COE Senate Meeting
April 01, 2011
(3237 Benjamin 9:00-11:00)

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

MINUTES

Senators in Attendance

1. Bob Croninger, EDPS  
2. Paul B. Gold, EDCP  
3. Gary Gottfredson, EDCP  
4. Jeff Harring, EDMS  
5. David Imig, At Large  
6. Sherril Moon, EDSP  
7. Andre Rupp, EDMS  
8. Jean Snell, EDCI  
9. Nelly Stromquist, EDHI  
10. Marvin Titus, EDHI  
11. Linda Valli, EDCI  
12. Frances Woods-Suku, Staff, COE Dean’s Office

Senators Absent

1. Alberto Cabrera, EDHI  
2. Latisha Hall, Administration Representative  
3. Elisa Klein, EDHD  
4. Debbie Speece, EDSP  
5. Betty Malen, EDPS  
6. Connie North, At Large  
7. Kasra Sotudeh, Graduate Student Representative  
8. Christy Tirrell-Corbin, At Large  
9. Mike Wisniewski, Undergraduate representative

Invited

1. Donna Wiseman, Dean  
2. Maggie McLaughlin, Associate Dean
1. STATE of the COLLEGE of EDUCATION

1. COE Assembly Vote on Proceeding with COE Reorganization Proposal

**COE Senate Resolutions 03/04/2011:** David Imig, COE Senate Chair, informed the CEA of two COE Senate Resolutions approved during its regular monthly 03/04/2011 meeting in response to the University Senate’s postponement of consideration of the College’s reorganization proposal.

1. **Resolution #1:** "After deliberation we have decided not to call for a further vote of the CEA on the reorganization" (as permitted in the COE Plan of Organization): **Motion** **Agreed to:** Yes: 14; No: 3; Abstain: 1; and

2. **Resolution #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

**Provost Office Response to COE Resolutions:** David Imig transmitted these resolutions and their votes to the Provost’s Office. Subsequently, although the Provost’s Office officials expressed support for the COE Senate resolutions conforming to the COE’s Plan of Organization, they conveyed belief that it would be prudent for the CEA to communicate its position with moving forward with reorganization via a straight up-or-down vote (i.e. confirm or reject) the COE resolutions to proceed.

**CEA Up-or-Down Vote on Moving COE Reorganization Forward 03/16/2011:** David Imig transmitted a memo to the CEA with instructions for the up-or-down vote to be conducted electronically with a deadline of 03/31/2011. The ballot language was as follows:

**Yes** = I support the actions taken by the College Senate on the reorganization of the College and urge that we move forward with reorganization (clarified on 03/30/2011 in a reminder memo to vote – “A yes vote will be viewed as a vote to move forward with the reorganization proposal that has been developed over the past two years and submitted to the university for approval”).

**No** = I do not support the actions taken by the College Senate on the reorganization of the College and urge that we discontinue the reorganization process (clarified on 03/30/2011 in a reminder memo to vote – “A vote no is a declaration that you do not support the proposed reorganization”).
Results CEA Up-or-Down Vote on Moving COE Reorganization Forward 04/01/2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
<th>Total Eligible to Vote</th>
<th>Total Voting</th>
<th>Yes (Freq/%)</th>
<th>No (Freq/%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure/Tenure Track</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>75 (75%)</td>
<td>52 (69%)</td>
<td>23 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Non-Tenure</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28 (54%)</td>
<td>21 (75%)</td>
<td>7 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41 (69%)</td>
<td>35 (85%)</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Undergraduate Representatives</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Graduate Representatives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
<td>151 (67%)</td>
<td>114 (75%)</td>
<td>37 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Everyone on leave/sabbatical included in vote

1. **Summary of Vote: Profile of Entire CEA Electorate** (All Votes Weighted Equally)
   - Proportion of Eligible CEA Members Voting: 151/225 = 67%
   - Proportion of Tenure Track Faculty Voting: 75/101 = 75%
   - Proportion of “Yes” Votes: 114/151 = 75%
   - Proportion of Tenure/Track Faculty “Yes” Votes: 52/75 = 69%

