

**UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND
BOARD OF REGENTS
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION POLICY
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2010**

The Committee on Education Policy of the Board of Regents met in public session on Thursday, September 16, 2010, in the President's Board Room on the 14th Floor of the Saratoga Building at 220 Arch Street on the campus of the University of Maryland, Baltimore, Baltimore, Maryland, beginning at 9:30 a.m. Present were Dr. Florestano, Chairperson; Ms. Gonzales, Mr. Hall, Mr. Kendall, Chancellor Kirwan, Mr. Slater, and Dr. Young. Also present were Ms. Baker, Dr. Beise, Ms. Doyle, Dr. Gartner, Dr. Goldstein, Dr. Hammond, Dr. Hirshman, Ms. Hollander, Ms. Jamison, Mr. Lurie, Ms. Marionni, Ms. Moultrie, Dr. Orlin, Dr. Passmore, Dr. Perman, Dr. Perreault, Dr. Shapiro, Dr. Shirazi, Dr. Siegert, Ms. Smith, Ms. Streckfus, Dr. Tardiff, Dr. von Lehmen, Dr. Ward, Dr. Warner, Dr. Watson, Dr. Welsh, Dr. Wolfe, Dr. Wood, members of the press, and other observers.

Dr. Florestano called the meeting to order. She asked that the meeting items be reordered since Chancellor Kirwan had not yet arrived from his earlier appointment. 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. Report on General Education.

General Principles: COMAR. Ms. Hollander explained that while public institutions in Maryland have the autonomy to design their general education programs to meet their unique needs and missions, the Code of Maryland Academic Regulations (COMAR) provides definitions and common standards to which all general education programs must conform. Specifically, regulations mandate that general education programs of public institutions require at least: one course in each of two disciplines in arts and humanities; one course in each of two disciplines in social and behavioral sciences; two science courses, at least one of which shall be a laboratory course; one course in mathematics at or above the level of college algebra; and one course in English composition. The regulations do not specify specific courses, however, Ms. Hollander said. She added that the Middle States Association also addresses general education, although their advice is extremely broad.

Ms. Hollander added that COMAR is undergoing a thorough review and revision this year and that the USM has representation on the group doing the review; she said she did not think that there would be radical changes to the general education requirements section of the regulations. The workgroup has been meeting over the summer and will take its report later this year to the Intersegmental Chief Academic Officers group; work will continue throughout the year, and the recommendations will likely go to MHEC next fall.

Mr. Slater commented that he had received a copy of a report from the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA) that asserted that most U.S. colleges and universities have failed to provide students with an adequate general education. He asked if that report could be shared with other Regents; Ms. Hollander agreed to share the report.

Mr. Slater said he would like to change the system so that students could not take very narrow courses, such as "History of Hawaii," to satisfy the general education requirement in history or the social sciences, for example. He said that he suspects that the academic community will resist specificity in general education requirements but is deeply concerned that students may graduate from our institutions with almost no knowledge of U.S. history or government. Ms.

Hollander responded that particular courses, including U.S. history and American government, are required of all Maryland high school students for graduation. At the university level, general education has to support the particular mission of the institution and the student's choice of major discipline, she said.

Dr. Florestano mentioned that she had heard some interesting news about the Bologna project; Ms. Hollander noted that two articles about the project have been provided to Committee members with the supplemental meeting materials today. Dr. Goldstein noted that a presentation about the Bologna project could be provided for the Committee later in the year should they so desire.

Ms. Hollander introduced Dr. Elizabeth (Betsey) Beise, Associate Provost, Academic Planning and Programs, at UMCP, who has prepared a presentation about the new general education program at UMCP that was part of the institution's most recent strategic planning exercise. In response to a question from Dr. Florestano, Dr. Goldstein noted that future EPC meetings would include presentations on the general education programs at other USM institutions, including Towson at the November meeting and the University of Baltimore in January.

