The Committee on Education Policy of the University System of Maryland Board of Regents met in public session on Wednesday, June 1, 2011, in Room 767 of the Albin O. Kuhn Library on the campus of the University of Maryland, Baltimore County, beginning at 9:30 a.m. Present were Dr. Florestano, Chairperson, Ms. Gonzales, Mr. Gossett, Mr. Kendall, Dr. Reid, Mr. Slater, Dr. Vance, and Dr. Young (telephone). Also attending were Dr. Allen, Mr. Anderson, Dr. Avery, Dr. Brown, Dr. Carton, Dr. Cooney, Dr. Dane, Mr. Davidson, Mr. Eaton, Dr. Eskow, Ms. Fellon, Dr. Foust, Dr. Gartner, Mr. Goff, Dr. Hammond, Dr. Hearne, Dr. Hirshman, Ms. Jackson-Bowen, Ms. Jamison, Mr. Knavel, Mr. Marionni, Mr. Muntz, Dr. Neufeldt, Dr. Okoh, Dr. Passmore, Mr. Pine, Mr. Ramsey, Ms. Ritz, Dr. Schwarz, Dr. Seigel, Ms. Shaheed, Dr. Shapiro, Mr. Siemer, Mr. Stevenson, Assistant Attorney General Travieso, Mr. Trump, Mr. Uchacz, Dr. Vanko, Mr. Waddell, Dr. Ward, Dr. Wei, Ms. West, Dr. Williams, Dr. Wolfe, Dr. Wood, Dr. Wylie, members of the press, and other observers.

Dr. Florestano called the meeting to order. 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. **Annual Report on Intercollegiate Athletics.**
   a. **Institutional Reports to the Board of Regents for AY 2009-2010.**

   The annual report on intercollegiate athletics has as its main focus the reports submitted annually to the USM Board of Regents by the eight institutions that have intercollegiate athletics programs. Those reports center on whether those programs are operating in such a fashion as to demonstrate integrity, to enhance the mission of the institutions, and to warrant the confidence of those within the institutions, particularly the students, and the public that supports public higher education. Dr. Florestano welcomed the athletics directors from the institutions and thanked them and their staff members for attending the meeting.

   Mr. Slater noted that a number of reports show a negative fund balance in the athletic program; he asked where the money comes from to “pay the bills.” Administrative vice president Mr. Richard Siemer said that Coppin is on track to balance its annual budget, although not to eliminate the accumulated negative fund balance, within four years. In the meantime, the budget is balanced by transfers to the athletic department from other auxiliary enterprises, e.g. dining services, residence halls, parking, since the auxiliary total is positive.

   Mr. Anton Goff, athletic director at Bowie, said that BSU, like CSU, presented a plan to the Regents last year to eradicate the negative fund balance. The program at Bowie is now running in the black, he said, and the department is applying revenue that exceeds expenditures to eliminate the accumulated negative fund balance. In response to a question from Dr. Florestano, Mr. Goff said that BSU has had some success in fundraising for athletics and has, in addition, successfully lobbied the legislature for projects such an artificial turf field and lights for the playing field that will make their facilities attractive to prospective renters. He said he anticipated high school championship games and other special events taking place at Bowie in the future.
UMBC Provost Dr. Elliot Hirshman said that UMBC’s athletic department balanced its budget three years ago and has been paying back its accumulated deficit since then. Next year, the deficit will be below one million dollars, he said, and it should be retired within a few years. Dr. Hirshman acknowledged the very fine work of athletic director Dr. Charlie Brown in addressing the department’s financial situation so effectively.

Mr. Slater asked UMCP how their balance can be precisely zero. Mr. Randy Eaton, senior associate athletic director and chief financial officer for the athletic department, said that the budget has historically been balanced from plant funds. The department has a pot of money in the Terrapin Club foundation from which funds are transferred annually to make the university athletic budget balance zero. Mr. Kendall asked if the athletic department ever makes contributions to the academic program; Mr. Eaton said “not directly.”