2. **Summary of Vote: Profile of CEA Electorate** (Votes Weighted by Faculty, Staff, and Students per COE Plan of Organization [POO])
   - **Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty**: N=101
   - **Students**: N=13 (6 Undergraduates; 7 Graduates)
   - **Staff**: N=10 (Weighting of Staff Vote computed as follows—see POO)
     - Ratio of Staff/Faculty (Non-Tenured): 1:10
     - Weighting Factor = (10 Staff/(52 Non-Tenured Faculty + 59 Combined Staff))
   - **TOTAL Eligible Votes (Denominator)**: N=124 [=101 (Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty) + 10 (Staff) + 13 Students]
     - Proportion CEA Members Voting: 88/124 = 71%
     - “Yes” Votes: 63/88 = 72%
     - “No” Votes: 25/88 = 28%
2. COE Response to the University Senate (04/07/2011)

Donna Wiseman, Dean, College of Education

A. Rebuttal to University Senate Concerns about COE Reorganization Proposal:

- **Transparency & Fairness of Process**: University Senate ought to support COE Reorganization Proposal, because the COE worked hard on this over several years
- **CEA Membership participated on many committees (e.g., standing, ad hoc)**: invested considerable time, coordinated their activities, reported to the COE Senate regularly
- **Multiple Votes taken by CEA and COE Senate over 2.5 years**: on proposed models, decision-making processes within and across departments, representation on committees
- **Admit that people still unhappy**: COE has not achieved “unanimous consent” for final Reorganizational Proposal notwithstanding extensive and iterative process and votes

B. University Senate Discussion of COE Reorganization Proposal at 04/07/2011 Meeting

- **University Senate 03/02/2011 Resolution on COE Proposal Review**: postponement for 30 days to provide COE with opportunity to prepare and submit multiple documents chronicling proposal development over past 2.5 years
- **Point-Counterpoint Presentation Format**: University Senate asked her to respond to each concern raised by Dr. Greg Hancock (and University Senators??) at the regularly scheduled 03/02/2011 University Senate meeting
- **University Senate Rules of Debate at 04/07/2011**: University Senate Parliamentarian will strictly limit Dean Wiseman and other University Senators (and “Introduced Speakers”) responses to 5 minutes

C. Dean Wiseman’s Planned Presentation at University Senate 04/07/2011 Meeting

- **General Focus & Tone**: positive and forward-looking
- **Organization of Rebuttal**: Matrix Format
  1. Concern about Reorganization
  2. College’s Response
  3. Evidence in Proposal (page numbers cited)
- **Content Areas of the Rebuttal**
  1. Rationale for Reorganizing
     a. Advancing the goals of the College’s Strategic plan
     b. Addressing External Reviewers Criticism of Departmental. Silos
     c. Eliminating Redundancies and Inefficiencies in a Climate of Fiscal Austerity
     d. Responding to the Recommendations of Higher Administration
     e. Responding to the Changing Demands of Colleges of Education
  2. Votes constrained to be between competing several reorganization structures
  3. Become a well-respected leader on pressing educational issues
4. Become competitive in modern, technologically-enhanced teaching and learning environment
5. Streamline administrative structures to be more responsive to decision-making demands of external environment
6. Cost-saving to be realized from reorganizing
   • Dean Wiseman’s presentation materials will be submitted today (04/01/2011) to the University Senate, and will be posted on the University Senate’s Website prior to the meeting

D. Suggestions by COE Senators for Speaking about Proposal at University Senate Meeting
   • **Nelly Stromquist**
     o COE is a Community of Practice: collegial environment tolerant of differing perspectives and dissent
     o Proposal development and debate was is not a “game of winners and losers”
     o Statements by COE Senators should emphasize managing the future
   • COE Senators should intending to speak should circulate drafts statements to other COE Senators and COE faculty for comments prior to University Senate meeting, if possible
   • Many COE faculty will be attending annual AERA conference on the day University Senate scheduled to meet (04/07/2011)
   • **Bob Croninger**
     • COE Senator/Faculty Comments at University Senate Meeting: may be free-flowing
     • Entire COE Faculty may not have sufficient time to vet all COE Speakers’ comments prior to the meeting; therefore COE Senate should not obligate all individuals to vet their statements before University senate meeting
   • **Andre Rupp**: cautioned that CEA Reorganization Proposal up-or-down vote may be confounding “what we do in the COE Senate” vs. “where the CEA stands on the Reorganization Proposal itself”