Revised Requirements: University of Maryland, College Park. Dr. Beise reported that the revision of general education was an element of the strategic planning process about which there were very strong feelings. The committee, chaired by historian Dr. Ira Berlin, surveyed general education programs at other universities nationwide, discussed at length the purpose of general education, and reviewed carefully every element of the program before making its recommendations. Dr. Florestano asked if there was a course requirement that addressed the issue of civic and community engagement; Dr. Beise replied that the civic and community engagement are values that are embedded across the entire general education curriculum.

Dr. Beise enumerated the goals of the general education program redesign. First of all, she said, is the "skills oriented" component (e.g. writing and mathematics). General education serves to expose students to disciplines outside of their majors. It "imprints" the students as UMCP students. The redesign sought to make general education more exciting; this goal is manifested particularly in the new I-Series courses, she said, which were modeled on the piloted Marquis courses in science and engineering for non-science majors. The revamped diversity component is geared to intercultural communication instead of focusing on cultural identity of particular groups, she noted; the program aims to create "culturally competent" citizens.

Dr. Beise then explained each of the four major areas and gave examples of the kinds of courses that would be in each. Dr. Florestano referred to the eight-course distributive studies area and asked if Mr. Slater's concern is justified; could a student finish the general education program without taking a course in either American history or American government? Dr. Beise said that could certainly happen; the expectation is that students will come to the university having taken those courses in secondary school. Mr. Slater noted that the university tests entering students for minimum competency in mathematics and writing and asked if there might be some sort of test of basic knowledge of history and government. Dr. Beise said that the committee did not consider placement tests. She did say that there were two historians on the

committee that designed the new general education plan and that there had been some discussion of the specificity of the history courses.

In response to a question from Dr. Young, Dr. Beise said that the “oral communication” area under “Fundamental Studies” includes public speaking, persuasive argument, dialogue, and presentation skills that faculty members felt was lacking across the disciplines.

Turning to the innovative I-Series courses, Dr. Beise explained that these deal with “big questions” and present materials a bit differently than in traditional courses, responding to the question, “How might a scholar in a particular discipline approach a particular issue or problem?” One example, she said, might be a course in physics on the global energy crisis. She noted that as a financial incentive to develop these untraditional courses, departments were given support for a teaching assistant for each such course from the provost’s office rather than from the departmental budget. She showed the Committee a list of course titles, noting that I-Series courses are offered by every college on the campus and that they include “enrichment features” that keep the courses fresh.

Dr. Beise noted that the “Scholarship in Practice” courses bring to bear on the general education program the richness of the research enterprise, emphasizing scholarship and its application, e.g. engineering, architecture, musical performance. Dr. Florestano asked what the institution was doing to promote the cross-disciplinary approach to problem-solving that seems to be featured in the new curriculum; Dr. Beise said that there will be faculty workshops throughout the fall to allow faculty to talk through ideas and possible courses. Dr. Beise added that the focus of the diversity courses is changing to promote intergroup dialogue and cultural competence. She noted that the campus is not yet able to implement all of the recommended changes. Ms. Gonzales asked what Dr. Beise means when she says the institution can’t do it yet. Dr. Beise said that while piloting some of the new courses is feasible and underway, the campus does not have the resources to launch a series of courses at the level of 4,000 seats/semester and to require students to take the new curriculum. Some courses will be available to interested students, but the goal is to implement the new general education plan with the Fall 2011 incoming class.

Mr. Slater asked if there is any possibility that MHEC will come up with a set of general education requirements with which UMCP will not be in compliance. Ms. Hollander said that the statewide regulations will be flexible, that the USM representatives are contributing to the discussion, and that the UMCP plan will fit whatever new regulations are proposed.

Dr. Florestano thanked Dr. Beise for her presentation.