Ms. Gonzales commented that it is very difficult to assess the academic success of the UMCP program since the graduation charts used concealed data for any cell in which fewer than five athletes would be represented. She asked how UMCP arrived at that particular cut-off point, since a number of other institutions provide data for even smaller cohorts. Mr. Dan Trump, senior associate athletic director for administration, said that reports of federal graduation rates use five as the cut-off. Ms. Marionni clarified that UMCP provided tables that include the censored data for use in executive session should the Regents desire; she will send the tables to the members of the Committee.

Ms. Gonzales asked the TU representative how, when applying student fees, the department decides to allocate amounts to particular teams. Mr. Tim Knavel, chief business officer in the athletic department, said that revenue is not allocated up front by individual sport or by gender but is applied to cover actual expenses incurred by the various teams when the budget is balanced at the end of the year.

In response to a question from Dr. Florestano, representatives from BSU and UMES indicated that they have higher recruiting expenses for women than for men because they put more emphasis on women’s athletics. Turning to Coppin again, Dr. Florestano asked if there is no possibility of revenue from Item 11 in the EADA report (Program Sales, Concessions, Novelty Sales, and Parking). Mr. Derrick Ramsey, CSU’s director of athletics, said that staff costs to operate concessions and to supervise parking generally outweigh any amount realized from sales. Mr. Slater asked Mr. Ramsey to what he attributes the increased administrative costs in the Coppin athletic department over the past year; Mr. Ramsey said that the department hired a full-time business manager, which should in the long run lead to a stronger financial picture.

Dr. Florestano noted that, in the report from SU, the athletic fee is reported in their athletic report as $380 but was approved by the BOR for FY 2010 as $460. Vice President for Student Affairs Dr. Ellen Neufeldt said that she believes the higher figure is correct and that a figure from an earlier year was inadvertently picked up in the athletic report.

Ms. Gonzales asked the athletic directors what they think the Regents ought to be looking for and what the Regents could do to help make matters better for the institutions and their athletic programs. She commented that the reports were full of data but the Regents need to know what all of those data tell us. “What does it all mean?” she asked.
Dr. Brown from UMBC said that he thinks the information in the report is appropriate but the timing is off. If the report were due in September, the Regents would be getting much more up-to-date information. Mr. Kendall recalled that there were some problems with timing when the report was first initiated; over the years, many issues have been resolved. The timing of the report also coincides with the NCAA release of APR data so that the Committee looks at two sets of information from the same time period.

Mr. Gossett asked the athletic directors if there is information in this report that they view as useless. “What keeps you up at night?” he asked. Mr. Anderson from UMCP commented that there are conversations to be had; issues change from day to day, he said, but the data do not always capture the issues that are of concern to the athletic departments or the Regents. It would be useful to have a forum in which the athletic directors and the Regents could talk about issues, he said, noting “It would be naïve to assume that what happened recently at OSU couldn’t happen here.” He added that it doesn’t make sense to look at the data collectively; each institution is unique.

Mr. Kendall said he would like to understand how the institutions handle NCAA compliance. Mr. Anderson said that all institutions are understaffed in the compliance areas. Mr. Gossett said that the NCAA is “archaic.” He said he would relish an opportunity to talk about current issues in a small group setting. He suggested asking staff to shift the time frame for the report and to create other opportunities to discuss issues in intercollegiate athletics.

Mr. Knavel from Towson said that he disagreed with Dr. Brown’s comment about timing. He said that the EADA has to be posted by October 31, programs are being audited by the NCAA and by the internal auditors in the fall, and the NCAA report is due in January. He said he likes having this report to the Regents later in the academic year; moving it to September would create unneeded pressure, he commented.


Dr. Florestano noted that the General Assembly expressed concern about the use of general funds to support intercollegiate athletic programs, including institutional scholarships to student athletes on the basis of athletic ability at public four-year institutions of higher education in Maryland. The University System of Maryland has stated to the budget committees that athletic activities are expected to be self-supporting. The JCR includes language that restricts the expenditure of $5,000,000 to support USM institutions until a report is submitted to the budget committees on the amount of general funds expended in fiscal 2011 on intercollegiate athletics, including athletic scholarships by institution, by September 1, 2011. USM Budget Director Monica West told the Committee that an information request has gone out to all of the administrative vice presidents; data are being collected on the source of funds for all athletic department expenditures, including scholarships and salaries. She assured the Committee that the required report will be submitted in a timely fashion.

c. NCAA APR Reports.

