

**UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND
BOARD OF REGENTS
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION POLICY
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF MARCH 16, 2011**

The Committee on Education Policy of the University System of Maryland Board of Regents met in public session on Wednesday, March 16, 2011, in the Margaret Brent Room (Rm. 2112) of the Adele Stamp Student Union Building on the campus of the University of Maryland, College Park, beginning at 9:30 a.m. Present were Dr. Florestano, Chairperson, Ms. Gonzales, Mr. Hall, Mr. Johnson (telephone conference), Mr. Kendall, Chancellor Kirwan, Mr. Slater, and Dr. Young. Also attending were Dr. Badejo, Mr. Blake, Mr. Bowden, Dr. Davis, Ms. Doyle, Dr. Gartner, Dr. Goldstein, Ms. Harbison, Dr. Hirshman, Ms. Hollander, Major Jagoe, Dr. S. Jones, Ms. Knepler, Mr. Lurie, Ms. Marionni, Dr. May, Chief Mitchell, Mr. Morgan, Ms. Moultrie, Dr. Orlin, Dr. Passmore, Mr. Prineas, Dr. Sawyer, Dr. Shapiro, Dr. Stuart, Ms. Susskind, Mr. Vivona, Dr. von Lehmen, Dr. Welsh, Dr. Williams, Dr. Wolfe, Dr. Wood, Dr. Wylie, members of the press, and other observers.

Dr. Ann Wylie, interim provost and vice president for academic affairs at the University of Maryland, College Park, welcomed the Committee and her colleagues to the campus. She described some of the exciting changes the institution is undertaking.

The agenda items were discussed in the order reported in the minutes; copies of materials distributed at the meeting are on file with the official minutes of the meeting.

1. Minutes of the Meeting of February 10, 2011 (Public Session).

Due to the rescheduling of the January 26th meeting of the Committee to February 10, it was not possible for the meeting minutes to be acted on at the meeting of the full Board on February 11, 2011. Dr. Young moved, Mr. Slater seconded, and the Committee on Education Policy voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the public session meeting of February 10, 2011.

2. Minutes of the Meeting of February 10, 2011 (Closed Session).

As with the public session meeting minutes, it was not possible for the minutes of the closed session to be acted on at the meeting of the full Board on February 11, 2011. Dr. Young moved, Mr. Slater seconded, and the Committee on Education Policy voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the closed session meeting of February 10, 2011.

3. New Academic Program Proposals.

The only program proposal on the Committee's agenda was a substantial modification from the University of Maryland University College.

a. *University of Maryland University College Substantial Modification of the Bachelor's of Technical/Professional Studies (BTPS) in Biotechnology and the BTPS in Laboratory Management.*

UMUC Provost Dr. Greg von Lehmen told the Committee that UMUC is asking for a modification of the existing BTPS degree programs in Biotechnology and Laboratory Management to establish Bachelor of Science alternatives for both programs. He noted that COMAR defines the Bachelor's of Technical/Professional Studies narrowly as "...a degree awarded for the successful completion of an A.A.S. degree, an advanced program of study in the designated area of concentration, and a 12-credit internship or field placement related to the program of study." UMUC is seeing roughly a hundred

students a year who come out of the community college with the A.A. degree rather than the A.A.S. degree and who are interested in pursuing these baccalaureate programs at UMUC. Because the programs were established as BTPS programs, those students are barred from admission because they do not have the A.A.S. stipulated in COMAR. By modifying the existing programs to add the alternative of earning the B.S. degree, those students with the A.A. degree can be accommodated. The proposed B.S. degrees would have the same curricular requirements as the current BTPS programs.

Dr. Young asked what the difference is between the A.A. degree and the A.A.S. degree. Dr. Cynthia Davis, Associate Dean of the School of Undergraduate Studies, said that the curricular requirements of the two degrees are identical. Mr. Slater said that he has read that UMUC does not have laboratories and that he therefore assumes that there is no laboratory work in the junior and senior years of these programs. Dr. Davis responded that students entering the UMUC programs are required to have 30 hours of laboratory science from the community college. The programs also require a 12-credit internship or field placement; students not already working in laboratory settings will be placed in labs for their internships, she said.