2. University System of Maryland Hagerstown: Status Report.

Dr. Dave Warner, executive director of the University System of Maryland at Hagerstown (USMH), gave a presentation on the status of the Hagerstown regional center, noting that all of the numbers are going in the right direction. USMH currently offers 21 degree programs from five institutions. Enrollment, FTE, revenue and number of programs have all increased, and cost-per-FTE and state appropriation have decreased.

There was a question and a brief discussion about the differences in governance and funding between the two USM regional centers at Hagerstown and Shady Grove and the six non-USM regional centers in which some USM institutions participate.

Dr. Florestano asked how USMH knows that a particular program is needed. Dr. Warner responded that, when a member of the advisory committee or some other party suggests a new program for USMH, the staff does research on the need, possible feeder institutions, potential enrollments, etc. and initiates discussion with institutions that might be interested in offering such a program. He observed that every academic program that has been initiated at USMH is still there, growing and supporting itself, while there have been instances in which the research has resulted in a decision not to offer a particular program that has been suggested. Mr. Kendall asked how the faculty and academic requirements at the center compare to those at the home campus; Dr. Warner said they are identical.

Dr. Warner reported on building use by outside organizations, and Chancellor Kirwan asked if we report those numbers when we report on facilities use. Dr. Warner said that those figures have been included in facilities use reports since 2008; he said that he shows “everything going on in the building,” including the number of UMUC on-line students who use the USMH facilities for testing. Dr. Kirwan noted that the activity, along with the rental agreement with the Barbara Ingram Arts High School, makes USMH an education hub in the area. Dr. Warner said that there is unfortunately no formula or mechanism for reporting all of that to the state; Ms. Gonzales urged Dr. Warner to develop one, to provide guidance to MHEC and the legislature. She then asked about financial arrangements with the participating USM institutions; Dr. Warner said that there is no charge to the institutions to offer programs at the facility. Each institution charges its own home tuition to Hagerstown students.

Chancellor Kirwan noted that one of the things that must be taken into account when looking at the cost per student at USMH is that, as part of the “Smart Growth” initiative, the State – not the System – made the decision to renovate an historic building in the downtown core rather than building a new, less costly, and easier and cheaper to maintain facility on the outskirts of the city. Dr. Warner said that the Center’s current location has been instrumental in the “renaissance of downtown Hagerstown.”

Dr. Florestano thanked Dr. Warner for a great presentation.

Dr. Jay Perman, president of UMB, welcomed the Committee to the campus on behalf of the faculty, staff and students of the institution. He apologized for not being at the meeting when it began but explained that he was on the other side of the campus speaking to the Governor’s Summit on Community Engagement. He shared two reflections with the Committee, one concerning the importance of the opportunity to teach students as a recruitment and retention tool for outstanding faculty, and the other concerning UMB’s role as the “farm team,” engaging the community in pipeline initiatives such as STEM and the achievement gap. He thanked the Regents and the Chancellor for their support of UMB.

3. Report on Implementation of the Recommendations of the Final Report of the Governor's STEM Task Force.

Chancellor Kirwan reminded the Committee that last fall, he and June Streckfus, Executive Director of the Maryland Business Roundtable for Education, presented to the Board the

recommendations of the Governor's STEM Task Force; at that time, the Committee asked for an update early this year. Dr. Kirwan noted that a number of important things have happened this past year related to the STEM TF recommendations. The State won one of the coveted Race to the Top Grants (\$250 million), and the task force recommendations related to teachers and teaching were an important part of the application. Maryland's application won all the points that were allowed for STEM. The College Success Task Force completed its work and made strong recommendations in support of aligning standards, with special attention to mathematics in high school and in elementary and middle school, thus priming the pipeline for more STEM majors. The USM applied for and won a major STEM grant from NSF on Climate Change Education. The initial grant for \$2 million dollars provides funding to lay groundwork for transformative STEM education in the area of climate change education in teacher ed and in K-12 Schools. We are partnering with NOAA, NIST, NASA and Maryland Public Television, and the state of Delaware to make the Chesapeake Bay a focal point of climate science education. One of the things that the Race to the Top grant will allow us to do, Dr. Kirwan said, is to build a robust Longitudinal Data System; he noted that he has been asked to chair the governing board of that LDS. Maryland has been at a distinct disadvantage in setting targets and tracking teacher candidates and majors into the workforce, but there is hope that the new LDS will give the USM and the State a much stronger tool to use. Finally, the USM is working on a plan to get to the goal of increasing the number of STEM teachers, working with institutions to identify programs and potential opportunities to increase the STEM teacher pipeline and setting benchmarks and targets to meet the goals.