Dr. Florestano noted that the NCAA APR reports were issued after the mailing for the Committee meeting; the members of the Committee have additional materials regarding the APR at their places. Each Division I sports team receives an APR score. She commended the four high-performing teams that
this year received public recognition from the NCAA: CSU’s women’s tennis team, TU’s women’s cross country and women’s gymnastics teams, and UMCP’s men’s cross country team. She also noted that this year, two USM teams received penalties. UMCP’s football team received a contemporaneous penalty that resulted in a loss of scholarships, and CSU’s men’s basketball team received a second-year sanction, losing scholarships and limiting practice time.

Mr. Anderson of UMCP said that he inherited the issue with the football team’s poor academic performance when he took the position as Director of Athletics. Following Mr. Goff’s departure from UMCP to head the program at Bowie, Mr. Anderson hired Chris Uchacz to fill the position of Associate Athletic Director for Academic Support and Career Development. Mr. Uchacz came to UMCP from Texas Christian University. Mr. Uchacz explained to the Committee the penalty structure that the NCAA utilizes, noting that the contemporaneous penalty incurred by the football team was the result of three “0 for 2s” (retention and eligibility) and a rolling APR of 922, which is below the 925 cut score. He said that the low rolling APR can be traced to the Fall 2009 when the team lost 24 APR points as well as posting a 2-10 season and having no post-season play. He said that he had turned TCU around when he was there (TCU’s single year APR in football last year was 997) and is implementing some of the same things at College Park. He added that he and football Coach Edsell see eye to eye; the coach has hired new staff in the football program and personally oversees academic and advisement and support for his players. Mr. Uchacz said his guess is that the football team’s APR will come in at 935 for 2010-2011.

In response to a question from Dr. Florestano as to how his strategy differs from what has transpired in the past, Mr. Uchacz said that student-athletes will be required to have 4½ year graduation plans, that new staff have been hired who have been successful in improving academic achievement everywhere they’ve been in the past, and that he has strengthened those programs that were already in place under Mr. Goff. Mr. Vance asked if the 4½ year graduation plan actually “punishes” the bright student; Mr. Uchacz clarified that the plan will assist students who wish to double major or to earn master’s degrees during their final year of eligibility.

Ms. Gonzales noted that a review of the football team graduation data for the 2002 cohort suggests that, while regular admits are likely to graduate or to leave in good standing, special admits have exceedingly poor graduation rates. Mr. Anderson said that the department is changing its admissions philosophy. There will be a special summer curriculum for special admits, and students will need to compete in the classroom as well as on the field.

Mr. Derrick Ramsey, athletic director at CSU, said that the thing that keeps him up at night is how to reconcile funding, academic success, and success in sports for his teams. He said that the basketball team had four “0 for 2s” in 2008 and 2009, which resulted in an “occasion one” historical penalty of public notice. The “occasion two” penalty imposed this year results in a loss of four scholarships over two years out of 13 total basketball player scholarships. He noted that Coppin has only one full-time academic support person and three or four part-time persons. The support staff meets bimonthly with all at-risk students (those with GPAs below 2.6). This year, ten hours of study hall is mandatory for freshmen and for all at-risk students, and the department gets biweekly progress reports from all faculty members who have athletes in their classes. The department is about to implement the “Grades First” program through which the department will get ongoing real-time information about the academic performance of student athletes. Mr. Ramsey said that Coppin simply has to do a better job at
monitoring the academic success of student athletes and has put mechanisms into place to ensure that the situation improves.

Dr. Florestano told the Committee that the NCAA has greatly enhanced its APR website; it is now possible to review data for any team, for any year, and by institution and by individual head coach.

Dr. Florestano then noted that the Regents were concerned about information revealed in a recent series of articles in the NY Times about gender equity in athletics and particularly about irregularities in “counting.” She asked if any of the athletic directors would like to comment. Mr. Anderson said that the practice of counting male athletes who practice with the women’s teams as members of the team roster is permitted under NCAA rules; he commented that it is a “slippery slope” when you start looking at the NCAA rules. Ms. Gonzales asked if any of the USM institutions count male athletes as members of women’s teams. All indicated that they did not.

