The Committee on Education Policy of the University System of Maryland Board of Regents met in public session on Monday, November 14, 2011 in Room 218 on the second floor of the Talon Center on the campus of Coppin State University, Baltimore, Maryland, beginning at 9:30 a.m. Present were Dr. Florestano, Chair; Ms. Gonzales, Mr. Kinkopf, Rev. Reid, Mr. Slater, Dr. Vance, Mr. Wojciechowski, and Dr. Young. Also attending were Dr. Arthur, Dr. Avery, Dr. Beise, Mr. Bowden, Mr. Collins, Dr. Cooney, Ms. Doyle, Dr. Gartner, Dr. Goldstein, Mr. Hamilton, Ms. Hollander, Ms. Jamison, Dr. Lee, Dr. Lingelbach, Mr. Lurie, Ms. Marionni, Ms. Moultrie, Mr. Muntz, Dr. Passmore, Dr. Reardon, Ms. Shaheed, Dr. Shapiro, Ms. Smith, Dr. Sykes, Dr. Ward, Ms. Watties-Daniels, Dr. Williams, Dr. Wolfe, Dr. Wood, 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. **New Academic Program Proposals.**
   a. **Coppin State University: Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Science in Geography.**

   Interim Provost Ron Collins introduced Dr. Douglas Reardon of the Department of Geography, who presented the proposal for the B.A./B.S. in Geography. Dr. Reardon reported that the proposed program will help the institution realize its mission to offer students quality undergraduate programs in the liberal arts, sciences and technology while providing educational access and increasing diversity. It will also help CSU align its efforts to several themes in the USM strategic plan, *USM in 2020*, including increasing educational access, furthering Maryland’s economic development, leveraging available resources, and achieving and sustaining national eminence. Dr. Reardon said that the proposed program would include instruction in the latest advancements in technology, including geographic information systems, the global positioning system and remote sensing satellite imagery, made possible with the 2010 opening of the new geospatial laboratory for research and learning. In Maryland alone, the Bureau of Labor and Statistics projects there will be more than 500 job openings each in geospatial industries each year. This number far exceeds the number of students graduating with Geography degrees from all existing programs in the University System of Maryland. Existing Geography programs in the USM are robust and growing, he noted, but there are no programs at the HBCUs.

   Dr. Reardon noted that the degree program will not require additional resources. Currently, the faculty teaching Geography courses, offered as service courses for other majors, include an associate professor and two assistant professors. The current faculty members have a track record of publications, externally-funded research, and service in professional organizations that speak to the quality of instruction and scholarship they will contribute to the proposed program.

   Dr. Florestano asked about similar programs in the USM. Dr. Reardon noted that SU’s program has doubled in size over the past decade and that programs at FSU and TU are both vigorous and growing. He reiterated that there are no Geography programs at the System’s HBCUs, and in fact, the program at CSU will be one of the first in the nation at a historically black institution.
Dr. Florestano asked where graduates will get jobs. Dr. Reardon said that firms such as Lockheed Martin are looking for individuals with this sort of training. Opportunities also exist in health care, private sector industries, and federal agencies such as NASA, NSA, and others. The program has been designed to align with the Geography Education National Implementation objectives (GENIP) and will serve a range of undergraduates, including those who will be seeking careers in the fast-growing geospatial industry and those who intend to pursue graduate degrees.

Mr. Slater said that he hopes to hear back from CSU in five years as to what the actual budget figures and enrollment trends have been. He inquired about the duration of the department’s grant from the Department of Education, which Dr. Reardon said is for five years, and about the number of new courses that the degree program will require, which Dr. Reardon said is zero since the department already offers extensive coursework in support of other majors.

In response to further questioning from Mr. Slater, Dr. Reardon said that a sizeable portion of the students in the program are anticipated to be “non-traditional” and will be served by the number of online courses and classes offered in the evenings, weekends and summer. It is also expected that students will be drawn from nearby community colleges. It is anticipated that the program will initially enroll twenty-five students and grow to sixty-eight students by 2016, he added.

