

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND
BOARD OF REGENTS
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION POLICY
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 21, 2011

The Committee on Education Policy of the University System of Maryland Board of Regents met in public session on Wednesday, September 21, 2011, in the Hilda and Michael Bogomolny Room of the University of Baltimore Student Center, 21 W. Mt. Royal Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland, beginning at 9:30 a.m. Present were Dr. Florestano, Chairperson, Ms. Gonzales, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Kinkopf, Mr. Slater, Dr. Vance, Mr. Wojciechowski, Dr. Young, and Chancellor Kirwan. Also attending were Dr. Avery, Mr. Bogomolny, Mr. Bowden, Mr. Collins, Dr. Copes, Ms. Doyle, Dr. Goldstein, Ms. Hollander, Ms. Jamison, Mr. Lurie, Ms. Marionni, Dr. Rhodes, Dr. Simpson, Mr. Smith, Dr. Ward, Dr. Wolfe, members of the press, and other observers.

Dr. Florestano called the meeting to order. Mr. Robert Bogomolny, president of the University of Baltimore, welcomed the Committee to the institution. 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. Creation at Coppin State University of a College of Health Professions.

Mr. Ronnie L. Collins, Acting Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Coppin State University, introduced Dr. Marcella Copes, dean of the School of Nursing, who told the Committee that CSU is proposing to create a new College of Health Professions to house two schools – the School of Nursing and the School of Allied Health. The latter represents a planned expansion of the Health Information Management (HIM) program and other allied health degree offerings.

Chancellor Kirwan commented that the proposal is well-written and compelling; he asked Dr. Copes to talk a bit more about the HIM program, which has grown impressively since its initiation. Dr. Copes said that Coppin's HIM program is the only bachelor's program in the state and has partnered with several Maryland community colleges to articulate with associate degree programs in Health Information Technology (HIT). The program began in 2007 with seven students and now has an enrollment of approximately 200. She said the field will continue to explode and the CSU program cannot meet the market demand for graduates, although program growth is limited only by resource availability. Dr. Kirwan asked about faculty needs. Dr. Copes responded that the program has a number of full-time faculty as well as a cadre of adjuncts; she said that future growth will require additional faculty hires.

Mr. Slater noted that the proposal indicates that Coppin graduates 80% of the baccalaureate-prepared minority nurses in the state of Maryland; he asked where the remaining 20% are educated. Dr. Copes said that they are spread among a number of institutions. Mr. Slater asked if the HIM program attracts a significant number of non-minority students; Dr. Copes said that while the program does attract some, CSU is engaging in more aggressive marketing of the program, including an advertisement in the education issues of U.S. News and World Report. Mr. Slater then asked how many community colleges have programs that feed into the HIM. Dr. Copes reported that roughly 50% of the Maryland community colleges have HIT programs; she added that CSU is also taking the HIM to the regional centers at Hagerstown and Shady Grove within the coming year.

Dr. Young said he can certainly see the need and demand for the program. He asked what the program capacity is now and what it is anticipated to be two years from now. Dr. Copes said that she expects that the program enrollment will double over the next two years. Based on current resources, the capacity will be at maximum with the addition of 100 students. Additional resources will be needed to accommodate projected growth over the next two years. She noted that faculty resources represent the most significant challenge, whereas clinical placements for students are no problem.

Dr. Goldstein commented that Dr. Copes runs an outstanding program with the highest rate in the state for passage of the nursing licensure examination. Following discussion, Mr. Slater moved, Mr. Wojciechowski seconded, and the Committee on Education Policy unanimously recommended that the Board of Regents approve the proposal from Coppin State University to create a new College of Health Professions.

Noting that this agenda includes no new academic program proposals, Mr. Slater commented that he would be very much interested in knowing the status of programs that the Board approved five years ago, particularly in terms of whether actual enrollments and costs match the projections made in the proposals. Ms. Gonzales said that five years is a long time to wait for a check-up and perhaps the Committee could look at programs two or three years out. Mr. Slater also asked if there is a way to ascertain whether there are "common mistakes" made in devising program budgets for proposals, e.g. over- or under-estimating tuition revenue. Dr. Goldstein said that he and his staff would take a look at this issue and propose a plan for sharing this information with the Committee.

2. Report on General Education at FSU.

Dr. Florestano told the Committee that this presentation represents a continuation of the series of presentations on general education that began last academic year when the Committee heard from UMCP, TU, and UB. She noted that the USM Strategic Plan and the System and state focus on competitiveness and workforce development demand that the governing board take responsibility for understanding general education requirements in the state and at the different USM institutions to ensure that the USM has in place high-quality educational programs to meet statewide needs. There will be additional presentations during the 2011-2012 academic year. She then turned to Dr. Steve Simpson, provost at Frostburg State University, observing that Dr. Simpson is now the System's "senior provost," having served in his position for ten years.