Dr. Florestano added that Regent Tom McMillen will bring up at the upcoming meeting of the full Board his interest in a “claw back” provision to increase accountability by coaches and other athletic department staff even after they have left an institution. She thanked the athletic directors for coming to the meeting and for being forthcoming about the issues they face. She said that the Committee and staff will follow-up on the reporting time line question and on the creation of additional mechanisms – perhaps small informal discussion groups – to use in exploring in more detail issues related to intercollegiate athletics.

   a. TU: Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Science, Family Science.

Dr. Terry Cooney, TU’s interim provost, reported that the Department of Family Studies and Community Development currently offers a major and minor in Family Studies to over 400 students. The current major had the specific objective of creating a program that was consistent with the guidelines and standards established by the National Council on Family Relations. The objectives are now well-established and the program was reapproved in 2009. The proposed Family Science program will add an undergraduate major that will complement the current applied curriculum by providing students with academic experiences focusing on the study of families and relationships in the context of contemporary society. In short, he said, the current major emphasizes the provision of human services and work with community groups, while the proposed program has a more “scholarly” orientation.

Dr. Florestano asked about job possibilities for program graduates. Dr. Karen Goldrich Eskow, department chair of Family Studies, said that she suspects that many graduates will go on to graduate study in family science, marriage and family therapy, social work, family law, public health, psychology, human resource management, and other social science disciplines. Others will pursue employment in human service fields in government, nonprofits, and private agencies. She added that the program anticipates a large number of double majors.

Following discussion, Mr. Slater moved, Dr. Reid seconded, and the Committee on Education Policy unanimously recommended that the Board of Regents approve the proposal from Towson University to offer the Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Science in Family Science.
b. **UMCP: Bachelor of Science, Atmospheric and Oceanic Science.**
Dr. Ann Wylie, Interim Provost, introduced the program, noting that it seeks to educate majors in the basic principles that control weather, ocean circulation, and the interactions between atmosphere and ocean that regulate the Earth’s climate, building on a sound foundation in mathematics, physics, chemistry, and computer science. Students will be provided with practical experience as researchers and creators of knowledge and will be prepared to enter a wide range of careers in atmospheric and oceanic science, in fields as diverse as education, media, research, prediction, or environmental impacts and mitigation, offered by an equally diverse array of public and private nonprofit/for-profit organizations.

Dr. Florestano asked why UMCP has not offered this program before, observing that it seems like a logical move. Professor Jim Carton, chair of the Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, noted that the department has been working on it for some time. Mr. Slater said he assumes that some students from UMCP had matriculated in the department’s graduate programs in the past, and he asked what those students majored in since there was no B.S. in atmospheric and oceanic science. Dr. Carton said that entering students were typically from physics or mathematics. He said that the graduate programs have remained small, attracting only two or three new students a year; the hope is that the existence of the B.S. program will boost graduate program enrollment to five or six annually.

Dr. Florestano asked who else in the area offers similar programs and whether the program will produce additional STEM teachers for the state. Dr. Carton said that no institutions in Maryland, West Virginia or Delaware that currently offer programs whose graduates satisfy the General Services Administration requirements for certification as “meteorologist” or “oceanographer.” There are programs in New Jersey and in Pennsylvania, he said, and the University of Virginia offers a track in its environmental science program. He said that graduates would have to acquire appropriate additional coursework in educational methods for certification to teach earth system science at the secondary level.

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

c. **UMES: Bachelor of Science, Biochemistry.**
Dr. Charles Williams, provost at UMES, introduced Dr. Jennifer Hearne, assistant professor in the Department of Natural Sciences, who spoke about the program. She said that it will address the strategic priorities of access and affordability, job placement, and research. UMES is the only HBCU in Maryland to offer biochemistry, she said, and the state of Maryland has 8% of all bio-sector jobs in the country. The projected job market increase for biochemists is approximately 23%, she noted and the current average annual wage for biochemists in Maryland is roughly $60,000 per year.