Dr. Florestano asked about need for the program. Dr. von Lehmen said that the BTPS program was offered originally because MHEC was looking for pathways for A.A.S. degree recipients. There are currently about 45 majors in the program who came with the A.A.S., but about a hundred students a year are being turned away because they do not have the associate's degree stipulated in COMAR for admission. He added that the proposal is aligned with the Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education and with initiatives to increase the number of graduates in STEM fields; it also supports the national and state goal of increasing the rate of degree attainment among adults. Dr. Florestano asked if there is a need to look at the COMAR regulations and to amend them to remove barriers such as this one. Dr. Goldstein said that he and Ms. Hollander both serve on a workgroup that is charged with revising the COMAR language on program duplication. Modifications to other sections of COMAR would also require appointment of a broadly representative review committee. Dr. Florestano said that this ought to be on the Regents' agenda. The current COMAR language, she said, is "not helpful to community college students and confusing to the rest of us."

Following discussion, Mr. Slater moved, Dr. Young seconded, and the Committee on Education Policy unanimously recommended that the Board of Regents approve the proposal from University of Maryland University College to offer the Bachelor of Science in Biotechnology and the Bachelor of Science in Laboratory Management.

4. Cultural Diversity Progress Reports.

Dr. John Wolfe, associate vice chancellor for academic affairs, presented the progress reports. He noted that Senate Bill 438 and House Bill 905, enacted in 2008, require that each institution of higher education in Maryland develop and implement a plan for a program of cultural diversity among its students, faculty, and staff. If an institution already has a cultural diversity program, it is to develop and implement a plan for improving the program. The legislation stipulates that plans must include an implementation strategy and timeline for meeting goals, a process for responding to reporting campus-based hate-crimes and bias-motivated incidents, and a summary of any resources, including State grants, needed by the institution to effectively recruit and retain culturally diverse student body, faculty,

and staff. Institutions are also required to enhance cultural diversity programming and sensitivity to cultural diversity through instruction and training of the student body, faculty, and staff.

Dr. Wolfe said that, consistent with the requirements of this legislation, each USM institution submitted its plan for a program of cultural diversity to the Board of Regents for its initial review in March 2009 and in February 2010 its first progress report. This 2011 progress report provides a brief summary of the more detailed institutional progress reports. Data on student, faculty, and staff are provided in each institutional report. The law requires that, on or before May 1 of each year, each institution shall submit its plan to the governing body of the institution for the governing body's review. Further, on or before August 1 of each year, the governing body of an institution shall submit to MHEC a progress report regarding the institution's implementation of its plan.

Dr. Wolfe then provided selected institutional examples to illustrate the range of possible responses to implementing and sustaining programs of cultural diversity. He noted that all institutions are doing a great deal in this area and have begun to identify and use national "best practices" in continuing refinement of their efforts to effectively address cultural diversity.

Dr. Wolfe added that legislation introduced this year will change the deadline for submitting institutional plans to the Board from May 1 to July 1, thus providing a bit more flexibility to the institutions and likely assuring more up-to-date and complete data.

Mr. Hall noted that he had attended a rally last year at UMCP concerning the removal of the institution's diversity officer; he asked how that is consistent with the goals of this plan. Dr. Wylie explained that the personnel action was one result of a two-year study that recommended that a number of programs be consolidated under a single chief diversity officer in the provost's office; a national search for someone to fill that new position is underway, she said. Mr. Hall asked Dr. Wylie for an example of a College Park program that might fall under the Office of Multicultural Affairs; Dr. Wylie said that the office oversees UMCP's Black Male Initiative as well as a number of awards programs and mentoring programs. Mr. Hall then asked if UMCP has classes or programs geared to addressing race relations among students; Dr. Wylie described the campus's very popular "intergroup dialogues" program, noting that it is being expanded due to increased student demand.

