Plan’s centralization of power/resources at expense of colleges/schools, so as to avoid further damage to COE’s operations and reputation among stakeholders.
  - Paul Gold: arguments for proceeding with current COE Reorganization Proposal
    1. The Plan had been debated, modified, and voted via multiple iterations over the past 2+ years
    2. The COE Dean and COE Senate instituted, over the past 2+ years, several “fail-safe mechanisms” to ensure that as many concerns raised by CEA members were addressed (e.g., SROC Report, Forums)
    3. Even if Greg Hancock’s criticisms of problematic reorganization processes are entirely valid, raising such objections at this late date damages the COE’s reputation as an entity capable of managing itself, while interfering with progress on new initiatives
    4. Dr. Hancock offered no counter proposal at this late date
  - Dr. Stromquist:
    1. Dean Wiseman’s response to the University Senate should highlight (a) the constraints under which the COE operated to form competing reorganization models; (b) the COE did the best it could; (c) the COE has proceeded too far at this point in time to retreat and start a reorganization process de novo.
    2. An Up/Down vote is not needed from the CEA
    3. COE must move ahead with the Proposal, while seeking compromises among all stakeholders going forward to enhance the COE as a community of practice and engender a climate of trust
  - Dean Wiseman: committed to inviting external reviewers to evaluate the new departmental structure within three years of its implementation.
G. Delaying Reorganization: Adverse Impact on Assistant Professors?

Marvin Titus: With regard to the potential damage to assistant professors, it was said that this was a matter of the time invested and uncertainty regarding expectations for assistant professors.

H. Student Input into COE Reorganization Decision-Making

Kasra Sotudeh:
1. Graduate students still feel marginalized from the COE decision-making process on reorganization
2. “If the COE throws away our [student] suggestions, then the COE sends a strong message to potential new applicants that the COE is not friendly/supportive of students”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS on the COE REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**MOTION #1**

"After deliberation we have decided not to call for a further vote of the CEA on the reorganization"

**Motion Agreed to:** Yes: 14; No: 3; Abstain: 1

**MOTION #2**

"We the COE Senate ask the COE Dean to respond to the University Senate with a statement that conveys the background and process for the reorganization of the COE and our support for moving forward with the proposed reorganization"

**Motion Agreed to:** Yes: 15; No: 1; Abstain: 3

**NEW BUSINESS**

Associate Dean Maggie McLaughlin briefed the Senate on the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that will be negotiated with each faculty member prior to the implementation of the Reorganization Plan. These have been framed with the guidance of the University Office for Legal Counsel.
The MOU will include the following:

1. Transfer of tenure home and tenure rights from department x to department y
2. For assistant professors, the promotion and tenure decisions will be made by old department, the time limit will be waived (e.g., stop tenure clock), and all other College of Education/University of Maryland policies will remain in force
3. For associate professors moving to full professor – the promotion decision will remain in the former department for up to 3 years, then it will shift to new department
4. Addenda that address current agreements regarding academic release and drff/grb awards

Faculty members must sign these MOUs or lose their tenure home. Dr. McLaughlin sees four versions of this document.

Meeting Adjourned: 11:15 pm
Minutes Submitted: Paul B. Gold, Secretary
Minutes Approved by COE Senate: 05/06/2011 (Yes: 16; No: 0; Abstain: 0)