Mr. Wojciechowski noted that his roommate at UMBC is a geography major and that he has indicated that the major requires significant laboratory space; Dr. Reardon said that CSU has a brand new, state of the art, geospatial teaching and research laboratory that will meet its needs adequately for the foreseeable future.

Ms. Gonzales commented that while she supports the proposed program, she is troubled by the budget tables. She asked how it is possible that the expenditures for the program are not expected to increase over the next five years even though enrollments all almost triple. Dr. Reardon said that accurate budget figures are “hard to get at” and so he has maintained 2011 figures for both revenue and expenditures moving forward. Ms. Gonzales said that approach is not realistic and that increased enrollment must increase expenditures as more faculty must be hired to offer more sections.

Dr. Goldstein commented that the faculty workload report shows that fewer faculty are teaching more students than was the case in the past. He noted that the HBCUs in particular have been moving forward programmatically and have increased diversity and enrollment without concomitant increases in the number of faculty. Ms. Gonzales said that she, like Mr. Slater, is looking forward to a report in five years on what the experience has actually been.

Dr. Young asked about the application of geospatial technology to health care. Dr. Reardon said that it is used extensively in epidemiology to track the incidence of disease and is also useful in mapping use of health care facilities and populations that rely on those facilities.

Following discussion, Ms. Gonzales moved, Dr. Young seconded, and the Committee on Education Policy recommended unanimously that the Board of Regents approve the proposal from Coppin State University to offer the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science in Geography.
b. **University of Baltimore: Master of Science in Innovation Management and Technology Commercialization.**

Provost Joe Wood introduced the proposed program, noting that the Merrick School of Business, which will house the new program, is highly ranked among business education schools, especially for part-time students. Dr. Wood noted that business education is becoming increasingly specialized, and UB is responding to that trend. Last year, the Board approved a program in Global Leadership, and this program is another specialized program that the school plans to offer. Dr. Wood indicated that there will likely be a third new program proposed next year. He noted that there is already in place in the school a solid faculty to deliver this M.S. in Innovation Management and Technology Commercialization; he introduced Assistant Professor David Lingelbach, one of the principal faculty members who will teach in the program, noting that Dr. Lingelbach was the manager of Bank of America in Russia before he became an academic.

Dr. Lingelbach said he would like to focus on three points: (1) the “gap” to which the program responds, (2) the focus of the program, and (3) the programmatic resources. Dr. Lingelbach said that there are two parts of the innovation process. At the front end, Maryland has considerable strength; in fact, we are #1 in basic R+D, although we lag in the development of start-up companies and the commercialization of research. At the back end, a recent survey by a University of Baltimore faculty member of high-tech company CEOs identified that the leading reason that technology ventures left Maryland for other locations was the weak labor pool for managers who understood the distinctive issues faced by growing technology firms.

The choice of focus for the proposed program responds to this second part of the process, the post-start-up phase during which management has a critical role. The curriculum of the proposed program is directly responsive to the concerns expressed by the CEOs who were surveyed. In terms of program resources, Dr. Lingelbach reported that the Merrick School has this field as a long-time strength. There is a strong focus on entrepreneurship as well as international reach.

Dr. Florestano asked about similar programs in the state; Dr. Lingelbach said that most other management programs are quite broad; no one is focusing on innovation management, he said. Dr. Reid asked what program graduates would do in terms of employment; Dr. Lingelbach said that they would be well-suited for a number of positions “below the founder level,” including chief marketing officer, chief financial officer, and others. Graduates would be in particular demand from high-growth high-tech companies, known colloquially as “gazelles.” Dr. Wood added that it is anticipated that most of the students in the program will be already working in such companies; the student population will be mostly part-time, and the program will be attractive to scientists and engineers who want to add a business focus to their expertise, for example.

Dr. Young asked for a clarification of the difference between this master’s program and a certificate program such as the UMCP Certification in Innovation Management. Dr. Lingelbach said that certificate
programs often require only three or four courses; the master’s program will be longer, more specialized, and more intensive, and will carry more weight as a credential in the business world.