Dr. Kirwan emphasized that all of this activity is taking place in an increasingly challenging economic environment. "We understand we will need to identify funding to support this initiative," he said, "and we have high hopes for the opportunity provided by the new RTTT funding."

Dr. Shapiro then described some of the specific activities to date in implementing the first three recommendations of the report. She noted that the College Success Task Force has completed its work and made recommendations related to college readiness and alignment, endorsing the Common Core Standards, and the anticipated development of a reliable and validated assessment instrument to assess college readiness. USM, along with all the community colleges and independent colleges, signed a letter of commitment to be part of a consortium (led by the national educational non-profit, Achieve) to develop the assessment, and Maryland is one of the governing states in that consortium. The state also has a leadership team involved with Complete College America, she added.

Dr. Shapiro reported that each USM institution has developed plans to increase its STEM teacher pipeline. From 2006-2008, the USM produced around 120 STEM teachers per year against a need of just over 500 new STEM teachers per year. The Race to the Top proposal included funding for elements of the STEM Task Force report, including increasing the teacher pipeline. As part of the USM strategic planning process, USM will be collecting data on STEM majors and STEM teachers, she noted. The RTTT funding might also provide increased opportunities to engage in the professional development of teachers; the new grant for Climate Change Education will also contribute to this goal.

Ms. Gonzales expressed surprise that the charts showing STEM teacher preparation show only a single graduate in the area of physical science. Dr. Shapiro explained that this is not actually

a major; Dr. Passmore added that programs like this tend to be embedded in other majors so there is no clearly defined cohort moving through that can be counted. Mr. Slater asked if the numbers reflect new teachers; Dr. Passmore responded that these are individuals educated to be teachers in the specified fields, but they are not yet certified and without an LDS we have no way of knowing if they are actually teaching or where.

Ms. Streckfus then described progress to date on the seventh recommendation, the development of the STEM Innovation Network: She reported that the Maryland Business Roundtable has secured initial investments from corporate and government funders to establish needed systems and services to be delivered by STEM Net. MBRT has received a planning grant from ATT and Citi and a \$100,000 in-kind grant from IBM. In addition, there has been pro bono support from some of the biggest companies' chief technology officers. ATT is supporting the first component of STEMnet – the STEM Teachers' Hub, which will bring information, resources and federal, higher education and industry expertise to strengthen K-12 STEM teachers and learning. Ms. Streckfus reported that teacher focus groups and an online survey were conducted to determine teacher need; there were 300 responses to the survey in only four days, she noted. Teachers want student-centered STEM support, including experts in the classroom, aligned to the common core curriculum. They want their own support hub for statewide STEM connections, so that they can post questions and share best practices on a sort of community bulletin board. They also want a STEM resource clearinghouse on line that would include webinars, demos, and simulations as well as connections to relevant websites; Ms. Streckfus noted that part of the RTTT proposal provides for \$2 million over four years to fund such a portal. She indicated that there are many opportunities to fund this sort of project; only five states have STEM innovation networks at this time.