In response to a question from Dr. Florestano, Dr. Hearne reported that UMBC and UMCP both offer programs in biochemistry and SU offers a biochemistry track within its chemistry major. Mr. Slater commented that the proposal shows only two faculty members who are biochemists, and he asked if the institution anticipates bringing on additional faculty. Dr. Hearne replied that there is significant faculty depth in the Department of Natural Sciences but that the program may add one additional faculty member as it matures.
Following discussion, Dr. Reid moved, Dr. Vance seconded, and the Committee on Education Policy unanimously recommended that the Board of Regents approve the proposal from the University of Maryland Eastern Shore to offer the Bachelor of Science in Biochemistry.

d. UMES: Master of Science, Chemistry.
Dr. Williams introduced Dr. Joseph Okoh, chair of the Department of Natural Sciences, who noted that planning for this program began a decade ago. It was approved up to the provost level in 2001 but then stalled due to a lack of faculty resources for implementation. In 2010, the department obtained from the administration a commitment to provide 1.5 additional faculty, and the decision was made to revive the proposal to offer the M.S. in chemistry. Students in the program will take 30 credits and will sit for comprehensive examinations, he said. The proposed program builds upon the existing strength of the faculty and the existing graduate programs offered by the Department of Natural Sciences.

Dr. Florestano asked how many M.S. programs in chemistry there are in Maryland. Dr. Okoh said that UMBC, UMCP and the UMB medical school all offer the degree, but there are no other programs on the Eastern Shore.

Following discussion, Mr. Slater moved, Mr. Kendall seconded, and the Committee on Education Policy unanimously recommended that the Board of Regents approve the proposal from the University of Maryland Eastern Shore to offer the Master of Science in Chemistry.

Mr. Kendall noted that there is yet another proposal from UMES on the agenda, and he asked Dr. Williams how the institution manages to support new programs with no new funding and no reallocation plans outlined in the proposals. Dr. Williams responded that the master’s program just approved has research funding to help support it and that there is a cadre of faculty already available to implement the B.S. in biochemistry. He emphasized that the institution is “looking inward” to play from its strengths and that it is increasing its push for grant funding. Dr. Okoh added that there has been some success in the acquisition of external funding and that has permitted additional faculty hiring as well as equipment and laboratory enhancements. Dr. Florestano noted that two programs, one from UMES and one from UB, were pulled from the agenda after staff review determined that the institution might not be in an optimal position to offer them at this time.

e. UMES: Master of Medical Science (MMS) Physician Assistant Studies.
Dr. Williams introduced Ms. Darlene Jackson-Bowen, chair of the Department of Physician Assistant, who reported that the proposed Masters of Medical Science in Physician Assistant Studies was developed in response to a mandate issued by the Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant, Inc. (ARC-PA) that requires Physician Assistant (PA) programs to transition to a graduate degree by 2020. Dr. Williams commented that this was similar to the recent shift in Physical Therapy from the B.S. to the M.S. and then to the D.P.T.

Ms. Jackson-Bowen said that UMES will be the only HBCU in Maryland to offer this degree. Towson University offers the master’s program in Physician Assistant Studies and has articulation agreements with a number of community colleges. The UMES program differs from the TU program in that it includes a mentorship internship for all first-year students; through the fall, spring, and summer sessions
of the 15-month didactic year, each student will undertake a one-day-per-week mentorship internship in which the student will shadow a local internist/family practice physician or Physician Assistant and perform hands-on patient care work.

If approved, the implementation of the MMS program in 2013 will not affect the current BS PA program through the graduating cohort in December 2013. The PA department is currently accepting only juniors and seniors for fall 2011 with the expectation that this cohort will graduate with bachelor’s degrees in 2013. Dr. Florestano asked if there will be changes in the requirements as a result of the change; Ms. Jackson-Bowen said that the standards are the same for all programs.

Following discussion, Dr. Vance moved, Mr. Slater seconded, and the Committee on Education Policy unanimously recommended that the Board of Regents approve the proposal from the University of Maryland Eastern Shore to offer the Masters of Medical Science (MMS) in Physician Assistant Studies.

3. Salisbury University Request for Permanent Exception to BOR Policy on Undergraduate Admissions (III-4.00).

Dr. Ellen Neufeldt, Vice President for Student Affairs at SU, said that this item is her “swan song” as she is leaving Salisbury for a new position as student affairs vice president at Old Dominion University this summer. She thanked the Regents for all of their support for her and for this pilot project and reminded the committee of the history of the item.