Ms. Gonzales asked why there is such a dearth of managerial talent in Maryland and commented that this program would seem to be an incremental way to increase the pool. She asked if aspiring technology company managers need to leave the state to get experience. Dr. Lingelbach said that what is needed is a change to the entire “ecosystem.” Technology is not as hot a topic from a business perspective in Maryland as elsewhere. There needs to be a change in perception, he said, and while he won’t claim that the UB program will be sufficient to foster that change, it does represent a critical first step.

There was a brief discussion of the program budget tables. Following discussion, Dr. Young moved, Mr. Slater seconded, and the Committee on Education Policy unanimously recommended that the Board of Regents approve the proposal from the University of Baltimore to offer the Master of Science in Innovation Management and Technology Commercialization.

The Committee then turned to its information agenda.

2. Report on General Education at CSU.

Dr. Florestano introduced the item, noting that today, the Committee will hear about the reform of the general education program at Coppin State University that occurred over the past two years. 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. 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. At the last meeting, the Committee heard from Frostburg State University, Dr. Florestano said.

Interim Provost Ron Collins noted that CSU is extremely proud of the work done over the past two years, adding that the work has been recognized at the national level and that the co-chairs of the University Assessment Committee – Dr. Elaine Sykes, Dr. Jackie Williams, and Prof. Denyce Watties-Daniels – will be presenters at the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s 2011 annual conference, which is entitled “Quality Assurance Through Accreditation,” on December 11-13, 2011. The presentation will be entitled “Life-long Learners and the Traditional Academy: A Robust Approach to Reforming General Education Requirements.”

Dr. Sykes reported that she joined the CSU assessment team in 2010-2011 and that it quickly became a “passion.” The institution’s University Assessment Committee had as its major charge the development of a response to Middle States Standard 12 (General Education Requirements) that identifies student learning outcomes for the university; Dr. Sykes noted that the student outcomes assessment is across the board and relates to all subject areas.

Dr. Williams indicated that the outcomes represent six area requirements to promote intellectual growth. They are written and oral communication; analytical reasoning; information literacy; social and self awareness; reflective practice; and responsible citizenship. She indicated that the redesign of
general education is a three-part process and the assessment committee is now working on the final phase: the incorporation of the identified learning outcomes across the curriculum. This phase entails assessing academic departmental usage of Plans of Study, Rubrics, and Syllabus of Record; refining processes and procedures for assessing student General Education competencies and Student Learning Outcomes; and applying procedures for revision and modifications as necessary.

Ms. Watties-Daniels said that the committee met weekly for six months in order to complete Phase I, which involved curriculum mapping and the identification of outcomes. In Phase II, members of the 40-person assessment committee worked with their colleagues in the departments on the development of ways to measure outcomes. The number of credits that the general education program requires has decreased from 46 to 40, and all students are expected to complete their general education requirements before the beginning of their junior year.

Dr. Florestano commented that CSU has provided a fascinating study and that she applauds their work, however she expressed frustration that the presentation did not give the Regents any information about what courses the students will be taking to achieve these new learning outcomes. She said that the assessment outcomes section is very strong, but the presentation would be strengthened significantly by the addition of a list of courses. Ms. Watties-Daniels said that the courses are already those offered at CSU, most of them in the previous general education program. Ms. Gonzales asked if there were any new courses developed for the program; Dr. Williams responded that while there were no new courses developed, several were “refined” and aligned with desired learning outcomes. She added that this provided opportunities to communicate with colleagues in the departments. Ms. Gonzales asked how the new program differs from the earlier one; Ms. Watties-Daniels said that the revised plan is “more directed.”

Mr. Slater said he is encouraged that the SOLs go across the curriculum. Mr. Wojciechowski asked for some examples of how “responsive citizenship” is implemented in various courses; Dr. Sykes provided an example from foreign language study. Mr. Wojciechowski asked if the committee includes students; Dr. Sykes said that surveys were conducted within departments, and it was the expectation that departments would draw upon their student majors for feedback. Dr. Williams confirmed that there was also student involvement in the University Assessment Committee.