Mr. Kendall asked if the legislation mandating these reports has a sunset provision or a specified end date, and he asked if we have any estimate of how much it costs to put this together. Dr. Kirwan noted that the activities themselves are not new; we have been doing these things already. The fiscal impact of the legislation is related to the cost of preparing the reports. Mr. Slater suggested that, as part of E+E, the Regents work to convince the legislature to modify the reporting schedule to require biennial rather than annual reports. Mr. Slater also remarked that he noticed that some of the institutional reports included no mention at all of LGBT individuals or programs.

Mr. Slater commented that he was struck in reviewing the reports from the HBIs that Coppin's student body is only about 21% male, while BSU and UMES have student bodies that are about 40% male. He added that he was impressed by the activities described on page 4 of the Frostburg report, in which they target historically black high schools in order to improve minority recruitment. He asked if the HBIs do any specialized recruiting at historically white high schools. Mr. Michael Bowden reported that Coppin

has targeted traditionally white high schools in Baltimore County and Montgomery County, although he acknowledged that attracting and retaining white students at Coppin remains a challenge.

In terms of gender distribution, Dr. Florestano observed that women are the majority in higher education within the state and nationally; in the USM, only UMBC is more than 49% male. Dr. Wood observed that the gender distribution is driven by employment needs and disciplinary emphases; women more than men have traditionally been attracted to careers as teachers and nurses and social workers. Dr. Goldstein said that manipulating the program inventory is one way to change the racial and gender balance of an institution; he note that new programs like UMES's pharmacy program attract a diverse population. Dr. Williams reported that the Pharm.D. program had 900 applications its first year; he added that one goal of the UMES pharmacy program is to attract students from the Eastern Shore who will remain on the Eastern Shore once they have graduated. In response to a question from Chancellor Kirwan, Dr. Williams reported that there are seven new students in the Ed.D. in academic leadership, of whom two are white; the program in organizational leadership has a preponderance of white students, and the professional science master's is also very diverse. Dr. Williams noted that UMES and the other HBIs need to include in their plans as a diversity goal the admission and enrollment of non-African-American students.

Dr. Florestano asked what Towson is doing to support its target population of first-generation, low-income students. Dr. Marcia Welsh, TU's provost, said that those students are being served by many of the same programs that have historically served minority-race students. Dr. Florestano then discussed with UMBC Provost Elliot Hirshman the initiative to close the achievement gap for transfer students. Dr. Hirshman noted that UMBC has worked with the community colleges to create a model program that includes building out the orientation program, bridge programs and learning communities; he added that they made good progress this year, but that year-to-year fluctuations are not unexpected.

Dr. Goldstein reported that his office now has the institutional achievement gap reports; these will be presented to the Committee and the Board in the fall.

Dr. Florestano asked UB about its tenure-track faculty initiative. Dr. Wood said that the diversity in the faculty at UB is not optimal; he is looking at part-time tenure-track hiring and tenure-clock stoppage as tools in the effort to build a more diverse faculty. In response to a question from Dr. Florestano, Dr. Goldstein noted that the provosts looked at tenure-clock stoppage as an issue a few years ago and discussed whether there was a need for a Board policy. It was concluded that all institutions have policies on stopping the tenure clock and that local policies will likely be most beneficial for institutions and for their faculty members. Dr. Florestano said it would be interesting to see the numbers of instances in which the clock was stopped at each institution.

Following discussion, Mr. Slater moved, Dr. Young seconded, and the Committee on Education Policy unanimously recommended that the Board of Regents approve the institutional programs of cultural diversity progress reports submitted in Spring 2011 for submission to MHEC.

5. Report on General Education at the University of Baltimore.

Dr. Florestano welcomed Dr. Joe Wood, provost at the University of Baltimore, and noted that this is the third in a series of institutional presentations on general education programs. At the September

meeting, the Committee heard about planned changes in the general education program at UMCP; in November, Towson University presented its revised general education curriculum. Dr. Wood noted that UB's general education program is in early stages of development. UB's first four-year graduating class will be honored at this May's commencement, he said.