Dr. Simpson reported that, when he first became provost at FSU, he was concerned that undergraduate education at that institution had not been thoroughly reviewed since the mid-1980s. Under Dr. Simpson's leadership, FSU launched its Undergraduate Education Initiative (UEI) in 2002. The General Education Program (GEP) is an integral part of the UEI, Dr. Simpson said, and it is difficult to talk about one without reference to the other. Dr. Simpson then introduced two colleagues who were available to respond to specific questions about the UEI/GEP: Mr. Rob Smith, Assistant Vice President for Planning, Assessment and Institutional Research, and Dr. Randall Rhodes, Assistant Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Dr. Simpson reported that the core principle of FSU's General Education Program is that students learn more completely and more deeply when components of general education and the major are

interwoven to offer multiple opportunities to develop connections between disciplines, theories, and ideas. Among the special features of FSU's undergraduate program are emphases on:

- Freshman learning communities and senior capstone courses that provide students with a focused introduction and conclusion to major programs;
- Lifelong learning skills, including technological and information literacy;
- An appreciation for cultural identities, including a required course in "Identity and Difference;"
- Interdisciplinary colloquia, encouraging students to synthesize and integrate knowledge across disciplinary lines through a required freshman FSU Colloquium and an elective upper-level FSU Colloquium; and
- Specific outcomes framed in a manner that can be assessed.

Dr. Simpson said that the element of which he is most proud is the required freshman interdisciplinary colloquium. He said that the distribution requirements (listed under "Modes of Inquiry" on the GEP excerpt from the FSU catalog that was included with the agenda mailing) are more focused and the course selections more limited than at some other institutions; this facilitates the assessment of learning outcomes, he noted. Dr. Florestano observed that under the "Humanities" and "Social Science" sections of the "Modes of Inquiry," there is no requirement that students take history, language or political science. Dr. Simpson responded that the purpose of the general education "Modes of Inquiry" is to introduce students to the mental approaches employed in different disciplines, not to ensure that all students acquire particular bits of information. Mr. Slater said that he would like to see our institutions ensure that all of our graduates have a solid grounding in American history and government; this might be achieved by a required examination or a course requirement, he said. Mr. Wojciechowski agreed that our institutions should be emphasizing civic education. He asked if FSU has a physical education requirement; Dr. Simpson said that it does not and that it has recently eliminated a health education requirement since the additional requirement might extend time to degree for some students. Dr. Kirwan noted that the recently approved strategic plan includes under Theme Three the development and implementation of a "Maryland Compact for Student Learning, Leadership Development, and Civic Engagement" specifying what the Board of Regents and institutions expect all USM graduates to know and be able to do and perform.

Mr. Johnson asked Dr. Simpson what the time frame is for further evaluation and assessment of the general education program. Dr. Simpson responded that the new UEI/GEP was implemented between 2002 and 2008 and that the assessment is now in progress. He added that there would likely be a reexamination of undergraduate education, including general education, in three years or so. Dr. Florestano thanked Dr. Simpson for his presentation.

3. PARCC: Partnership for Readiness in College and Careers (Common Core State Standards Assessment Consortium).

Dr. Nancy Shapiro noted that the discussion of general education provided a nice segue into her presentation concerning college readiness and high school expectations. She said that in June 2010, the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) released the Common Core State Standards® (CCSS) in English/Language Arts and mathematics. The stated aim of the Common Core State Standards is to define the knowledge and skills students should achieve in order to graduate from high school ready to succeed in entry-level,

credit-bearing academic college courses and in workforce training programs—that is, with no need for remediation in college. As of July 2011, 44 states had taken up the invitation and had adopted the standards. In 2011 the U.S. Department of Education made two awards of approximately \$180 million dollars each, to two consortia to develop assessments of the CCSS: PARCC and SMARTER Balance. Each consortium represents approximately 25 states. The Maryland State Board of Education signed up with the PARCC Consortia, led by Achieve, Inc., Dr. Shapiro said. She noted that the slides included in the agenda packet were prepared by Achieve to use in presentations to state boards of education and university governing boards.

The Common Core Standards do not specify particular courses or curricula but rather articulate “high level learning outcomes.” A major difficulty at present is that there is a disconnect between what university faculty and high school teachers think that students need to know in order to achieve success in college and the workplace.

Dr. Shapiro noted that, at the request of MSDE and MHEC, Maryland’s public two-year and four-year institutions were asked to sign letters in support of Maryland’s participation in the PARCC consortium, and those letters required a commitment to use the resulting assessments as early indicators of college readiness—students who passed the “tests” would be placed in college credit bearing courses. Chancellor Kirwan signed the letter of support for the USM institutions, with the caveat that only if higher education faculty had a significant role in developing the assessments and readiness criteria, would USM institutions agree to use the resulting scores as indicators of students ability to be successful in the first credit-bearing college mathematics and English courses (i.e. placement in non-remedial courses).

Dr. Shapiro pointed out that one of the slides lists challenges in three categories: technical, implementation, and policy. An additional challenge, she said, is engaging higher education in the work in order to ensure alignment with college readiness. Dr. Shapiro is the higher education lead for PARCC in Maryland (Leslie Wilson of MSDE is the K-12 lead), but there is little role for higher education spelled out. Chancellor Kirwan is a member of an advisory board, not a governing board; in fact there are no representatives of higher education on the governing board. Dr. Kirwan commented that the involvement of higher education is critical in order to address the misalignment between high school graduation requirements and college readiness. The U.S. has the largest college drop-out rate in the world, he said. The problem simply doesn’t exist in other countries that have one single system of education. He said that he is hopeful about the potential of PARCC but disturbed by the limited voice for higher education. Furthermore, there is no money for higher education’s participation; Dr. Shapiro pointed out that of a total of \$180 million for PARCC, higher education in Maryland will receive only \$160,000 spread over four years.