   A. **COE National Ranking**: 23rd best school of education in US
   B. **Full Department and Program Rankings**: will not be available until April
   C. **Four Departments received Top-10 distinctions**
     • EDCP/CAPS (1st): 12th consecutive year
     • EDHD’s Educational Psychology Program (7th)
     • EDSP (9th - tied with University of Minnesota-Twin Cities)
     • Higher Education Administration Program in the Department of Education Leadership, Higher Education, and International Education (10th – tied with Harvard University)

4. **COE Budget: 2012 Fiscal Year**

   **1% State Give-Back**: permanent deduction to college state funds
1% Campus Give-Back: as required in strategic plan; 0.5% to provost office
Other 0.5%: Reallocate within college and report to Provost: Internal reallocation=$80,000-85,000

5. Merging University of Maryland System Campuses
   UMCP, UMB, Shady Grove

  • State of Maryland Legislature: exploring the benefits of merging UMCP and UMB
  • UMCP Deans met with UMB Deans: good meeting with discussions regarding collaborative endeavors
  • Study Grove: much emphasis on what the two institutions could do at Shady Grove
  • Deadline for Completing Study of the Potential Merger: December 2011.
  • Some concerns about impact on University of Maryland System

OLD BUSINESS

A. COE Plan of Organization and By-Laws

POO and By-Laws Ad Hoc Committee Report
(Gary Gottfredson, Nelly Stromquist, Jean Snell, Paul Gold)


Revising the COE Plan of Organization to be Consistent with new COE Structure: issues for consideration (note: not a comprehensive list)
  • Clarifying relationships among COE, COE Departments, & COE Senate
  • Clarifying & streamlining the COE Senate’s component structures & functions:
    o Classifying & specifying COE Committees as under jurisdiction of (a) COE Dean's/College Administration; entire COE; COE Senate (see Section 2 below – By-Laws)
    o Revising charge of COE Senate Steering Committee, redefining its membership, & selecting its membership
  • Clarifying shared governance aspect of COE Senate committee structures:
    o i.e., the joint roles of the Dean’s office and the Senate vis-à-vis the various committees
    o 2009-2010 COE Senate approved these changes and will go into effect once the new COE Plan of Organization is approved by the CEA)
  • CEA Electorate (i.e. eligibility to vote)
    o Defining “faculty,” “staff,” “student”
    o Revising mechanisms for calling and setting CEA agenda
  • COE Senate Representation
    o Faculty representation ought to be formally be the same for each department (3 faculty per department); however larger departments can advocate more proportional representation through the selection of the Chair, Chair-elect, and the 2 at-large seats
Responsibilities for nominations; election; and terms of At-Large delegates
Increase representation of Staff and Students (both undergraduate & graduate)
Inclusion of COE representatives to the University Senate on the COE Senate as ex-officio members to enhance dissemination of information and the coherence of COE policy-making with that of University

2. Plan of Organization Revisions: By-Laws—Committees

A. COE Committees in Current COE Plan of Organization are currently of two “types”
   • COE-Wide Standing Committees
   • COE Senate Standing Committees
B. Should Committees in COE Report-Line Structure be streamlined and differentiated according to position and role as follows?
   • COE-Wide Standing Committees
   • COE Senate Standing Committees
   • COE Dean's/College Administration Committees
C. Classifying Committees within COE Report-Line Structure:
   • APT and PCC Committees: should these be grouped with other COE Senate Committees or defined as a separate class of COE Committees?
   • Proposed three PCC “Subcommittees” (i.e. [1] Graduate, [2] Undergraduate (GenEd), and [3] Initial Certification): should these report to the COE Senate’s PCC Committee and/or directly to the COE PCC committee?
   • APAC Committee: does the COE Senate need one?
D. Should a "COE Senate Liaison" (i.e. delegate) be assigned to each College Administration Committee? (i.e. Outreach, International Initiatives, Advancement Advisory)
E. Committee Membership Questions?
   • How many Representatives per Department on should serve on each Committee (e.g., APT one vs. two vs. three)?
   • Which Committees require that members COE Senate Delegates versus CEA faculty?
   • How should Committee Chairs be selected? (e.g. chosen by members, or appointed by the COE Senate Chair, or appointed by COE Dean)