The exception sought by Salisbury University is to make optional the standardized test requirement for freshman admission for applicants presenting a high school grade point average of 3.5 or higher. This request follows the five-year pilot program during which the University was able to analyze the outcomes of the program and evaluate its effectiveness, Dr. Neufeldt said. The data in the final report clearly indicates that the pilot program has met expectations for retention and graduation rates. After four years of study, students in the test-optional and regular test-submitted groups perform similarly based on retention and GPAs. In addition, test-optional students outperform the test-submitted students in the area of course completion and four-year graduation rates. Of the 220 test-optional students, 54.1% are expected to graduate in four years compared to 49.4% of the 930 of the test-submitted students.

Dr. Neufeldt emphasized that the success of the program is due in large part to the holistic review process that SU utilizes in making admissions decisions, and SU would like to institutionalize the test-optional provision for those students who meet the 3.5 high school GPA requirement. Dr. Florestano commented that the results of the pilot program are very impressive.

Mr. Slater asked if there is something unique about Salisbury that makes this work and if it would make sense to simply change the admissions policy for all institutions. Dr. Neufeldt said that SU had done careful analysis of its indicators of success prior to proposing the pilot program and had ascertained that high school grade point average and rigor of high school curriculum had stood out as the primary factors in student success. In order to gauge whether a test-optional program would be beneficial, any institution would have to look carefully at what their success factors are, she said.
Mr. Gossett asked about application numbers. Ms. Jane Dane, Dean of Enrollment Management in the Office of Admissions, reported that last fall, SU received roughly 8,000 applications for freshman admissions and approximately 25% of the enrolling class was admitted test-optional. Ms. Gonzales asked if SU finds that most of the test-optional students have test scores that don’t “measure up” or don’t take the tests at all or take them and don’t submit scores. Dr. Neufeldt said that there were a variety of scenarios. Some had enviable scores, she said, while others simply do not test well. She noted that the students admitted under the provision are more socio-economically diverse than those admitted with test scores. Taking multiple administrations of standardized tests and taking test-prep courses is costly, she noted.

Dr. Goldstein said that no other institutions have expressed a desire to pilot a test-optional program at this time. Dr. Reid said that he was curious about what statement about academic credentials is made by institutions that require standardized test scores. Dr. Wiley said that UMCP will continue to require test scores since all of their peer institutions require them.

Following discussion, Dr. Reid moved, Ms. Gonzales seconded, and the Committee on Education Policy unanimously recommended that the Board of Regents approve Salisbury University’s request for a permanent exception to the test requirement for freshman admission and that BOR Policy III-4.00 be amended to reflect the exception.

4. **Creation at Towson University of the School of Emerging Technologies.**

Dr. introduced Dr. David A. Vanko, dean of the Jess & Mildred Fisher College of Science and Mathematics at Towson University, who described for the Committee the proposal to create a new School of Emerging Technologies in FY 2012 located administratively within the Fisher College. The proposed school will interface with other colleges at Towson and will develop and support innovative, integrative, interdisciplinary programs at the baccalaureate through applied doctoral levels in fields involving emerging technologies, and will seek to address workforce and public/societal needs. Dr. Vanko said that the school will also form educational partnerships with community colleges, government agencies, and technology-based industries and will serve as an incubator for interdisciplinary faculty/student research and other forms of scholarly and creative collaborations.

Dr. Florestano asked why the proposal to create the school was coming to the Committee at this time. Ms. Hollander indicated that this is required by the Board Policy on the Creation/Development By University System of Maryland Institutions of Schools or Colleges (III-7.05) and is appropriate in that in the future, the school may evolve into a stand-alone school that would require a structural modification which would likely involve the relocation of faculty members and the creation of new governance and management bodies, departments, and an expanded director’s (or dean’s) office. The proposal also alludes to the development of new academic programs, which would of course come to the Committee for review and recommendation, she said.

Ms. Kendall noted that the school is a nice fit with the USM strategic plan; he said that the proposal outlines an aggressive and challenging plan and he asked if resources will be adequate to achieve its goals. Dr. Vanko said that the school has seed funding from a reallocation of existing institutional resources and will be looking for external and corporate funding.
Following discussion, Ms. Gonzales moved, Dr. Reid seconded, and the Committee on Education Policy unanimously recommended that the Board of Regents approve the proposal from Towson University to create a new School of Emerging Technologies. Dr. Florestano wished Drs. Cooney and Vanko good luck in their new undertaking.