Mr. Kinkopf asked if college and career readiness use the same standard. Dr. Shapiro said that this is a discussion not yet on the table. There is only one set of standards, and the definition of “passing” is very controversial, particularly for students who do not plan to go on to college. Ms. Gonzales said that there should be a way for students who are not ever going to be “college ready” to develop appropriate skills for the world of work. Dr. Shapiro said that representatives of business have indicated that they want career-ready students to be equally qualified as college-ready students and to know the same things.

4. Report on Program Actions Delegated to the Chancellor, 2010-2011.

Ms. Teri Hollander reported that this report responds to Board Resolution III-7.03, which requires an annual report to the Board of Regents of program actions delegated to the Chancellor. Ms. Hollander indicated that, in order to provide the Committee with a complete picture of the year's program activity, she has also provided a list of Board actions. Between June 2010 and August 2011, the Chancellor approved 16 new certificates and concentrations; he also approved the suspension and discontinuance of 16 degree programs, certificates and areas of concentration. In addition, she noted, the Board of Regents approved one new school and 22 new programs and certificates.

Dr. Florestano noted that looking at the discontinuances is very telling. The Committee is always interested in knowing what is being discontinued in order to liberate resources for new program offerings. In response to a question from Mr. Slater, Ms. Hollander explained the difference between program suspension and discontinuance.

Mr. Johnson said he would like to see the savings that are realized as a result of discontinuances. Dr. Florestano said she would also like to see the MHEC low productivity report; Ms. Hollander reported that MHEC did not do that report this year, most likely due to its staffing shortage.

5. Status of Reports Required by 2011 Joint Chairmen's Report.

Dr. Goldstein noted that, each year, at the end of the Maryland legislative session, the chairmen of the Senate Budget and Taxation and the House Appropriations Committee issue a "Joint Chairmen's Report" (JCR) that includes requirements for agencies, including the USM, to submit reports on topics of particular interest to the General Assembly. The USM has primary responsibility for a number of reports from legislative session and is designated as a major contributor to others for which other agencies, e.g. MHEC or MSDE, have primary responsibility. He noted that the 2011 session had yielded an almost unprecedented number of reporting requirements. He noted that the table distributed with the agenda provides summary information about each report and the USM involvement in it. He made a few brief comments about two reports: the study to merge UMCP and UMB and the task force to study higher education in Baltimore City. Dr. Florestano asked that a copy of the report on general fund expenditures on intercollegiate athletics be provided to members of the Committee; the Academic Affairs staff has a copy of that report and will send it out electronically to the Committee members.

6. Role and Function of the BOR Education Policy Committee.

and

7. Tentative Annual Agenda 2011-2012.

Dr. Florestano noted that these are standard "first meeting" items for the Committee. The article included on the role and function of the academic affairs committee should help Committee members, both new and continuing, understand the Committee's function. The tentative agenda, which was developed by Academic Affairs staff working with the Committee Chair, is open to additions and other changes. Dr. Florestano suggested that Committee members review the annual agenda and contact Dr. Goldstein or his staff with questions, comments, or suggestions.

Dr. Florestano said that she would be most interested in adding to the agenda, either for Education Policy or for the full Board, a presentation by faculty members who have been doing course redesign. Dr. Shapiro described current activities in course redesign funded by a grant from the Lumina

Foundation; the project involves community college faculty who are redesigning introductory courses with the assistance of “faculty fellows” from the USM who have experience in course redesign and are open to “spreading the good work.”

Dr. Florestano also noted that about four years ago the Committee approved a policy on alternative means of earning academic degree credit, including online courses; registration in special sessions; independent study or undergraduate research; study abroad; service learning; internships; credit by exam; and advanced placement credits. Ms. Hollander said that the Committee will receive a report on the implementation of that policy when it meets in November.

Dr. Florestano asked about the outcome of the program RFP process for Aberdeen Proving Ground. Dr. Kirwan reported that at least one USM institution had responded to each of the RFPs; all programs have been awarded, and USM institutions are involved in offering the BRAC programs as are other Maryland institutions. Dr. Kirwan also briefed the Committee on the status of the Towson University building on the Harford Community College campus. TU will be offering only 2+2 programs only, but there have been objections filed; MHEC approval is still pending.

Dr. Florestano noted that when the athletic directors met to give their annual reports last June, there was interest in have a meeting to discuss timing and report requirements as well as other topics. She said she has suggested that we not convene the athletic directors until some other issues related to athletics have been resolved; an internal study of BOR responsibilities regarding intercollegiate athletics is currently underway.

8. Adjournment.

Mr. Slater moved, Dr. Young seconded, and the motion to adjourn the Committee on Education Policy at 11:15 a.m. passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia S. Florestano
Chairperson