B. Committee Reports

1. Nominating Committee (Alberto Cabrera & David Imig)
   • Number and kind of positions that are going to become open.
   • David Imig and Alberto Cabrera to work on generating this list

2. Awards and Recognition Committee (Andre Rupp)

Solicitations for 2010-2011 COE Awards Nominations: sent to COE faculty by Andre Rupp on 03/16/2011 & 03/31/2011 with a due date of 04/08/2011

Rules for Awards include
   • Award criteria & required supporting evidence
• Nominees for an award must not have received an award in that category during the past three years

Awards to be made for the 2010-2011 Year include:
• COE Excellence in Teaching Award
  a. Tenured or Tenure Track Faculty
  b. Non-Tenure Track Faculty with Multi-Year Contracts
• COE Award for Outstanding Scholarship
• COE Distinguished Leadership Award
• COE Distinguished Outreach Award
• COE Distinguished TERP Award
• COE Outstanding Staff Service
  a. Exempt Staff Member
  b. Non-Exempt Staff Member
• COE Outstanding Students
  a. Doctoral Student
  b. Master’s Student
  c. Undergraduate Student

3. Initial Certification Subcommittee (Jean Snell; Christy Tirrell-Corbin)

Committee’s Current Role
• Oversees all COE educator preparation programs leading to initial certification
• Reviews all new initiatives; revisions to programs, curricula, and policies
• Provides guidance for all activities required for state approval and/or institutional or professional accreditation of educator preparation programs

Conceptual Framework Revision Process: Overview of Changes (Jean Snell)
• Jean Snell distributed three documents to COE Senators for review & comment
  1. UM College of Education Conceptual Framework (Version 03-31-2011)
  2. Overview of Proposed Changes
  3. Graphic depicting dimensions of revised framework
• NCATE 2011-2012 Accreditation Process: Jean Snell requested that COE Senators
  1. Share the Draft Conceptual Framework with their Departmental colleagues
  2. Obtain and transmit feedback to Jean prior to next (and final) 2010-2011 COE Senate Meeting for an up-or-down vote to move it forward for inclusion in NCATE package
• Conceptual Framework Revision Subcommittee
  1. Period of Work: Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters
  2. Membership: representatives from teacher education and the advanced educator preparation programs (including programs housed outside of COE); one of our local school district leaders
  3. Feedback Solicited & Incorporated: document drafts were vetted by as broad a constituency as possible (e.g., Program Coordinators/Teacher Education Leaders, PDS Coordinators, District Leaders, University Teacher Education Council, Initial Certification/Educator Preparation Committee, Advanced Educator Preparation Program Coordinators); represented from these groups included faculty (from within the Unit as
Proposed Changes to Conceptual Framework:

- **Unit document:** Conceptual Framework guides the work of the educator preparation programs across the entire unit, which includes COE educator preparation programs, and Music, PE, and School Library Media educator preparation programs.

- **Reshaping the Vision:** to be consistent with COE and University’s priorities & strategic plans, especially greater emphasis on excellence and equity, in context of agency, responsiveness, and responsibility.

- **Operating Framework Revised:** according to three innovative domains: Commitment, Knowledge, and Practice.

- **Elevating Important of Action (“Commitments”) to be commensurate with Concepts (“Dispositions”):**

- **“Program and Candidate Commitments”:** revised to reflect emphasis on action.

- **“Knowledge”:** minor revisions, however, Knowledge is now viewed through an action context—knowledge development and its application as a dynamic process.

- **“Practice”:** knowledge application across three distinct areas (a) field experiences, (b) clinical practice, and (c) induction (induction role with graduates, acknowledging policy imperatives and priorities of stakeholders in public education).

---

**NEW BUSINESS**

End of Year Assembly scheduled for 05/06/2011

---

**Meeting Adjourned:** 11:00 pm  
**Minutes Submitted:** Paul B. Gold, Secretary  
**Minutes Approved by COE Senate:** 05/06/2011 (Yes: 16; No: 0; Abstain: 0)