UB's mission is to provide access and quality education for students with interests in applied and professional disciplines, Dr. Wood said. The nature of the institution is changing as more classes of freshmen enter, he said, but for every freshman the institution enrolls, it still enrolls four transfer students; this ratio is likely to continue. Currently, UB is more than 50% graduate student by headcount, although undergraduate are likely to edge out graduates this fall.

Dr. Wood introduced his colleagues, Dr. Diedre Badejo, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and Dr. Jeffrey Sawyer, Interim Associate Provost, and he distributed copies of his slide presentation. He noted that UB is starting from scratch since in the past, when it was only an upper-division institution, its students came with that component of their undergraduate programs already complete. He noted that he has been involved with institutions at which general education was simply a smorgasbord of courses, but the aim at UB is to create a coherent structure for general education that integrates "learning, thinking, writing, and doing."

Dr. Florestano asked what the content of the curriculum will be; Dr. Wood said that content is dictated by COMAR to a large extent, so that the UB curriculum will include, minimally, arts and humanities, social sciences and history, limited science, and writing. Dr. Florestano said that it would be helpful to have more specificity. Dr. Wood said the UB general education curriculum is still in its formative stages; the subject matter is in 100- and 200-level course and students in the past have brought that with them. UB has been responsible for ensuring that competencies are there. He noted that, for example, science is a construct; scientific facts are the subject matter or content; but having the ability to employ the scientific method, i.e. to think scientifically, is a competency.

Dr. Kirwan noted that UB faces a special challenge in terms of general education in that 80% of its students come as transfers after spending a year or more elsewhere. He asked how UB plans to accommodate the gap between what those students bring and what UB hopes to achieve in its general education program. Dr. Wood said that the curriculum will reinforce competencies and approach general education vertically; it will not be a checklist of lower division offerings for students to tick off and then forget about. He said that he would be back to the Committee in a year or so to report on the completed curriculum. In the meantime, he said, UB students will get general education as prescribed by COMAR, but it will not be as well designed and constructed as it ultimately will be.

Dr. Kirwan asked which community colleges are UB's main feeders; Dr. Wood said that they are Baltimore City, Baltimore County, and Anne Arundel County. He assured Dr. Kirwan that UB is working with the community colleges to ensure alignment.

6. P-20 Update.

Dr. Nancy Shapiro described the material included in the agenda mailing as "layered information." She introduced her staff members:

- Danielle Susskind, project manager for PARCC: Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Career;
- Erin Knepler, project manager for the Lumina Project;
- Lynn Harbison, project manager for US Department of Education Grant: Education Equals Mentoring, Coaching and Cohorts (E=MC²);
- David May, project manager for National Science Foundation Grant: Minority Student Pipeline Math Science Partnership (MSP)²; and
- DeWayne Morgan, evaluator on both E=MC² and (MSP)².

Dr. Shapiro distributed copies of her slide presentation and discussed the work of the P-20 Council and said a few words about each of the grant-funded projects, federally funded and otherwise, with which the USM is now involved. The final several slides of the presentation demonstrated the alignment of USM's P-20 initiatives with the themes and strategies of the USM Strategic Plan.

Mr. Slater commented that the amount of funding that the P-20 initiatives have garnered is impressive; he asked what happens when grants expire. Dr. Shapiro said that sustainability is key and that someone has to pick up the additional work when the dedicated funds run out.

Dr. Florestano thanked Dr. Shapiro for a "very impressive" presentation; she commented that she particularly likes the chart cross-walking the P-20 initiatives with the strategic plan. There was a brief discussion about possible restructuring of the state's education agencies.

There was also discussion of the Race to the Top (RTTT) grant of \$250 million that Maryland won. Dr. Shapiro noted that MSDE has not yet released any funds; there are three years remaining on the grant. Ms. Gonzales expressed surprise that none of the funds had yet been expended, and she asked if the budget was staged. Dr. Shapiro replied that it is a cost-reimbursable budget. Thus far, of the \$250 million awarded, MSDE has committed roughly \$10 million to higher education: \$4.5 million for CAIRE (the System-wide RTTT evaluation center that will be located at Towson); about \$4.5 for the Longitudinal Data System; and roughly \$880,000 for "UTeach-like" programs at USM institutions.