5. Exemplary Professional Development School Achievement Award (SU).
SU Provost Diane Allen reported that Salisbury University was honored with the 2011 Exemplary Professional Development School Achievement Award from the National Association of Professional Development Schools (NAPDS). Only five campuses across the country were recognized. She said that, for over a decade, SU’s PDS network has enabled University students to improve their practice by working with students in public schools across the region. Currently, some 34 schools in seven counties partner with SU to help train teachers. The Worcester Cluster includes Snow Hill Elementary, Snow Hill Middle, Berlin Intermediate, Showell Elementary and Buckingham Elementary.

Dr. Allen said that some of SU’s noteworthy accomplishments cited by the award include the establishment of a co-teaching model for internships and the dissemination of this model nationally, the exceptional buy-in by Worcester County teachers to the SU education program, and the strong linkage of intern involvement with student achievement. Also noted was SU’s visibility at the NAPDS national conference, evidenced by 18 presentations in the past 5 years.

Dr. Florestano commented that the Board of Regents and the USM have been pushing the PDS model for fifteen years. It is admittedly a much more costly model of teacher preparation, she said, but the fact that SU has made the commitment to its students and to Worcester County and has been recognized for its achievements is reason to celebrate.

UMCP Dean of Agriculture Cheng-i Wei presented this report. He provided a bit of history and described a few of the highlights included in the report. He noted that there was a lot of work to do and a lot of talent to do it, mentioning among the critical issues Chesapeake Bay clean-up, development of biofuels, and enhancement of international programs. He introduced Interim Dean Dr. Jurgen Schwarz, his counterpart at UMES.

Dr. Florestano said that this is a wonderful report and that she was “dazzled” by it. She asked about the two-week European study tour offered by UMES. Dr. Schwarz said that this study-abroad tour exposes students in fashion merchandizing to global cultures and international marketing. Dr. Florestano asked about interaction between the agriculture programs and UMCES; Dean Wei said that there are a number of joint faculty positions.

Dr. Florestano said she sees that UMES is still trying to find state funding for the required federal match. The Regents have been supportive in the past, she says, but it appears that nothing has changed. She asked Dr. Goldstein to contact Mr. Vivona to let him know that this is a continuing concern and also to explore the proposal for support for the “3x5 Cooperative Solution.” She told Dean Wei and Dean Schwarz that the Regents would look into extending the reporting cycle further, perhaps to every four years.
7. **Retention and Graduation Rates of First-Time, Full-Time Degree-Seeking Undergraduates.**
Mr. Chad Muntz, USM Director of Institutional Research, presented the report on retention and graduation patterns of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students system-wide and at the individual institutions. Mr. Muntz did an on-screen presentation and provided copies of his slides to the Committee.

Ms. Gonzales commented on the slide in which Mr. Muntz graphs six-year graduation rates of all students, low-income students, and African-American students, inquiring if it is possible to show rates for those African-American students who are not low-income. Mr. Muntz said that he can extract those data.

Mr. Muntz noted that there remains a significant lag in low-income and African-American student retention rates that has serious implications for the Chancellor’s Closing the Achievement Gap initiative; given the gap, the USM is in a situation in which the mantra will become “no junior left behind.” Dr. Reid asked if the reason for the lag is known; Mr. Muntz indicated that there is a lot of attrition in the first year and the reason is not clear. Mr. Kendall suggested that the real answer to the lag may rest in early preparation for college; he suggested that programs like Way2Go Maryland show great promise.

8. **Adjournment.**
Dr. Florestano noted that, in addition to Dr. Neufeldt’s departure for Old Dominion, the Committee is losing two others of its regular presenters. Dr. Malinda Orlin is retiring from UMB after 10 years as vice president for academic affairs and a total of 36 years at UMB. Dr. Elliot Hirshman is leaving UMBC after three years to become the President of San Diego State University. The Committee expressed its gratitude and good wishes to all three.

Dr. Reid moved, Mr. Kendall seconded, and the motion to adjourn the Committee on Education Policy at 12:10 p.m. passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia S. Florestano
Chairperson