Mr. Hall asked if there are financial incentives for students to go into STEM fields and STEM teaching in particular. Ms. Streckfus said that MBRT has a Science Scholars Program through which schools track their STEM majors and the students get \$10,000 in aid to stay in STEM disciplines. Dr. Shapiro said that there is some federal funding available to encourage STEM majors, and she hopes that some of the RTTT funding can be utilized for programs such as UTeach which encourages STEM teachers. Mr. Slater asked if we know where the RTTT funding will go; Dr. Kirwan said “not in any detail.”

Dr. Florestano thanked Dr. Kirwan and Ms. Streckfus for the status report. Mr. Kendall noted that the state of Maryland is getting an extraordinary amount of federal funding thanks to the very impressive work of Dr. Shapiro and her staff.

4. Institutional Reports on Progress in Closing the Achievement Gap.

Chancellor Kirwan commented that this is one of his signature initiatives. He emphasized that the achievement gap is a national issue; there are huge disparities in college attendance and completion based on race and income. The USM is providing leadership not just in the state but nationally, he said, adding that this initiative is critical to the 55% college completion rate and to the state's economic competitiveness. Further, he said, this is a moral imperative; if we do not address the achievement gap between high- and low-income students, the discrepancy in earnings between those who have a college degree and those who do not will relegate low-income students to lifelong low-income status.

Dr. Kirwan reminded the Committee that, in November 2007, the USM hosted a statewide conference of political, community, business, and education leaders to set a course for Maryland to cut in half the achievement gap by 2015 and eliminate it by 2020. As a follow-up to the conference, the USM's 10 undergraduate-degree-granting institutions were asked to develop achievement gap strategies that include institutional data analysis and needs assessments, along with specific goals and timelines to reduce the gap between low-income and high-income students, under-represented minority students and majority students, and African-American males and white males. Dr. Kirwan remarked that he is extremely gratified by the institutional responses. Each institution knows what its gap is and has developed strategies to reduce it, while monitoring the success of its initiatives. Dr. Kirwan noted that particular recognition is due to Dr. Goldstein, Dr. Wolfe and the staff in Academic Affairs and to Dr. Passmore and Mr. Muntz and the institutional research offices at the institutions for their exemplary work. He noted that this initiative represents an opportunity for the USM to provide the same kind of national leadership on this issue as we have provided on cost-containment through the Board's E+E initiative.

Dr. Goldstein thanked all of the institutional provosts for their leadership in this area. He noted that each institution has developed a delivery team unit that includes representation from academic affairs, student affairs, institutional research, and the faculty; Dr. Wolfe, Dr. Passmore, and Mr. Muntz have been visiting the institutions to work with the delivery teams on the achievement gap. Dr. Goldstein noted that the Regents' packet includes a timeline as well as summary reports on each institution's progress thus far. He added that any Regent who would like a copy of the entire report from an institution may request it from his office. The next institutional reports are due in November, and an annual summary report will be presented to the Committee next fall. The institutions are looking at strategies that have proven successful elsewhere, such as living/learning communities, early warning systems, and summer enrichment programs, and are redirecting existing resources to implement those strategies.

Mr. Slater noted that FSU has identified male and female graduation rates as their target initiative, noting that there is no significant racial gap; he said he doesn't hear that claim made. He also noted that CSU stands out for its very poor graduation rates overall and asked if campus efforts have yet shown to be having an impact. Dr. Goldstein reported that Dr. Avery has introduced a bridge program. CSU Provost Dr. Cynthia Jackson Hammond, who joined Coppin this summer, reported that 175 entering students completed a developmental program this summer; 100% completed the developmental English requirement and 98% the math requirement and will be taking regular college-level courses this semester. She said that the summer program will become standard for all students moving forward. It is accompanied by monitoring of progress, special "tell and assist" programs, and links to academic resource advising. Mr. Hall asked if the program costs the students additional money; Dr. Hammond said that it was free to students since CSU had special resources to support it.