Dr. Florestano commended Dr. Shapiro and her staff on the wonderful job that they do and expressed regret that the Committee does not have additional time to hear more about the projects. Dr. Shapiro noted that the posters in the room provide highlights of each of the projects and said she would leave the posters up during the lunch break should the Regents wish to review them further. Dr. Young said it would be helpful if the material included on the poster could be made available through email so that it could be reviewed at leisure.

7. External Funding Report.

Dr. Goldstein reported that this annual report provides information on extramural awards received by USM institutions in support of specific initiatives in research, education, or service in FY 2010; in addition to detailed information by institution and funding source for FY 2009 and FY 2010, the report also provides five years of summary data by institution for comparison purposes. He noted that, in spite of predictions last year of a likely downturn in funding due to constrained budget and increased competition, the USM once again saw an increase in extramural funding, up 6% over last year for a FY2010 total of \$1,370,245,201. Both UMB and UMCES had double-digit increases.

Dr. Goldstein said he would like to reiterate what he says whenever he presents this report: first of all, this is an added measure of faculty workload for faculty members who are also involved in instruction and in service activities, and second, while some of our institutions are categorized as “research institutions,” they are not the only ones securing significant extramural funding. Comprehensive institutions bring much to the table, he said.

Mr. Slater commented that it would be interesting to know to which institutions the extramural funding that in past years would have been credited to UMBI has gone now that UMBI has been abolished.

8. Campus Crime Reports, 2009.

The agenda packet for the Committee included data drawn from the Campus Security Statistics website of the Office of Postsecondary Education of the U.S. Department of Education. Tables on crime reports for 2007, 2008, and 2009 include criminal offenses that occurred on campus. They also include data for on-campus arrests, as well as campus disciplinary actions and judicial referrals, for liquor law violations, drug abuse violations, and illegal weapons possession. Following up on the discussion of hate crimes and bias-related incidents that the Committee had during discussion of the cultural diversity reports, it was noted that this report requires separate reporting of hate offenses (although only those that fit the definition of “crime,” not those like graffiti that are defined in the cultural diversity report as bias-related incidents). In the three-year period included in this report, only one hate crime occurred – an assault involving bodily injury at UMCP in 2007.

As is the practice when the annual crime report is reviewed by the Committee, Dr. Florestano welcomed the police chief from the host campus. UMCP’s Chief of Police and Director of Public Safety David Mitchell noted that he has been on board at College Park for only eight months; this is his “dream job,” he said, adding that he has been in law enforcement at the state and county level in Maryland for forty years.

Chief Mitchell reported that there has been a dramatic decline in campus crime at UMCP over the past year. Crime is down 9%, and violent crime is down 12%; further, the decline has occurred while Prince George’s County has seen an increase in crime. He acknowledged that there is a great difference between “crime” and “perception of crime” and indicated that his department is working to alter inaccurate perceptions. The campus has been divided into four sectors, each of which is assigned to particular officers. Increased visibility will help enhance campus citizens’ perception of safety, he said. The College Park campus is not only one of the safest places in Maryland but one of the safest places in the United States.

Mr. Kendall said that Chief Mitchell’s point about perception is an important one; he asked how the department can attack that perception when the *Diamondback* almost daily features reports of crime in the area immediately surrounding the campus. Chief Mitchell said that he was interviewed the previous evening by the *Diamondback* and the gist of the article that will appear shortly is that crime is in fact down. The chief noted that the crime alerts issued by the department are intended to increase public safety, but at the same time, those alerts sometimes create a sense that more is going on and that crime is more widespread than is actually the case.

Chief Mitchell noted that one spectacular success over the past year was the post-Duke game celebratory bonfire. He said he is proud to say that, while it was certainly risky to say "Let's have a bonfire," there were no incidents, no injuries, and no arrests associated with the celebration. He said he hopes this will establish a new tradition.