Mr. Collins distributed to members of the Committee a “Plan of Study” printed from the CSU website that includes a listing of courses approved for general education credit. Dr. Florestano noted that Coppin is yet one more USM institution from which it is possible to graduate without taking a government or history course. She said she was also concerned about the very low level of mathematics required of elementary education majors.

Dr. Florestano thanked the team from Coppin for a very impressive presentation.


Dr. Ben Passmore, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, who compiled the report and analyzed the data, distributed copies of a revised report, noting that there was a calculation error in the UMES data that has been corrected (resulting in a substantial change in Table 3 on page 7). He
added that he had corrected a number of typographical errors. Dr. Passmore indicated that the updated version of the report is posted on the USM web site and specifically on the BOR Portal.

Dr. Goldstein briefly described the history of what he called a “fun report” to present and talked about the overlap between the various aspects of faculty workload: teaching, research, and service. Noting that the instructional workload report is tied to the Board’s E+E initiative, Dr. Goldstein reported that overall the results indicate substantial success both in meeting explicit workload goals and in generally improving productivity. The total tenured/tenure-track faculty complement rose by 11 or .3%, while FTE student enrollment rose by 1,100 or 1.3% in AY 2010-2011. Collectively, the USM exceeded the expected instructional productivity standards (averaging 7.8 course units per FTE faculty member at comprehensive institutions and 6.1 at research institutions). The time-to-degree continues to improve again reaching the lowest level (8.6 semesters) on record. Finally, USM levels of grants and other research awards dipped by 5%, in large part due to a substantial dip in funding at UMCP, but still totaled over 1.2 billion dollars.

Mr. Slater said that he would very much like to see a ten-year trend for the Table 1 data on faculty compositions at the research and comprehensive institutions. Mr. Kinkopf asked how the data in Tables 3 and 4 (average course units taught) compare nationally. Dr. Passmore responded that we do not have data from other institutions; he added that a number of other institutions have modeled their own faculty workload policies on the USM policy, however. He reiterated that we are generally heading in the right direction.

There was a brief discussion of time to degree. Ms. Gonzales said she would be interested in seeing five-year graduation rates. Dr. Florestano thanked Dr. Goldstein and Dr. Passmore for a wonderful report.

Mr. Chad Muntz, USM Director of Institutional Research, who compiled the report on opening fall enrollments, gave an on-screen presentation for the Committee. He noted that the report provides an overview of preliminary fall 2011 undergraduate, graduate and first professional enrollment – overall enrollment growth, full-time and part-time enrollment patterns and decreasing numbers of first-time full-time freshmen. USM enrollment reached another high – 155,607 students, up 2.0 percent from last fall’s enrollment (+3,026 students). Virtually all of the increase (98%) was at UMUC. The report also includes estimated FY 2012 FTES data. Mr. Muntz noted that each headcount student represents 4.5 FTES over six years. He noted that the Board Committee on Finance will also discuss this report at its November 17, 2011 meeting.

Mr. Kinkopf asked why our enrollments are not increasing more given the increased demand. There was a discussion of the extent to which concerns about maintaining quality and budgetary constraints suppress enrollment growth. Dr. Florestano commented that the yield rates are very important.

Rev. Reid asked if the report might be modified to include a demographic breakdown. Mr. Muntz said that the demographic breakdown of enrolled students is included in the retention and graduation report.
5. **Motion to Adjourn and Reconvene in Closed Session.**
Dr. Florestano reported that the Open Meetings Act permits public bodies to close their meetings to the public in special circumstances outlined in Subtitle 5, section §10-508(a) of the Act. She asked for a motion to adjourn the open meeting and to reconvene in closed session in Room 210 to discuss issues specifically exempted in the Act from the requirement for public consideration.

Ms. Gonzales moved, Mr. Wojciechowski seconded, and the Committee on Education Policy voted unanimously to adjourn the open session of the Committee on Education Policy at 11:30 a.m. to reconvene in closed session under article §10-508(a) of the Open Meetings Act.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia S. Florestano
Chairperson