Mr. Hall asked, "as an African-American, first-generation, male," if it is fair to compare BSU with UMCP or TU in terms of graduation rates, given their different entering populations and missions. Dr. Goldstein pointed out that each institution identified its own gap and comparison population; BSU's choice to compare all BSU African-American students with all students in the USM might be further refined in the future to comparisons by gender or to compare BSU's African-American students to USM African-American students, he added. Ms. Gonzales countered, "What's fair? If an institution admits particular students, is it not fair for those

students to expect that if they apply themselves and works hard that they will leave the institution after four or six years with a degree in hand?" She observed that the graduation rate is a measurement of how an institution is doing in honoring the bargain it makes with its students.

Dr. Florestano asked why the UMB gap relates specifically to the School of Nursing. Dr. Orlin replied that nursing is UMB's only significant undergraduate population. Dr. Goldstein added that UMB had originally been "excused" from the achievement gap initiative but volunteered to participate since it does have undergraduate nursing. Ms. Gonzales pointed out a discrepancy in the Fall 1997 and Fall 1998 graduate rates for all USM students between the BSU and CSU tables; Dr. Passmore said he would correct the figures, noting that he believes the error is in the CSU table.

Dr. Florestano expressed admiration for the campuses and asked what the Regents can do to help move this initiative forward. Chancellor Kirwan said, "Your holding our feet to the fire is critical," adding that annual reporting to the Board, coupled with inclusion of the achievement gap progress in both his own evaluation and the evaluation of the presidents by the Board, provides needed accountability.

5. Process for Responding to JCR Report on Implementation of Recommendations of the 2001 Study of Coppin State College.

Dr. Goldstein noted that, in March 2001, the USM and MHEC appointed an external study team to conduct an independent study of Coppin State College (now University). The study was mandated by the Partnership Agreement between the State of Maryland and the U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights; one component of that agreement required Maryland to develop strategies to enhance its four public HBCUs. The Coppin Study Team was to review the following areas: mission; academic programs; student mix; administrative and faculty staffing; institutional advancement; fiscal affairs; and physical plant. The Team's report was to be a seminal document in the development of a new strategic plan for Coppin. The team members included representatives of business and higher education, and staffing was provided by Coppin, MHEC, and the USM. Regent Gonzales, who was at that time chair of the BOR Committee on Education Policy, was the Regent Liaison to the Team.

Dr. Goldstein reported that, as part of the Joint Chairmen's Report (JCR) from the 2010 legislative session, the USM and MHEC were charged to "establish an independent study team to assess the implementation of recommendations from the 2001 Independent Study Team on the Revitalization of Coppin State College." The new team is to "determine which of the 2001 recommendations have been fully, partially, and not yet implemented"; in addition, the team is to "provide technical assistance in implementing the recommendations that have not been executed or effective." The JCR language spells out the recommended composition of the study team in general categories and calls for an interim report by December 15, 2010 and a final report to the budget committees on July 15, 2011. Dr. Goldstein noted that Dr. William De Lauder, retired president of Delaware State University, has agreed to chair the team; the team membership roster is almost complete and will be shared with the Board shortly. The team will meet regularly this fall to ensure that the December deadline for the interim report is realized.

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

and

7. Tentative Annual Agenda 2010-2011.

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. Goldstein noted that there is a special meeting of the Committee scheduled for December 13 to review mission statements; he added that the mission statement timeline has been provided to the Committee members with the supplemental materials at their places. He observed that mission statements are critical for several reasons, one of which is that new academic program proposals are evaluated by MHEC and the Board on the extent to which they are consistent with the institutional mission. The mission statement review meeting, the last of which was held in December 2005, reinforces what the Regents are about, what the institutions are about, how they differ one from the other, etc. Ms. Gonzales asked if mission statements can be modified out of cycle; Dr. Goldstein said that they can but that it is very rare.

8. Adjournment.

Ms. Gonzales moved, Dr. Young seconded, and the Committee voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting of the Committee on Education Policy at 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Patricia S. Florestano
Chairperson