Mr. Hall asked about the number of sworn officers UMCP has. Chief Mitchell said that there are about 100 officers, a number based on the size and population of the area being served. In addition to the campus itself, the campus police have concurrent jurisdiction with the PG County police in "old town" College Park. Concurrent jurisdiction is granted by the county, he said, and is driven by where students live and/or socialize. There are discussions underway as to whether concurrent jurisdiction should be extended given the new housing construction targeted at students, he added.

Dr. Florestano asked how campus police forces decide what to report as campus crime and whether data from one institution to another are truly comparable if some report more incidents than others. Chief Mitchell clarified that campus crime reporting is codified in federal law (the Clery Law); institutions have to follow strict guidelines and there are clear definitions to guide their reporting.

Dr. Florestano asked how UMCP is addressing alcohol violations. Chief Mitchell said that his department has joined forces with the local bars to ensure that student safety is a primary concern. Two establishments cooperated, and one – The Thirsty Turtle – did not. The Thirsty Turtle has been shut down, the chief said; they were "not friendly to our students." Since that closure, the situation in downtown College Park has improved.

Dr. Mary Gartner, associate provost at Frostburg State University, provided some current information about efforts by FSU President Jon Gibralter to address alcohol issues on campus. She noted that there has been a 27% decrease in binge drinking over the past ten years. Dr. Gibralter remains a national leader in the fight against student alcohol abuse.

Dr. Kirwan asked about a pilot program he heard was underway between the UMCP campus police and the Department of Computer Science. Chief Mitchell described the project with Professor Ashok Agrawala; "Video 911" will provide officers approaching the scene of a crime with a full view of the surrounding area (including video and audio). Chief Mitchell said the pilot will begin in about two weeks; there have been expressions of interest from the Baltimore institutions and from Johns Hopkins' Applied Physics Laboratory.

Dr. Florestano asked if the campus police have any difficulty recruiting and if salaries are competitive. Chief Mitchell said that salaries are competitive and that benefits are excellent. Recruiting is not a problem, he said, noting that the campus police force attracts young officers hoping to work their way up through the ranks at the university as well as seasoned veteran officers who may have retired early from other forces.

9. USM Enrollment Projections, 2011-2020.

Mr. Joseph Vivona, vice chancellor for administration and finance and chief operating officer of the USM, reported that there was a last-minute change in the College Park projections and that therefore the Committee has been given new materials. Mr. Vivona distributed copies of his slide presentation.

Mr. Vivona observed that addressing the Governor's college attainment goal will depend upon increased input and/or improved performance so that the USM admits more students and/or retains and graduates more of those admitted. Funding constraints make it much more about retention and graduation than admission, he noted. Current statewide projections result in 62,000 fewer degrees over the next ten years from Maryland higher education. This is equivalent to one year's high school graduating class. Mr. Vivona said that the institutional projections approved by the Board for the USM come closer to the 55% goal but still fall short. This is a work in progress, he noted. The commitment to near-term enrollment growth is not yet resolved, but since students take four to six years to become graduates, we have to address enrollment growth now if we want to increase output before the end of the decade.

Mr. Kendall noted that the goal is 55% for all college degrees – two-year and four-year – and as such our increased enrollment of transfer students, many of whom will already have a two-year degree – will not contribute to attaining the goal because we cannot “double count.” Mr. Vivona observed that the degree mix is critical and that graduate degrees are also very important to driving the new economy in Maryland even though we don't count them at all toward the 55% goal. He added that currently the overwhelming majority of our transfer students come with no degree in hand. Chancellor Kirwan added that even if the 55% goal is not addressed by transfer students, other important goals – such as the production of STEM teachers – are. Mr. Vivona said that the USM will be tracking many elements – “drilling down” so to speak – as it contemplates future actions.

Mr. Kendall asked how the USM projections compare to the MHEC projections. Mr. Vivona replied that there are some significant differences, although this year's projections are closer than ever because of funding constraints.

Mr. Vivona noted that this is an information only item for the Committee on Education Policy. Approval of the enrollment projections will be based upon the recommendation of the Committee on Finance, which meets tomorrow.

10. Adjournment.

Mr. Kendall moved, Dr. Young seconded, and the Committee on Education Policy voted unanimously to adjourn at 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia S. Florestano
Chairperson